DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

13-14 GEORGE V, 1923

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1025 **Volume II: Pages 1027-2045**

Volume III: Pages 2047-3044 **Volume IV: Pages 3045-4005**

Volume V: Pages 4007-4756

VOLUME CLV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF JANUARY TO THE NINTH DAY OF MARCH, 1923, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1923

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HON. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING,

C.M.G., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.

SECOND SESSION OF THE FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1923

THE MINISTRY

Prime Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs, President of the Privy Council	Right Hon. WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE KING, C.M.G., M.A., LL.B., LL.D.
Minister of Finance and Receiver General	Right Hon. WILLIAM STEVENS FIELDING, LL.D., D.C.L.
Minister of Railways and Canals[1]	Hon. GEORGE PERRY GRAHAM.
Postmaster General	Hon. CHARLES MURPHY, B.A., K.C.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND, LL.D., K.C.
Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Minister in charge of and to administer the Department of Health	Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN BÉLAND, B.A., M.D.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General	Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Customs and Excise	Hon. JACQUES BUREAU, LL.D.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE, B.A., LL.B., K.C.
Solicitor General[2]	Hon. DANIEL DUNCAN McKENZIE.
Minister of Trade and Commerce[3]	Hon. JAMES ALEXANDER ROBB.
Minister without Portfolio[4]	Hon. THOMAS ANDREW LOW.
Secretary of State	Hon. ARTHUR BLISS COPP, LL.B.
Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization	Hon. CHARLES STEWART.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. WILLIAM RICHARD MOTHERWELL.
Minister of Labour	Hon. JAMES MURDOCK.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. JOHN EWEN SINCLAIR.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. JAMES HORACE KING, M.D., C.M., F.A.C.S.
Minister of National Defence[5]	Hon. EDWARD MORTIMER MACDONALD.

---

[1]Accepted portfolio of Railways and Canals, April 28, 1923. Hon. William Costello Kennedy, Minister of Railways and Canals, died January 17, 1923.

[2]Resigned April 11, 1923. Hon. E. J. McMurray, B.A., LL.B., accepted office as Solicitor General, September, 12, 1923.

[3]Accepted portfolio of Immigration and Colonization, August 17, 1923.

[4]Accepted portfolio of Trade and Commerce, August 17, 1923.

[5]Accepted portfolio of National Defence, August 17, 1923; Acting Minister from April 28, 1923.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker.....Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, K.C., B.C.L., LL.D.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. George Newcombe Gordon, K.C.

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

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

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

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.....[1]L. C. Panet.

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

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

Associate Editor of Debates (French).....Marcel Gabard.

Official Reporters of Debates:—

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

French: J. H. Mackay.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES:

Messieurs: Boivin, Ethier, Fansher, Gardiner, Garland (Bow River), Hocken, MacKelvie, McGiverin, Marcil (Bonaventure), Prevost, Rinfret, Robinson and Ross (Kingston)

Chairman: G. H. Boivin, B.A., K.C.

[1]Died June 26, 1923.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Fourteenth Parliament

1923

ANDERSON, ROBERT KING.—Halton.

ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Verchères.

ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead.

BANCROFT, LELAND PAYSON—Selkirk.

BAXTER, HON. JOHN B. M.—St. John City. and Counties of St. John and Albert.

BEAUBIEN, ARTHUR LUCIEN—Provencher.

BÉLAND, HON. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.

BENOIT, ALDERIC JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.

BINETTE, JOSEPH—Prescott.

BIRD, THOMAS WILLIAM—Nelson.

BLACK, GEORGE—Yukon.

BLACK, WILLIAM—Huron, S. Riding.

BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.

BOUCHARD, GEORGES—Kamouraska.

BOUCHER, AIMÉ—Yamaska.

BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Levis.

BOWEN, FRED W.—Durham.

BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.

BRETHEN, GEORGE ARTHUR—Peterborough, E. Riding.

BRISTOL, HON. EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.

BROWN, JOHN LIVINGSTONE—Lisgar.

BUREAU, HON. JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

CAHILL FRANK S.—Pontiac.

CALDWELL, THOMAS W.—Victoria and Carleton (N.B.)

CAMPBELL, MILTON N.—Mackenzie.

CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.

CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.

CARMICHAEL, ARCHIBALD M.—Kindersley.

CARROLL, WILLIAM F.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

CARRUTHERS, JOHN—Algoma, E. Riding.

CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANÇOIS—Charlevois-Montmorency.

CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln.

CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.

CHEVRIER, EDGAR RODOLPHE EUGÈNE—Ottawa.

CHEW, MANLEY—Simcoe, E. Riding.

CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.

CHURCH, THOMAS LANGTON—Toronto, North.

CLARK, JOHN ARTHUR—Burrard.

CLIFFORD, LAWSON OMAR—Ontario, S. Riding.

COOTE, GEORGE GIBSON—Macleod.

COPP, HON. ARTHUR BLISS—Westmoreland.

CRERAR, HON. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.

D'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.

DAVIES, CLAUDIUS CHARLES—North Battleford.

DÉCHÈNE, AIMÉ MIVILLE—Montmagny.

DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.

DENIS, J. ARTHUR—St. Denis.

DENIS, JEAN JOSEPH—Joliette.

DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.

[1]DESCOTEAUX, JOSEPH F.—Nicolet.

DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.

DESROCHERS, EUGÈNE—Maskinongé.

DICKIE, CHARLES HERBERT—Nanaimo.

DRAYTON, HON. SIR HENRY L., Kt.—York, W. Riding.

DRUMMOND, JOHN DOUGLAS FRASER—Middlesex, W. Riding.

DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenberg.

DUNCAN, MATTHEW ROBERT—Grey, N. Riding.

ELLIOTT, PRESTON—Dundas.

ELLIOTT, WILLIAM—Waterloo, S. Riding.

ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.

EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.

EVANS, JOHN—Saskatoon.

[1]Elected May 14, 1923.

FAFARD, J. FERNAND—L'Islet.
FANSHER, BURT WENDELL—Lambton, E. Riding.
FIELDING, RT. HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queens.
FINDLAY, JOHN WALTER—Bruce, S. Riding.
FINN, ROBERT E.—Halifax.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORKE, ROBERT—Brandon.
FORRESTER, WILLIAM—Perth, S. Riding.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADÉLARD—Labelle.
FOURNIER, CHARLES ALPHONSE—Bellechasse.

GARDINER, ROBERT—Medicine Hat.
GARLAND, EDWARD J.—Bow River.
GARLAND, WILLIAM FOSTER—Carleton.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GENDRON, ROMUALD M.—Wright.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GERVAIS, THÉODORE—Berthier.
GOOD, WILLIAM CHARLES—Brant.
GORDON, GEORGE NEWCOMBE—Peterborough, W. Riding.
GOUIN, HON. SIR LOMER, K.C.M.G.—Laurier-Outremont.
GOULD, OLIVER ROBERT—Assiniboia.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE PERRY—Essex, S. Riding.
GRIMMER, ROBERT WATSON—Charlotte.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALBERT, ROBERT HENRY—Ontario, N. Riding.
HAMMELL, WILLIAM JAMES—Muskoka.
HANSON, RICHARD B.—York-Sunbury.
HARRIS, JOSEPH HENRY—York, E. Riding.
HATFIELD, PAUL LA COMBE—Yarmouth and Clare.
[1]HEALY, A. F.—Essex, N. Riding.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, West.
HODGINS, ARCHIE LATIMER—Middlesex, E. Riding.
[2]HOPKINS, EDWARD N.—Moose Jaw.
HOEY, ROBERT ALEXANDER—Springfield.
HUBBS, JOHN—Prince Edward, (O.)
HUDSON, ALBERT BLELLACK—Winnipeg, South.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUMPHREY, LEVI WILLIAM—Kootenay, West.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

IRVINE, WILLIAM—Calgary, East.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JELLIFF, LINCOLN HENRY—Lethbridge.
[3]JOHNSON, R. M.—Moose Jaw.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.
JONES, GEORGE BURPEE—Royal.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERIC—Missisquoi.
KELLNER, DONALD F.—Edmonton, East.
[4]KELLY, FENWICK LIONEL—Cape Breton N. and Victoria.
KENNEDY, DONALD M.—Edmonton, West.
KENNEDY, DOUGALD—Port Arthur and Kenora
KENNEDY, JOHN WILFRED—Glengarry and Stormont.
KING, HON. JAMES H.—Kootenay, E. Riding
KING, JOHN WARWICK—Huron, N. Riding.
KING, RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE—York, N Riding.
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

LADNER, LEON JOHNSON—Vancouver, South.
LAFLAMME, J. NAPOLÉON K.—Drummond-Arthabaska.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
LAPIERRE, EDMOND ANTHONY—Nipissing.
LAPOINTE, HON. ERNEST—Quebec, East.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec County.
LEADER, HARRY—Portage la Prairie.
[5]LÉGER, AUGUSTE THÉOPHILE—Kent, (N.B.)
LESUEUR, RICHARD VRYLING—Lambton, W. Riding.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LEWIS, ARTHUR JOHN—Swift Current.
LOGAN, HANCE JAMES—Cumberland.
LOVETT, LEWIS JOHNSTONE—Digby-Annapolis.
LOVIE, WILLIAM JAMES—Macdonald.
LOW, HON. THOMAS ANDREW—Renfrew, S. Riding.
LUCAS, WILLIAM THOMAS—Victoria (Alta.)

MACDONALD, HON. EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACKELVIE, JOHN A.—Yale.
MACKINNON, DONALD ALEXANDER—Queens, P.E.I.
MACLAREN, MURRAY—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.

[1]Elected March 1, 1923.
[2]Elected April 10, 1923.
[3]Election declared void February 22. 1923.
[4]Elected July 31, 1923.
[5]Died October 28, 1923.

[1]MACLEAN, HON. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, ALFRED EDGAR—Prince, P.E.I.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACPHAIL, AGNES C.—Grey, Southeast Riding.
MCBRIDE, THOMAS GEORGE—Cariboo.
MCCONICA, THOMAS HENRY—Battleford.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCDONALD, ANGUS—Timiskaming.
MCGIVERIN, HAROLD BUCHANAN—Ottawa.
MCISAAC, COLIN FRANCIS—Antigonish-Guysborough.
MCKAY, MATTHEW—Renfrew, N. Riding.
[2]MCKENZIE, HON. DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCKILLOP, HUGH C.—Elgin, W. Riding.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCMURRAY, HON. EDWARD JAMES—Winnipeg, North.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
MCTAGGART, NEIL HAMAN—Maple Creek.
MALCOLM, JAMES—Bruce, N. Riding.
MANION, HON. ROBERT JAMES—Fort William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARLER, HERBERT—St. Lawrence-St. George.
MARTELL, LEWIS HERBERT—Hants.
MAYBEE, MILTON EDGAR—Northumberland (Ont.)
MEIGHEN, RT. HON. ARTHUR—Grenville.
MERCIER, PAUL—Westmount-St. Henri.
MEWBURN, HON. SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MILLAR, JOHN—Qu'Appelle.
MILNE, ROBERT—Neepawa.
MITCHELL, WALTER G.—St. Antoine.
MORIN, L. S. RÉNÉ—St. Hyacinthe-Rouville.
MORRISON, JOHN—Weyburn.
MORRISSY, JOHN—Northumberland (N.B.)
MOTHERWELL, HON. WILLIAM R.—Regina.
MUNRO, ELGIN ALBERT—Fraser Valley.
MURDOCK, HON. JAMES—Kent, (O.)
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.
NEILL, ALAN WEBSTER—Comox-Alberni.
OUIMET, JOSEPH RODOLPHE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, West.
PELLETIER, FRANÇOIS JEAN—Matane .
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, South.
PRESTON, RICHARD FRANKLIN—Lanark.
PRÉVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PRITCHARD, JOHN—Wellington, N. Riding.
PUTNAM, HAROLD—Colchester.
RANKIN, JAMES PALMER—Perth, N. Riding.
RAYMOND, WILLIAM G.—Brantford.
REED, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Frontenac.
RHEAUME, JOSEPH T.—Jacques Cartier.
RINFRET, FERNAND—St. James.
ROBB, HON. JAMES ALEXANDER—Châteauguay-Huntingdon.
ROBERGE, EUSÉBE—Megantic.
ROBICHAUD, JOHN G.—Gloucester.
ROBINSON, ERNEST WILLIAM—Kings (N.S.)
ROBITAILLE, CLÉMENT—Maisonneuve.
ROSS, ARTHUR EDWARD—Kingston.
ROSS, THOMAS EDWIN—Simcoe, N. Riding.
RYCKMAN, EDMOND BAIRD—Toronto, East.
ST. PÈRE, EDOUARD CHARLES—Hochelaga.
SALES, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
SAVARD, EDMUND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SENN, MARK CECIL—Haldimand.
SEXSMITH, EDWARD JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
SHAW, JOSEPH T.—Calgary, West.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, South.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, DUNCAN JAMES—Oxford, N. Riding.
SINCLAIR, HON. JOHN EWEN—Queens (P.E.I.)
SPEAKMAN, ALFRED—Red Deer.
SPENCE, DAVID—Parkdale.
SPENCER, HENRY ELVINS—Battle River.
STANSELL, JOHN LAWRENCE—Elgin, E. Riding.
STEEDSMAN, JAMES—Souris.
STEVENS, HON. HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver, Centre.
STEWART, HON. CHARLES A.—Argenteuil.
STEWART, C. WALLACE—Humboldt.
STEWART, HUGH ALEXANDER—Leeds.

[1]Resigned November 1, 1923.

[2]Resigned April 11, 1923.

STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, W. Riding.

STORK, ALFRED—Skeena.

SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.

THURSTON, JOHN J.—Victoria (O.)

TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.

TOLMIE, HON. SIMON FRASER—Victoria City (B.C.)

[1]TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.

VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbinière.

WALLACE, JOHN ALEXANDER—Norfolk.

WALSH, JOSEPH C.—St. Ann.

WARD, WILLIAM JOHN—Dauphin.

WARNER, DANIEL WEBSTER—Strathcona.

WHITE, JOHN FRANKLIN—London.

WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.

WOODS, ROBERT JOHN—Dufferin.

WOODSWORTH, JAMES S.—Winnipeg, Centre.

[1]Resigned April 25, 1923.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Fourteenth Parliament

1923

ALGOMA, E. RIDING—Carruthers, John.

ALGOMA, W. RIDING—Simpson, Thomas Edward.

ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—McIsaac, Colin Francis.

ARGENTEUIL—Stewart, Hon. Charles A.

ASSINIBOIA—Gould, Oliver Robert.

BAGOT—Marcile, Joseph Edmond.

BATTLEFORD—McConica, Thomas Henry.

BATTLE RIVER—Spencer, Henry Elvins.

BEAUCE—Béland, Hon. Henri Sévérin.

BEAUHARNOIS—Papineau, Louis Joseph.

BELLECHASSE—Fournier, Charles Alphonse.

BERTHIER—Gervais, Théodore.

BONAVENTURE—Marcil, Hon. Charles.

BOW RIVER—Garland, Edward J.

BRANDON—Forke, Robert.

BRANT—Good, William Charles.

BRANTFORD—Raymond, William G.

BROME—McMaster, Andrew Ross.

BRUCE, N. RIDING—Malcolm, James.

BRUCE, S. RIDING—Findlay, John Walter.

BURRARD—Clark, John Arthur.

CALGARY, EAST—Irvine, William.

CALGARY, WEST—Shaw, Joseph Tweed.

CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—
[1]McKenzie, Hon. Daniel D.
[2]Kelly, Fenwick Lionel.

CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—
Carroll, William F.
Kyte, George W.

CARIBOO—McBride, Thomas George.

CARLETON—Garland, William Foster.

CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Archambault, Joseph.

CHAMPLAIN—Desaulniers, Arthur L.

CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY—Casgrain, Pierre François.

CHARLOTTE—Grimmer, Robert Watson.

CHÂTEAUGUAY - HUNTINGDON—Robb, Hon. James Alexander.

CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Savard, Edmond.

COLCHESTER—Putnam, Harold.

COMOX-ALBERNI—Neill, Alan Webster.

COMPTON—Hunt, Aylmer Byron.

CUMBERLAND—Logan, Hance James.

DAUPHIN—Ward, William John.

DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Lovett, Lewis Johnstone.

DORCHESTER—Cannon, Lucien.

DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Laflamme, J. Napoléon K.

DUFFERIN—Woods, Robert John.

DUNDAS—Elliott, Preston.

DURHAM—Bowen, Fred W.

EDMONTON, EAST—Kellner, Donald F.

EDMONTON, WEST—Kennedy, Donald M.

ELGIN, E. RIDING—Stansell, John Lawrence.

ELGIN, W. RIDING—McKillop, Hugh C.

ESSEX N. RIDING—[3]Kennedy, Hon. William Costello.
[4]Healy, A. F.

ESSEX, S. RIDING—Graham, Hon. George Perry.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Manion, Hon. Robert James.

FRASER VALLEY—Munro, Elgin Albert.

FRONTENAC—Reed, William Samuel.

GASPÉ—Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe.

GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Jacobs, Samuel William.

GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—Kennedy, John Wilfred.

[1]Resigned April 11, 1923.
[2]Elected July 31, 1923.
[3]Died January 17, 1923.
[4]Elected March 1, 1923.

GLOUCESTER—[1]Turgeon, Onésiphore.
[2]Robichaud, John G.
GRENVILLE—Meighen, Rt. Hon. Arthur.
GREY, N. RIDING—Duncan, Matthew Robert.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Macphail, Agnes C.

HALDIMAND—Senn, Mark Cecil.
HALIFAX—[3]Blackadder, Edward.
[4]Finn, Robert E.
[5]Maclean, Hon. A. K.
HALTON—Anderson, Robert King.
HAMILTON, E. RIDING—Mewburn, Hon. Sydney Chilton.
HAMILTON, W. RIDING—Stewart, Thomas Joseph.
HANTS—Martell, Lewis Herbert.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thompson, Thomas Henry.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Porter, Edward Guss.
HOCHELAGA—St. Père, Edouard Charles.
HULL—Fontaine, Joseph Eloi.
HUMBOLDT—Stewart, C. Wallace.
HURON, N. RIDING—King, John Warwick.
HURON, S. RIDING—Black, William.

INVERNESS—Chisholm, Alexander W.

JACQUES CARTIER—[6]Lafortune, David Arthur.
[7]Rheaume, Joseph T.
JOLIETTE—Denis, Jean Joseph.

KAMOURASKA—Bouchard, Georges
KENT (N.B.)—[8]Leger, Auguste Théophile.
KENT (O.)—Murdock, Hon. James.
KINDERSLEY—Carmichael, Archibald M.
KING'S (N.S.)—Robinson, Ernest William.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Hughes, James J.
KINGSTON—Ross, Arthur Edward.
KOOTENAY, EAST—King, Hon. James H.
KOOTENAY, WEST—Humphrey, Levi William.

LABELLE—Fortier, Hyacinthe Adélard.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Fansher, Burt Wendell.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—LeSueur, Richard Vryling.
LANARK—[9]Stewart, Hon. John Alexander.
[10]Preston, Richard Franklin.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Lanctôt, Roch.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Séguin, P. Arthur.
LAST MOUNTAIN—Johnston, J. Fred.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer, K.C.M.G.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Ethier, Joseph Arthur Calixte.
LEEDS—Stewart, Hugh Alexander.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Sexsmith, Edward James.
LETHBRIDGE—Jelliff, Lincoln Henry.
LÉVIS—Bourassa, Joseph Boutin.
LINCOLN—Chaplin, James Dew.
LISGAR—Brown, John Livingstone.
L'ISLET—Fafard, J. Fernand.
LONDON—White, John Franklin.
LOTBINIÈRE—Vien, Thomas.
LUNENBURG—Duff, William.

MACDONALD—Lovie, William James.
MACKENZIE—Campbell, Milton N.
MACLEOD—Coote, George Gibson.
MAISONNEUVE—Robitaille, Clément.
MAPLE CREEK—McTaggart, Neil Haman.
MARQUETTE—Crerar, Hon. Thomas Alexander.
MASKINONGÉ—Desrochers, Eugène.
MATANE—Pelletier, François Jean.
MEDICINE HAT—Gardiner, Robert.
MEGANTIC—[11]Pacaud, Lucien Turcotte.
[12]Roberge, Eusèbe.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Hodgins, Archie Latimer.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Drummond, John Douglas Fraser.
MISSISQUOI—Kay, William Frederic.
MONTMAGNY—Déchêne, Aimé Miville.
MOOSE JAW—[13]Johnson, R. M.
[14]Hopkins, Edward N.
MUSKOKA—Hammell, William James.

NANAIMO—Dickie, Charles Herbert.
NEEPAWA—Milne, Robert.
NELSON—Bird, Thomas William.
NEW WESTMINSTER—McQuarrie, William Garland.
NICOLET—[15]Trahan, Arthur.
[16]Descoteaux, Joseph F.

[1]Called to Senate October 27, 1922.
[2]Elected November 20, 1922.
[3]Died October 22, 1922.
[4]Elected December 4, 1922.
[5]Resigned November 1, 1923.
[6]Died October 19, 1922.
[7]Elected November 20, 1922.
[8]Died October 29, 1923.
[9]Died October 7, 1922.
[10]Elected December 4, 1922.
[11]Resigned October 26, 1922.
[12]Elected November 20, 1922.
[13]Election declared void February 22, 1923.
[14]Elected April 10, 1923.
[15]Resigned April 25, 1923.
[16]Elected May 14, 1923.

NIPISSING—Lapierre, Edmond Anthony.
NORFOLK—Wallace, John Alexander
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Davies, Claudius Charles.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Morrissy, John.
NORTHUMBERLAND (Ont.)—Maybee, Milton Edgar.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Halbert, Robert Henry.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—Clifford, Lawson Omar.
OTTAWA—Chevrier, Edgar Rodolphe Eugene.
McGiverin, Harold Buchanan.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Sinclair, Duncan James.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Sutherland, Donald.

PARKDALE—Spence, David.
PARRY SOUND—Arthurs, James.
PEEL—Charters, Samuel.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Rankin, James Palmer.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Forrester, William.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—Brethen, George Arthur.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—Gordon, George Newcombe.
PICTOU—Macdonald, Hon. Edward Mortimer.
PONTIAC—Cahill, Frank S.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Leader, Harry.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Kennedy, Dougald.
PORTNEUF—Delisle, Michel Siméon.
PRESCOTT—Binette, Joseph.
PRINCE ALBERT—Knox, Andrew.
PRINCE EDWARD—Hubbs, John.
PRINCE, (P.E.I.)—MacLean, Alfred Edgar.
PROVENCHER—Beaubien, Arthur Lucien.

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

RED DEER—Speakman, Alfred.
REGINA—Motherwell, Hon. William R.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—McKay, Matthew.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Low, Hon. Thomas Andrew.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Michaud, Pius.
RICHELIEU—Cardin, Pierre Joseph Arthur.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Tobin, Edmund William.
RIMOUSKI—d'Anjou, Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel.
ROYAL—Jones, George Burpee.
RUSSEL—Murphy, Hon. Charles.

ST. ANN—Walsh, Joseph C.
ST. ANTOINE—Mitchell, Walter G.
ST. DENIS—Denis, J. Arthur.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Morin, L. S. Réné.
ST. JAMES—Rinfret, Fernand.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Baxter, Hon. John B. M.
MacLaren, Murray.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—[1]Demers, Marie Joseph.
[2]Benoit, Alderic Joseph.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ST. GEORGE—Marler, Herbert.
ST. MARY—Deslauriers, Hermas.
SALTCOATS—Sales, Thomas.
SASKATOON—Evans, John.
SELKIRK—Bancroft, Leland Payson.
SHEFFORD—Boivin, George Henry.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fielding, Rt. Hon. William Stevens.
SHERBROOKE—McCrea, Francis N.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—Chew, Manley.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Ross, Thomas Edwin.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Boys, William Alves.
SKEENA—Stork, Alfred.
SOURIS—Steedsman, James.
SPRINGFIELD—Hoey, Robert Alexander.
STANSTEAD—Baldwin, Willis Keith.
STRATHCONA—Warner, Daniel Webster.
SWIFT CURRENT—Lewis, Arthur John.

TÉMISCOUATA—Gauvreau, Charles Arthur.
TERREBONNE—Prevost, Jules Edouard.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Bureau, Hon. Jacques.
TIMISKAMING—McDonald, Angus.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Bristol, Hon. Edmund.
TORONTO, EAST—Ryckman, Edmond Baird.
TORONTO, NORTH—Church, Thomas Langton.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Sheard, Charles.
TORONTO, WEST—Hocken, Horatio Clarence.

[1]Resigned July 22, 1922.
[2]Elected August 31, 1922.

VANCOUVER, CENTRE—Stevens, Hon. Henry Herbert.
VANCOUVER, SOUTH—Ladner, Leon Johnson.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Ouimet, Joseph Rodolphe.
VICTORIA (Alta.)—Lucas, William Thomas.
VICTORIA (O.)—Thurston, John J.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON (N.B.)—Caldwell, Thomas W.
VICTORIA CITY (B.C.)—Tolmie, Hon. Simon Fraser.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Euler, William D.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Elliott, William.
WELLAND—German, William Manley.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Pritchard, John.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Guthrie, Hon. Hugh.
WENTWORTH—Wilson, Gordon Crooks.
WESTMORELAND—Copp, Hon. Arthur Bliss.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRI—Mercier, Paul.
WEYBURN—Morrison, John.
WINNIPEG, CENTRE—Woodsworth, James S.
WINNIPEG NORTH—McMurray, Hon. Edward James.
WINNIPEG, SOUTH—Hudson, Albert Blellack.
WRIGHT—Gendron, Romuald M.

YALE—MacKelvie, John A.
YAMASKA—Boucher, Aimé.
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Hatfield, Paul La Combe.
YORK, E. RIDING—Harris, Joseph Henry.
YORK, N. RIDING—King, Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie.
YORK, S. RIDING—Maclean, William Findlay.
YORK, W. RIDING—Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L., Kt.
YORK-SUNBURY—Hanson, Richard B.
YUKON—Black, George.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, January 31, 1923

SECOND SESSION, FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 31st day of January, 1923, met this day at Ottawa for the despatch of business.

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

HOUR OF MEETING

CHANGE IN THE RULE SUGGESTED BY Mr. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Under rule 2 the House should have met at 2 o'clock to-day; but as the letter received from the Governor General stated that His Excellency would proceed to open parliament at 3 o'clock, I have come to the conclusion that there would be less inconvenience for everyone concerned if I applied the spirit rather than the letter of the law. I have no doubt that it was the government's intention that the House should meet at 3 o'clock to-day. The rule says that the time for the ordinary meeting on Wednesday should be at 2 o'clock. It may be that opening day is not an ordinary meeting day. At any rate I am satisfied to put such a construction on the rule under the present circumstances. The question came up in 1918 when the House met at 11 o'clock on Monday, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier then made the following remark:

> We meet under conditions of some peculiar novelty. We do not meet under the rules of the House because those rules say that this House shall meet at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. We do not meet under the proclamation of His Excellency the Governor-General, because the Governor-General, while fixing the date of the meeting of Parliament, did not fix the hour. Of course, parliament, though elected by the people, has to be called by the Governor-General. It is within His Excellency's privilege to summon it at any time he pleases, and to fix the hour also. It has pleased him to call parliament for the 18th March, but he has not fixed the hour. He might have said that we should meet at 11 o'clock of the morning or at the same hour in the evening, and we would have to obey his command. I think, therefore, that under such circumstances the House is irregularly called.

The Governor General's proclamation does not state at what hour parliament is to meet. Since the House is to meet to-day, it has to do so in accordance with its rules which state that on Wednesday it should meet at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

As Speaker it is my duty to see that the rules which the House has adopted for its proceedings be observed. I do not think they should be infringed upon, and I would suggest that rule 2 be amended so that the government be given a free hand to open parliament at any time it may deem it advisable in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from Mr. A. F. Sladen, Governor General's Secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion parliament.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons chamber:

VACANCIES

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

Of Marie Joseph Demers, Esquire, member for the electoral district of St. Johns and Iberville, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Hon. William Costello Kennedy, member for the electoral district of the North Riding of Essex, by decease.

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

I have also the honour to inform the House that I received a communication from the Chief Electoral Officer, informing me that in accordance with Chapter 11, Section 10, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, he had received communications from several members notifying him of the following vacancies having occurred in the representation, namely:

Of Hon. John Alexander Stewart, member for the electoral district of Lanark, by decease.

Of David Arthur Lafortune, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, by decease.

Of Lucien Turcotte Pacaud, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Megantic, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

Of Edward Blackadder, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Halifax, by decease.

Of Onesiphore Turgeon, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Gloucester, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

And that the Chief Electoral Officer had accordingly issued new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

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

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I am glad to welcome you to a return to your parliamentary duties. In the interval which has elapsed since the last session, I have had the pleasure of extending my travels throughout Western Canada and as far as the Territory of the Yukon. The cordial hospitality everywhere enjoyed by Her Excellency and myself will be long remembered.

It is gratifying to note that in a period of world-wide trade depression following the Great War, Canada has made substantial progress towards recovery.

The increase in the volume of trade, the diminution of unemployment as compared with last winter, and the restoration of our currency to a position of equality with that of the neighbouring Republic, are indications of the improved situation. The economic condition in European countries makes for embarrassment the world over. A much better situation in Europe will be necessary before we can expect a complete restoration of confidence in business affairs here. In the meantime, the Dominion has much reason for satisfaction with the improvement that has taken place, and with the many evidences of a returning prosperity.

The desirability of obtaining the best available terms for the admission of our products in foreign markets has engaged the attention of the Ministry.

Conventions have been made to govern trade relations between France and Canada and between Italy and Canada. These Conventions will be submitted for your approval.

Since last session, acting under a Statute of 1919, with amendments thereto, an Order in Council has been passed appointing a Board of Directors to be known as The Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railway Company, having under its control and operation the various lines which go to make up the system, and also the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The various units of the system are being consolidated as rapidly as possible. This, it is expected, will increase the efficiency and decrease the cost of operation.

It having been represented that an amalgamation of interests of shipping companies and vessel owners upon the Great Lakes has operated to control freight rates and insurance upon grain shipments in a manner which has deprived agriculturists of much of the benefit to which they were entitled, as well as led to discrimination against Canadian ports and harbours, a Royal Commission has been appointed to investigate and report upon this alleged combine.

A bill will be submitted to you to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers from undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade by combines, monopolies, trusts, or mergers.

As a consequence of an agreement entered into between the Government of Great Britain and members of the Canadian Government, the law with respect to the landing of imported animals in Great Britain has been amended by the British Parliament. The removal thereby effected of the embargo on Canadian cattle entering the United Kingdom is a source of general satisfaction. It has materially improved the outlook as regards live stock, and should lead to the re-establishment of a profitable trade with Great Britain.

The adverse conditions with which agriculture generally is confronted in many parts of Canada, despite the abundant crops of the past year, render it desirable that a special committee, with powers to make recommendations, be appointed to look into various agricultural matters such as the mixing of grain in private terminal elevators, the marketing of farm products, the development of the live stock industry, and the possibilities of further diversification in our Canadian agriculture.

The matter of securing an increasing flow of desirable settlers to develop the large areas still available for cultivation in Canada has had the serious consideration of my advisers. Additional advertising and general publicity campaigns have been launched in Great Britain and in the United States and, as opportunity offers, will be extended to other lands from which a suitable class of settlers may be attracted. In other particulars, the activities of the Department of Immigration and Colonization are being expanded.

The time for the usual decennial revision of the Bank Act having arrived, a measure for that purpose will be laid before you.

Having regard to the recent decennial census, a readjustment of the representation of the Provinces in the House of Commons, as required by the British North America Act, is also due. A Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

In pursuance of the announcement made in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of last Session a Postal Conference with the United States was held at Ottawa in the month of December last. The results of the Conference were embodied in a new Postal Convention which has been in force since January 1st. It is a pleasure to record that arrangements were made not only for extending and improving the international postal service, but also for the conveyance through the United States of parcel mail from Canada to all South American countries.

The Government of France has graciously offered to the Canadian Government a tract of land of 250 acres on Vimy Ridge, at the site selected for the erection by Canada of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian troops in the Great War. This gift has been gratefully accepted, and a bill approving the agreement has been duly introduced in the French Parliament. An appropriate resolution expressing Canada's appreciation of the action of the French Government will be offered for your acceptance.

During the course of the session your attention will be invited to other agreements of an international character and significance, and to other matters requiring legislation.

Members of the House of Commons:

The Public Accounts for the last fiscal year, and the Estimates for the coming year, will be submitted at an early date. A strict economy in all public expenditures continues to be a necessity of the existing financial situation.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

Since you last assembled, Canada has harvested the largest wheat crop in its history, and an abundance of other kinds of grain and fruits. May the Divine Providence which has vouchsafed this basis of our material prosperity guide and bless all your deliberations.

NEW MEMBERS

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

Of Alderic Joseph Benoit, Esquire, for the electoral district of St. Johns and Iberville.

Of Eusébe Roberge, Esquire, for the electoral district of Megantic.

Of Joseph T. Rhéaume, Esquire, for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier.

Of John G. Robichaud, Esquire, for the electoral district of Gloucester.

Of Richard Franklin Preston, Esquire, for the electoral district of Lanark.

Of Robert Emmett Finn, Esquire, for the electoral district of Halifax.

NEW MEMBERS INTRODUCED

Alderic Joseph Benoit, Esquire, member for the electoral district of St. Johns and Iberville, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. Sir Lomer Gouin.

Eusèbe Roberge, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Megantic, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. H. S. Béland.

John G. Robichaud, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Gloucester, introduced by Hon. A. B. Copp and Pius Michaud, Esquire.

M. Joseph Théodule Rhéaume, député de la circonscription électorale de Jacques-Cartier, est présenté par Sir Lomer Gouin et l'hon. Ernest Lapointe.

Robert Emmett Finn, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Halifax, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Richard Franklin Preston, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Lanark, introduced by Right Hon. Arthur Meighen and Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

OATHS OF OFFICE

Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office, introduced and read the first time.—Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.

REPORTS

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

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

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

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

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

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

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

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

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House under rule 10, said committee to be composed of Messieurs Béland, Copp, Low, Kyte, Papineau, Tolmie, Boys, Johnston (Last Mountain) and Halbert, and that that portion of rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

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

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an approved Minute of Council appointing the Honourable H. S. Béland, Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Honourable

J. A. Robb, Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable T. A. Low, Minister without Portfolio; and the Honourable John E. Sinclair, Minister without Portfolio, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

DECEASED MEMBERS

TRIBUTES PAID BY RIGHT HON. MESSIEURS MACKENZIE KING AND MEIGHEN, AND FORKE.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since last we assembled, some of our members have visited distant lands, have crossed continents and oceans, and, in the providence of God, have safely returned, or are returning, to resume their legislative duties. Four of our number have made "upon a vaster sea the unreturning voyage."

It is fitting that before proceeding with the business which parliament has been summoned to transact, we should pause for a moment, to give some expression to the sorrow which at this time we feel in our hearts; and to pay some tribute, however slight, to the memory of those who, in the brief interval which has elapsed since our previous session, have been taken from our midst.

As I have already mentioned, no less than four honourable members, each enjoying in special measure the regard and esteem of this House, have been removed by the Hand of Death; three of them in the month of October, and the fourth but a fortnight ago. Both sides of the House have been bereaved. Each has sustained a loss which is deeply felt in this parliament and throughout the country. We on your right, Mr. Speaker, have suffered most; no less than three of the four who are gone having been loyal and devoted supporters of the government, and one of them a member of it.

The first on this side to be taken was Mr. David Lafortune, K.C., at the time member for Jacques Cartier. Who is there, who has been in parliament during the twelve years Mr. Lafortune was a member of the Commons, will not deeply deplore the fact that he is no longer with us?

Mr. Lafortune was active in politics for many years. He was first returned to parliament in a by-election in 1909, was re-elected in 1911, and again in 1917 and 1921.

At two previous general elections he
4 p.m. had also been the Liberal candidate.

For some thirty years he practised law in the city of Montreal, and attained in his province a distinguished position as a member of the legal profession. Few members shared a more intimate knowledge of the lives and needs of their constituents or enjoyed more completely their confidence. His early life had acquainted him with the hardships and struggles of those in humble circumstances, and his energies in public life were directed in the main toward an improvement of industrial and social conditions.

Mr. Lafortune possessed rare gifts as a public speaker and as an advocate. Both at the bar and in parliament his talents were employed with zeal and effectiveness in the cause of the people. His fluency and ready wit, on more than one occasion, lent not a little merriment to the proceedings of this House. They were a part of a generous and kindly disposition which made him hosts of friends, left him without an enemy, and endeared him to to all who knew him well.

Dr. Edward Blackadder, one of the honourable members for Halifax, died within three days after Mr. Lafortune. He, too, had taken an active part in politics for a number of years, though he was returned to parliament only at the last general election. He was one of the Liberal candidates in 1911, and was again nominated as a Liberal candidate in 1917, withdrawing subsequently when it was decided to avoid an election in the constituency because of the Halifax disaster of that year.

It was apparent to us all that Dr. Blackadder was in failing health. The news of his death was not therefore, wholly unexpected, though it brought with it a sense of real loss to our public life. We all recall, as one of the most touching incidents of the last session of parliament, the fidelity with which, despite his all too evident infirmity, he attended the several sittings of this House, and sought to further to the utmost of his strength and opportunity the interests of his constituents.

The most modest of men, Dr. Blackadder was also one of the most cultured. He possessed a wide range of knowledge and experience and rare literary gifts. These he used with zeal in the advocacy of Liberal principles and ideals. Few men, in a brief career, have enjoyed activities as important and manysided. He was a practising physician, a journalist, a university professor and a member of parliament. His time and his talents were employed in the most unselfish manner in the service of his fellowmen, and in upholding a high standard in matters of public concern. At all times unassuming, well-informed, intensely earnest and sincere, he was a type of citizen this parliament and our country can ill afford to lose.

The last to be taken from this side of the House was the Honourable Mr. Kennedy, Minister of Railways and Canals. Mr. Kennedy's death is so recent, and has come so near to all of us who were his colleagues in the government, that it is not possible to speak of the loss it has occasioned without emotion. That he is no longer with us is due, beyond all question, to the fidelity and tenacity with which, at great risk to his health, and as it has now proved, at the peril of his life, he held to his post of duty at a time when the business of his department demanded close and continuous attention. To his colleagues in the government, and to myself in particular, Mr. Kennedy's death has occasioned profound sorrow.

Mr. Kennedy was elected to parliament as the member for North Essex at the general elections of 1917. He was returned in the general election of 1921. Few men have entered upon public life with more of promise, and even fewer in so short a time have won and merited so great distinction. With early manhood still on his side, his rare organizing genius and business ability had put him in a position of independence, where it was possible for him to place virtually the whole of his time and his talent at the service of the state. His generous nature, social disposition and known integrity combined with his business and political sagacity had gained for him not only hosts of personal friends and the confidence of his fellow townsmen and constituents, but the high regard of his fellow members in parliament and the esteem of the citizens of our country generally. His administration of the affairs of the Department of Railways and Canals revealed a positive genius for the work of government. He seemed to possess the very qualities most needed; untiring energy, undaunted courage, high integrity, sound judgment and vision. All of that is now lost to Canada in whose service he died. In a very true sense his death is a national loss. He was in every way worthy of the many tributes paid his memory from one end of our country to the other.

There is but one thing left to be done by those of us who loved and honoured him, and that is to emulate his courage; to take up our public tasks with renewed vigour and devotion, that the spirit which he exemplified so bravely may be kept alive in our midst.

All that I have said of our friend, the late Mr. Kennedy, might be said with equal truth, and fulness of meaning of the late Honourable James A. Stewart. Indeed, the parallel is so close as to be almost complete throughout.

Mr. Stewart entered the House of Commons as the Member for Lanark in the first session of the last parliament. He was returned at a by-election in May, 1918, and so sat through practically the whole of that parliament. He was again returned at the general elections of 1921, at which time he was holding the portfolio of Minister of Railways and Canals in the government of my right honourable friend, the leader of the opposition. I can sympathize with my right honourable friend, as I am sure he does with me, in the loss of one who was the most loyal of colleagues and truest of friends. I extend to him, and to those who sit around him, the sympathy of all honourable gentlemen on this side of the House, in the loss from their ranks of one whose splendid qualities of heart and mind were appreciated by us all, and who, though opposed to us politically, was genuinely respected and admired.

It may be said of Mr. Stewart as it has been of Mr. Kennedy that without question, the impairment of his health which, amidst the promise of years and fortunate circumstances, brought his life thus early to a close, was furthered by his high sense of public duty, and endeavour conscientiously to discharge his obligations as a representative of the people in parliament and as a minister of the Crown.

There would appear to be something more than chance in the tragic circumstance that these two men, both more or less of a like age, of like characteristics, attainments, and distinction in the business and political world, should have come beneath the roof of the same institution at the same time to wage battle against death, each with the companion of his life, a solitary watcher at his side. For a time it seemed that "one would be taken and the other left." Now they have both passed, "gentlemen unafraid," into the Great Beyond. It may well be that all this has come to teach those of us who are engaged in political controversies a wider tolerance and more of chivalry towards those who differ from us in opinion; and the nation, a larger measure of charity towards its public men!

All four of the honourable members who have been taken from us were alike in this: each loved mercy, each sought to do justly, and each walked humbly with his God. They were alike in yet another particular. Each enjoyed, in all that pertained to his personal and public life, the interest and devotion of a companionship which it was beautiful, and at times touching, to witness, and which it will ever be pleasing to recall. Our sympathy

goes out in fullest measure to the ones who have been so greatly bereaved. It will be the unanimous wish of this House that an expression of its sympathy should be conveyed to Mrs. Kennedy, Mrs. Stewart, Madame Lafortune and Mrs. Blackadder, and to those who share their irreparable loss. To you, Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in being able to look for the discharge of this sad duty on our behalf.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the entire course of my membership of this House, now extending over a goodly number of years, there has never been an occasion before when the opening of parliament was clouded by the recollection of the death of so many members. Between our parting last session and our gathering now, no less than four, as the right honourable Prime Minister has said, have passed from among us. It is true, I think, of all, that, even when we parted at the close of last session, the hand of disease had been laid upon them—a premonitory touch was there, warning them of what might come. Each had been conducting a constant battle with physical infirmity. But nevertheless all were gallantly holding on and were doing a big day's work as each day passed, and all undoubtedly were hopeful that they would gather with us to share our tasks to-day. It is the seeming intrusion of the enemy of life in the season of activity and before the evening comes that makes the writing of the finger of Providence hard to comprehend. When the allotted span has run—a span that for thousands of years has remained almost unchanged, the measure of the tenure of our life on earth—when that span has run the passing of a man seems to fit in with the scheme of things; we submit in sorrow, and we imagine we understand. But when one falls from among us in the very middle of achievement and before the sun has sunk in the heavens, it is then that his journey seems not to be ended, but to be broken, and we fail wholly to understand—we realize that we do not know.

Dr. Blackadder had been a member of this House for only a few months. His family has been for generations a well known and highly respected one in the province of Nova Scotia. His passport to parliament was the same as that which accounts for the entrance of the great body of representatives in all democratic parliaments in the world,—the possession of those acceptable human qualities in which rather than in brilliant attainment, the mass of people put their trust. A wide and generous sympathy with the lot of his fellows, a generous playing of life's game, modesty of manner and earnestness and integrity of character—these were the things that we all observed in Dr. Blackadder, and by these attributes we will remember him long.

Mr. Lafortune was a very extraordinary man He possessed two characteristics in pre-eminent degree—tenacity of purpose and a sunny temperament, warmed and vivified with humour. The course of this life is always a struggle, but in the case of Mr. Lafortune the journey was a very long and very steep one and he travelled it pretty much alone. From a youth and young manhood not blessed with any advantages of education he plodded through to a very considerable professional success. From most modest circumstances he worked on and on into comparative affluence. From obscurity he rose to a position of high public office and to a secure place in public esteem. His passing will not soon be forgotten by the members of this House, because he was the type of man one could not readily forget. He had an individuality that was distinctive, and his unique characteristics came to the surface in everything he set his hand to do.

Hon. W. C. Kennedy's death adds another to the honour roll—now one of considerable length, of Canadian ministers of the Crown who have died in office. For a long time he waged with conspicuous bravery an almost hopeless battle, and in the conduct of it he drew to himself the admiring sympathy of everyone, both friend and foe. The tribute paid to him by his fellow countrymen last week in the city of Windsor where the funeral service was followed by mourning multitudes; the warm, glowing, earnest eulogy of the Prime Minister this afternoon—these testify to the worth of the former Minister of Railways more fittingly and more impressively than I can do. But this I can say with the fullest assurance—no man could have fallen out of the ranks of the foe whose death would seem to us more like the loss of a friend. Mr. Kennedy was a man born to success—success not alone in some specialized form, the attainment of which in these times is a great life's work, but he reached success in every form that answers to the aspirations of a wholesome rounded man. In business he was farsighted and enterprising; he marched right through from humble beginnings to substantial wealth. In social life his very presence seemed to be all that was necessary to make him friends, he won his way just by the warmth of a genial personality. In

politics his rise was phenomenally rapid. In domestic life he was singularly happy. And all these successes, in the case of a man of Mr. Kennedy's mould, could be carried without exciting the envy of any one. He seemed to move in a perpetual atmosphere of comradeship and goodwill. His death is a distinct loss to this House, and I can well understand the feelings of the Prime Minister that his place in the councils of the government, as in the hearts of us all, will not soon or readily be filled.

There remains another, a fourth, one who was with us when we parted and who will join us no more in this arena of toil and strife. Hon. John Alexander Stewart, big constructive man of affairs, gallant friend, fearless fighter, clear-headed leader of men—he too has gone from us. The career of Mr. Stewart was one that warms the heart of youth. Not so much is that due to the high station that he ultimately reached, it is due more to the length of the journey, to the perilous path he travelled, to the cliffs surmounted, to the pluck and spirit he displayed. To these things are due the grip such a career has on the imagination of the young, and the fact that it fires the ambitions and commands the emulation of others. There could scarcely be imagined an obstacle calculated to prey on human vitality and throw a shadow over the path of a forward-looking mind which Mr. Stewart did not have to encounter. He was blessed by inheritance with little, if anything at all, of a material nature; but he did inherit a sound intellect and a will of iron. Early in his life he was attacked by one of the worst of maladies, and for three decades he waged a constant war against the dreadest of disease. There is nothing so haunts and depresses the spirit as an exhausting conflict with an unshakeable physical affliction. "The weariness, the fever and the fret" have robbed this world of some of the best of human treasures. Against such a handicap Mr. Stewart waged the struggle of life; but rarely did he reveal the spectre, the spectre that never left him, even to his closest friends.

> Yield not thy neck
> To fortune's yoke, but let thy dauntless mind
> Still ride in triumph over all mischance.

That was the motto he followed through the buffetings and struggles of fifty years.

The personality of the hon. member for Lanark was the mainspring, indeed, it was the creator, of a series of industries that changed the face of the countryside in which he lived. The fruits of his energies were reaped by hundreds of happy people. Indeed, he held the belief—and he made good that belief—that a concentration of will and intellect would win the day in competition with all other assets that so much command the envy and admiration of men. And wherever the hand of his operations went, the strength of his character became recognized, and larger and larger numbers came to rely upon his judgment and his leadership. He was one of the few big men of commerce—how few, only those of long parliamentary life fully realize—whose qualifications for parliament were as ample as their qualifications for business. Entering this House when far past middle life, on toward the half century mark, a member of it for the short space of four years, even then speaking very rarely, he nevertheless marched, and marched with ease, to a recognized place in the forefront of the House of Commons. His firm grasp of facts, his direct, visible march from premise to conclusion, the confidence he always inspired that on everything that counted he knew just where he stood, lucidity of statement that was simply the reflection of lucidity of intellect,—these were the qualities that accounted for his rapid rise in a short parliamentary term. And, indeed, these are all the possessions which in a modern British parliament any man really needs.

The place which Mr. Stewart had reached among the fifty men who comprised His Majesty's opposition was very much the same as that which he attained in the community in which he lived. He was the tried counsellor, the trusted of everyone, the friend of all.

It is, as the Prime Minister has gracefully said, fitting that a word should go to the families of the deceased, expressive of the solicitude of this House. To the widows of the two former Ministers of Railways—two women who shared in a very peculiar way their husbands' fortunes, and shared just as intimately their husbands' cares; two women, as well, who enjoyed in a very marked degree the affectionate regard of hon. members here of all political parties, this House will not fail while honouring their husbands, to extend a tender, a very real, and a very lasting sympathy.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, amidst the pressing duties of life we are sometimes called upon to pause for a moment and to realize that here we have no abiding city. The House has lost four valuable and highly esteemed members through death. I should like to add a few words of tribute to the memory of those departed members, but I shall not speak at any length after the very eloquent and feeling speeches

which we have had from the right hon. the Prime Minister and the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I had not a long acquaintance with any of the deceased, but sitting here day by day, month after month, during the last session of parliament, one could not help forming a fair estimate of the men whose loss we now deplore.

The late Mr. Kennedy, I think, must very easily have impressed all new members as being a man of ability and character, whom it was well to know, a real man in every sense of the word. He undertook a great task and discharged it faithfully and creditably, and I am sure we all keenly regret his death. In Mr. Kennedy's decease the Prime Minister has lost a valuable friend and the government an able counsellor, while the country at large has suffered an equal loss.

In Hon. Mr. Stewart, too, we all recognized a man of ability, one who proved a shining light in this House and whom we could all admire. We know his record, and I am sure we deeply deplore the fact that he will be with us no longer. It did not require very much discernment, nor much knowledge of character, to realize not only that Mr. Stewart was a man of ability, but that also he was of a kindly and genial nature. Surely we all sincerely regret the loss of these two bright lights.

I shall not labour the fine qualities of Dr. Blackadder. Studying him across the floor of the House, I came to admire him. I learnt that he was a highly valued member of his community, and that he had lived a useful life and had done much service for his country. Not only the House, but his constituents as well, will greatly miss him.

Of Mr. Lafortune a great deal might be said. As I sat in this chamber last session I could not help being impressed by the assiduous attention he paid to his duties, as well as by his regular attendance throughout the session. I cannot speak about his past services, not having been acquainted with him, but I am confident he must have been greatly beloved by his constituents. He had lived a long and useful life, and having done his day's work he has been called home and has gone to rest at eventide. With the other two eminent speakers who have referred to these departed gentlemen, I think it is but fitting that some intimation should be given to the bereaved, as has been done this afternoon, of the esteem in which those who have gone were held in this House, and whose presence we shall greatly miss.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

[Mr. Forke.]

Thursday, February 1, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Auditor General's report for the year ended 31 March, 1922, three volumes complete—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of Governor General's warrants issued since last session of Parliament on account of 1922-23—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of the Auditor General respecting over-rulings by the Treasury Board of the decision of the Auditor General—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of expenditures on account of Unforseen Expenses from April 1, 1922, to January 31, 1923—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of temporary loans—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of endorsements made or liabilities incurred under the Act respecting the shipbuilding industry—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of superannuation and retiring allowances from January 1, 1922, to December 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of Civil Service Insurance for the year ended 31 March, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Statement of Returned Soldiers' Insurance for year ended 31 March, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Superintendent of Insurance of the business of 1921—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Abstract statement of loan and trust companies in Canada for year ended December 31, 1921—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the National Battlefields Commission for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1922—Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Report of Canadian delegates to the Third Assembly of the League of Nations, September 3 to 30, 1922—Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Report of Canadian delegates to the third assembly of the League of Nations—Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Report of Canadian delegates to the Genoa Conference for the economic reconstruction of Europe—Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King.

Annual Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Graham (for Hon. Mr. Murphy.)

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Graham.

Annual Report of Naval Service March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Graham.

Militia Orders promulgated between February 2, 1922, and February 1, 1923—Hon. Mr. Graham.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence, March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Graham.

Regulations of the Department of National Defence—Hon. Mr. Graham.

Statement of the Department of Labour, 31 March, 1922—Hon. Mr. Murdock.

Report of Public Printing and Stationery for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Murdock.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. King (Kootenay).

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1922—Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Lists of permits issued to take intoxicants into the Northwest Territories during the year ended December 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Ordinances passed in connection with the Northwest Territories, February 28, 1922, to January 18, 1923—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs respecting Enfranchisement of Indians, April 1, 1922, to January 31, 1923.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Annual Report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Annual Report of the Department of Mines for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Statement showing orders in council passed since the last return under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, the Forest Reserve and Parks Act, the Migratory Birds Convention Act, the Dominion Lands Survey Act, and the Regulations for the survey, administration, disposal and management of Dominion lands in the Railway belt in the province of British Columbia.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil).

Annual Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) (for Hon. Mr. Robb).

Annual Report of the Weights and Measures and Electricity and Gas Inspection service for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) (for Hon. Mr. Robb).

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Grain Commissioners of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) (for Hon. Mr. Robb).

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the fiscal year March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) (for Hon. Mr. Robb).

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

Report of the Director of the Experimental Farms for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

Orders and Regulations passed under the authority of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act for the year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

TREATIES WITH FRANCE AND ITALY

On the Orders of the Day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Can the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) inform me whether he intends this week or next week laying on the Table of the House the treaty with France and the treaty with Italy?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: (Minister of Finance): I expect on Monday next to bring down the treaty with France. We may have to wait a day or two for authority to place the Italian treaty on the Table, but that matter is under negotiation.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. HAROLD PUTNAM, SECONDED BY MR. JOSEPH T. RHEAUME

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

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester) moved:

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

He said: Mr. Speaker, postponing just for a moment whatever else I may choose to say in respect of this motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I desire to refer to the very first paragraph of the Speech, wherein His Excellency graciously informs this House of the pleasure derived by Their Excellencies from their recent visit to the

Canadian West and also far to the Canadian North. The proverbial hospitality of our fellow citizens in that part of Canada would doubtless be extended with particular zest to visitors so very distinguished and at the same time so democratic in habit and sympathy. No member of this House who has enjoyed—and I think all have—that personal touch with His Excellency will doubt the sincerity of the wish of His Excellency for the welfare, not only of Canada in general, but of every constituency in our far-flung Dominion. In that spirit, in that light, we interpret his recent trip to the West. This House is pleased that Their Excellencies accomplished that long journey evidently with no undue discomfort, but under conditions which made the visit the very reverse. If and when Their Excellencies visit eastern Canada, I am sure the people there will be only too proud, will find it an unbounded pleasure, to try to emulate the hospitality of the West. We cannot show them there mountains as high, or valleys as deep, or plains as wide, as those which obtain in the West; but we have a type of natural scenery, the varied beauty of which will stand, like the word of Caesar, "against the world".

We members of this House who were present yesterday heard from our three respective leaders very touching and appropriate references to four parliamentary comrades who have departed. Time, the great healer, has had, as yet, the least opportunity to perform his kindly office in the case of the Hon. Mr. Kennedy, late Minister of Railways in the present administration. Even after this House was summoned, he received that other summons which supersedes every human plan, every human mandate with which it may come into conflict. The words concerning the virtues of our departed friends were so well and fittingly spoken yesterday that in saying more I am in danger of adding imperfection to that which was said so perfectly. But I did have the pleasure of knowing, in varying degree of intimacy, those four friends, and I am at least able to say of them all, that each had a heart like the heart of a tender child, but a character as firm as a rock. After all, the shock was tempered somewhat in each case, by the circumstance which was pointed out by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) yesterday, namely, that though they were with us as recently as last session, hoping to return to the duties of this, there was a premonitory hand visible upon them. Frequently the angel of death beckons away from their activities and from their ambitions those who are in the prime of years and in the pride of their strength. In the case of all these four friends the visitation was a release from a wavering body, "a worn-out fetter which the soul had broken and thrown away."

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely to my constituency that I ascribe the honour which is involved in the very kindly request of my political superiors that I should move this afternoon this reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would disclaim even any partial application of that honour to myself personally. Indeed, I would invoke my own obscurity in the discussions of this House as proof that the favour was for my constituency, and from what I have heard since the bestowal of this honour, I am amply authorized to say, as representing people of all political affiliations in my constituency, that that constituency appreciates the honour.

I should like,—but I know the sense of proportion will forbid,—to delineate some of the local characteristics of my constituency. The House, however, will allow me to say that, in geographical situation, in point of importance, it is easily one of the pivotal counties of the Maritime provinces. I should like to tell of the industry of its virile people, of the importance of its shire town, as an educational and railway centre, of its natural scenery, wherein it has the constant blue waters of the Northumberland strait upon its north, and those wonderfully whimsical tides from the Bay of Fundy on the major part of its south shore. Those tides caress and forsake that south shore every morning and every night. I should like to tell of those Cobequid mountains, standing always as a thing of beauty between those two arms of the sea. I should like to tell of rich and cultivated valleys in my county bejewelled with beautiful farm houses, commingling with stately elm trees for mile upon mile until, were it not that the unfolding panorama were so enchanting, the traveller would protest that he were satiated. But I shall not offend further the sense of proportion by dwelling upon a thing so purely local in regard to the constituency to which I so gladly relate the honour of my place towards this motion today, for a high honour it is, because this recurring motion is always, by common consent of all the parties, and groups in this House, accorded an august and cordial place of priority at the very threshhold of our deliberations. Unfortunately, in the earlier days of colonial and constitutional government, especially in the older provinces of Canada, a Speech or a Message from the British Throne could not be always received

in the same cordial spirit. At the head waters of that same Bay of Fundy, there is, in my county, a pretty settlement which furnishes a sad and tragic example of this fact. In those days about 165 years ago, I think, when there were such hopeless enmity and distrust between England and France, that spot was peopled by peaceful French-Acadian farmers, and on one luckless day, without the least premonition of evil, those people received a Speech or a Message from the British Throne, delivered by a military messenger, surrounded by his stern soldiery, a message which embraced the appalling tidings that on the very morrow they must leave their happy homes, they must abandon all the worldly possessions which their years of toil had garnered, they must contribute their quota, to the last man and woman and child, in that historic, that tragic expulsion of the French-Acadians from my own fair province of Nova Scotia. My gratefulness rises to the very gates of Heaven that since that day the mercy of England has grown even more rapidly than her material might; that though her arm is strong to smite it is equally strong to save; and that it is unthinkable that she should ever again treat a conquered people so, or resort to any such nightmare of Frightfulness. Between that day and this, in the old provinces of Canada, we had a long and stern fight to achieve the political rights which we to-day enjoy. In our Maritime provinces, fortunately, by circumstances, responsible government itself was attained without the shedding of blood. In the older areas formerly known as Upper and Lower Canada, that unfortunately was not entirely the case. But we shall waste no words in doubtful blame of those who found themselves in the thickest of that fight. Rather, we shall be profoundly thankful that the rugged road to the goal of responsible government was marked by such very few stains of blood.

And right in that connection, may I make bold to offer one word of appeal to our good friends who represent the western provinces in this House. We hear rumours, in fact more than rumours, that sooner or later there must be accountings between the East and the West; that there must be, for example, an authoritative deliverance as to who owns the great revenues of the national resources of the West; while there may be arguments and contentions as to how much of eastern money went to build the western railroads. Mr. Speaker, in one sense these are matters of pure dollars; and let me eliminate every possibility of misunderstanding by telling my friends from the West that I fully credit them with just as sincere a desire as the best-intentioned patriot of the East to have in this Dominion a real union of the peoples of all the provinces. I can say that much with all the more sincerity by reason of the fact that the majority of my own relatives have long lived on those prairies, which sometimes have smiled and sometimes have been bitterly unresponsive to their labours. But when we approach these accountings and try to balance this unique ledger, I ask our friends from the West to remember that the boon of responsible government as a spiritual heritage for all Canada is something in the battle for which the eastern provinces alone bore the brunt, the tedium, the delay, the expense, and, here and there the bloodshed. Let our friends, as I think they will, give due credit for that asset which was won by the East.

During our recess, Mr. Speaker, an event of national importance—because of his recognized place, and that of his party, in this House—has been the resignation from the Progressive leadership of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), whose absence to-day I regret. We are glad, every member in this House, that that resignation has not carried down with it the resignation by the hon. member of his seat in this chamber. Allow me to say that a leader more devoted to an honest cause, or abler in debate, or more courteous toward every member of the House, or better equipped with the saving grace of common sense to handle routine or to grapple with emergency, it would be difficult indeed to discover. May I congratulate—and I think I do so safely on behalf of the whole House—the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) on his promotion. I am sincere in wishing him, as the new leader of the Progressives, the same measure of success as was achieved by his predecessor. I think that the canny quality of the Scotsman is one of his outstanding characteristics, and therefore, he will not expect me to wish him further success than that generous measure. Besides, I doubt whether there is among his followers a single man who is a disciple of the error of pushing a good thing too far.

Glancing at the clock, it seems to me that I have spent more time than I had intended upon what may be called pure preliminaries. But I will set the House at quasi-ease by promising to atone for that by curtailing some at least of the details which I had contemplated in discussing the remaining topics proper in the Speech from the Throne. And in doing so, I may deem it consistent with my duty to omit some of those

topics altogether, because I can neither flatter nor upbraid myself that if I now omit anything legitimate for discussion some other hon. gentleman will not observe the omission and supply the discussion much more acceptably, I am sure, than I might hope to do.

There is in the Speech from the Throne a reference to the intention of this government in regard to the battlefields of Europe. I know there will be profound and consecrated approval that something definite is to be done in connection with those historic fields to perpetuate the memory of our unreturning brave. The government of France graciously donates, and the government of Canada gratefully accepts, the gift and the trust of a site for a suitable memorial at Vimy Ridge. Mr. Speaker, your grateful countrymen have followed your personal visit to those spots, and the personal part which you have been good enough to take in that splendid project. We know that your part in this matter involves a drain upon your time and energy; but, Sir, we cannot forbear to hope that you will see that great duty through. None, by sympathy or by artistic temperament, are better qualified, and we know, Sir, that your patriotism is so deep that "giving doth not impoverish." We shall in our hearts be the better able to honour those who on our behalf have surrendered the dear prize of life, when we know that we have done what we could to observe all the outward symbols of honour and to have their last resting places set in proper order.

I am sure the House will join with me in congratulating upon their return in such good health the two distinguished ministers of this government, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe). They have visited Europe upon a mission that was many-sided, and Canada is to be congratulated that she was represented by gentlemen of such outstanding ability and prestige.

There is mention in the speech of better trade relations not only with France but with that friendly nation, Italy. We shall await their own report on this matter, Mr. Speaker; but we are in hopes that we shall have a real extension of our commerce. International trade is very apt to be like Shakespeare's definition of the quality of mercy, in that it is twice blessed; it blesses him that gives and him that takes. In that light, and so far as Canada sets herself to trade with the countries of Europe, she will do her part to relieve that distress which unfortunately now obtains there, because the sane statesmen of the world all agree that to get Europe back into the orbit of normal trade is one of the main hopes for an issue out of her present troubles.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, can exceed the patriotic patience of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in going thousands of leagues to try to discover avenues of trade when none know more accurately than himself that it violates every standard of logic that we are not trading in an unhampered way with our great neighbour immediately upon the south. The foolish virgins of the parable had themselves to blame when they found that the door was shut against them. But those people —and there are very many in this country, though I will not at present be partisan in this particular to say whether they are in the majority, but I certainly have my own opinion about that,—who desire still that we should have reciprocity with the United States are ready to do full justice to the Finance Minister, as current history is doing him ample justice in that respect while still his vigour is virtually unabated.

It may perhaps be asked sometimes by some: What has this government done during its twelve months of office?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTNAM: "Hear, hear," say my hon. friends. I am glad to be able to report that, as far as my observation goes, the people are evidently much more judicial than my hon. friends themselves, for they realize to the full the manifold and unique difficulties—particularly the financial problem—which have faced this administration when it came into power. Another way to put the question, and I hesitate not to ask it of the hon. members who said "hear, hear," is: what has this government neglected to do that it might feasibly have done for the national welfare during the past twelve months? The people are disposed—and it is a good thing for democracy, which we on this side so uniformly trust, —to give the government an absolutely fair trial. For my own part I see ample evidence of the old adage that the new broom sweeps clean; and if we take the results of the recent by-elections we do not find any indication that the people regret the verdict they gave about twelve months ago.

One criticism has been levelled against the government from certain quarters—most unfairly I think—in connection with the attitude of the Prime Minister in regard to a message received last fall from Mr. Winston Churchill, then a member of Mr. Lloyd George's cabinet, asking the academic question, whether, in the event of England despatching soldiers to the Near East, Canada would immediately do

likewise. I heartily commend, and I feel certain that the country also heartily commends, the answer of the Prime Minister that parliament must first be consulted. Had he done otherwise he would have offended not only what we think is the well-established principle of responsible government, but also the very spirit of the League of Nations. Because the League of Nations, to which Canada is a party, did not make the extravagant promise that of its own volition it could bring about the end of war. One of its cardinal policies is that when war threatens the League shall ask the contending powers to pause, to wait, to ponder, to weigh and discuss the merits and demerits of the question at issue to see if there is not an honourable way out. It would have been the very reverse of that salutary treatment of dangerous international disputes if, without summoning parliament at all, the Prime Minister had committed Canada to war with the haste and through the agency of a mere telegram.

There is naturally mention of the fact that we have a new board of directors of our National Railway System, and that as soon as possible there is to be a complete amalgamation of the Grand Trunk with the other units of the system. Down in Nova Scotia—and it will occasion no bitterness now if I give it as an historic fact—the arms of Confederation were suddenly thrown around us although we had never consented to any such approach, and naturally we felt an intense shock because we are a modest people. Now, this immense increase of government railway ownership from approximately 2,000 miles to 22,000 miles was also wished upon the Maritimes without their consent in any shape or form, and Nova Scotia in particular unanimously pronounced against that action at the very first opportunity. But, Mr. Speaker though the people of my province believe that both those bargains were very bad for them economically, as good and loyal Canadians they are disposed now to make the best of those bad bargains, and consequently they expect to see government railway ownership have a fair trial. Under this new Board, working in conjunction as far as the law and the circumstances will permit with the government, I have faith that our National Railways will get a fair trial under government ownership.

We in the Maritime provinces have waited long for what we believe are our just rights, and in stating this I will not thank any hon. gentleman to tell me that I am trenching upon ground that is sectional. I suppose that in Russia, to proclaim a wrong and seek redress would be considered sectional, and the reformer might be given short shrift before a firing squad; but in Canada to seek redress of a wrong suffered in any quarter must never be considered sectional.

Mr. HANSON: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? I should like to ask him where he stands with reference to the inclusion of the Intercolonial railway in the National Railway system, having regard to his own specific declarations in the Halifax Herald during the autumn of 1921.

Mr. PUTNAM: I beg to inform my hon. friend that I stood precisely where the Minister of Public Works in the last administration, Mr. McCurdy, stood during the election in my county. His election manifesto said: Give us back the Intercolonial Headquarters at Moncton. I have told my hon. friend that on the question of railway amalgamation, just as on the question of Confederation, I do not propose to walk with aimless feet, whatever his own attitude may be. I have told him, and I do not see why now he asks the question, that we propose to make the very best of a bad bargain, just as Joseph Howe did with Confederation.

Mr. HANSON: Thank you.

Mr. PUTNAM: Two statements, Mr. Speaker, made recently by the president of the new Canadian National Railway board, Sir Henry Thornton, have my utmost approval. Speaking at Halifax, he said he had heard during the course of his visit to that part of the country that there was an honourable understanding under which, as a condition of the Maritime provinces entering the confederation, such railway rates would prevail and such railway treatment would be accorded to us as would not interfere with the legitimate flow of trade between those provinces and the more westerly parts of Canada. Sir Henry said—and it is a long time since we have had such a specific promise from so authoritative a source—that in the formulating of his railway policy that contention would be examined upon its merits. For the present, Mr. Speaker, that is all I want; I believe that if the contention is examined into and decided upon its merits, there are better days in store for the people of the Maritime provinces.

Sir Henry Thornton also stated publicly in the city of Moncton that the railway employee need not fear that the wages paid to him in the future would not be sufficient to enable him, without undue worry and anxiety, to support his family and to attain

that degree of independence which would be commensurate with his station in life, based upon the ordinary standards of Canadian citizenship. That, Mr. Speaker, gives me comfort, and it gives comfort to thousands of deserving railway men throughout this country. The life of the railway employee is a laborious and a hazardous one, and when he is performing an honest day's work; when by the sweat of his brow he does his part in the building up of our transportation facilities, he should not have to worry about the question whether his wages will be sufficient to maintain in decency and in comfort the little family which God has committed to his care. I say it is a consoling utterance, an utterance which, though made by Sir Henry Thornton soon after his arrival in this country, was overdue to the railway employees of Canada. It should have come sooner, from some one in authority to speak, because the smaller paid railway men have been more than once placed under the threat and the execution of slashes and cuts in their pay, producing a state of doubt whether a bare living would remain for them and their dependents. Deficit or surplus, that must stop. I give this government praise for having restored to their proper status and their proper seniority those employees of the Grand Trunk Railway Company who, for a grievance which they undoubtedly considered just, went on strike away back in 1910. During the course of the last election campaign the Prime Minister promised that, the Grand Trunk railway being under government sponsorship, he would use his influence to have that grievance remedied. I congratulate the Prime Minister and his cabinet upon the vindication of the promise made in that respect. It is an earnest of the fair play which the railway employees may expect in all parts of this country.

There is another order promulgated by Sir Henry Thornton with which I agree; he has rescinded the order of the old board providing that any railway employee who responded to his legitimate ambition or to the desire of his fellow men that he should become a member of a provincial or the federal parliament, would thereby become subject to dismissal. The rescinding of that order was a proper measure of reform. I know there will be academic and technical critics who will say, "Oh, if you are going to extend that principle you will have difficulty; there will be an incongruous condition if other federal officials are not allowed to run for parliament." In all these matters, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget to be practical. The railway men are in constant and close touch with the commercial conditions of the country. If I want to inquire how business is, how trade is, I ask a railway man of my own town and he can tell me. If the railway employees, segregated as they are for the most part in large centres, choose to take advantage of this new order promulgated by Sir Henry Thornton, I am very certain that even this House—looking at the matter from the point of view of ability and public service, will be the gainer.

Mention is made in the Speech of a proposal to examine into an alleged combine in shipping on the Great Lakes. In view of the fact that the Speech suggests that there may be a combine, without dogmatically saying so, it will perhaps be as well to reserve judgment on that point. It is significant, however, that at a time when competition in tonnage was very keen and difficulty was found in getting business of any profitable sort, the fresh water freight rates did multiply themselves two and three times. It is exasperating to our western friends that they should have to put up with that sort of parasite upon the economic body. I can only hope that the probe will be thorough—as I believe it will—and if there are combines and if there can legitimately be brought into force means to punish the grafters, I hope that a mere finding will not be the end of it, but that a salutary punishment will follow. Let us prevent that sort of thing, I care not from what quarter it may come.

It is a matter of such universal approval, Mr. Speaker, that the embargo upon live beef cattle going to England from this country has been removed that I would not be justified in dealing with the matter at any considerable length. I know that strong friends of the farming industry in this country have lived and died despairing that this reform would ever come about. I myself was brought up on a farm and from the earliest days of my youth I heard this question agitated. I know that this House and the country are prepared to extend their thanks to those two illustrious ministers who were in Europe at that time, and who, when this matter was being dealt with, took occasion to be in London. Some may say that their presence had nothing to do with the result; I am not prepared to say dogmatically that it had. But I am prepared to affirm that these ministers took care to be on the job in case they might be able, by offering arguments or submitting data, to turn the balance in this important matter in favour of the Dominion. For our agricultural friends I only hope that the benefits will be as substantial

as they anticipate. Of course, it will not mean everything, but at a time when our American friends are seeing fit—temporarily, I do hope—to tighten their tariff restrictions against Canadian agricultural products, the entry of live Canadian cattle into the British market is certainly a step in the right direction.

The Speech from the Throne portends the dawn of a better time. The clouds of economic discouragement have overhung the firmament for a long while, and through long and strenuous years we have watched to try and determine whether the situation was growing darker or more hopeful; but at last we see the dark clouds interlaced with streaks of light that, we believe, herald the morning which will slowly roll them away. Thus far the Canadian people deserve unlimited credit for their patience and their morale in holding the economic line. If we should falter now, if we should fail in the qualities of courage and tenacity and hope which we have hitherto displayed, we should be utterly unworthy of those brave boys, living and dead, who held the trenches when the odds seemed so overwhelmingly against them as might well have caused dismay.

I am gratified to learn, in fact, I have seen evidence of it personally, that there is a diminution in unemployment. That should bring joy not only to the heart of the honest labourer worthy of his hire, but to every humane heart in this country; for what spectacle is more pitiful, what more calculated to tempt us to ask whether our civilization has not failed after all, than that of the honest and needy labourer begging simply for the modest prize of work and finding it not, but going back home each evening to his wife and bairns and reporting that this simple privilege of work is not for him. In the times of stress through which we have passed, years in which the world was reeking and rocking from the earthquake of the great war, labour and capital have been taught a lesson in common, and that lesson is that sometimes both are equally helpless in the face of a combination of difficult circumstances. Out of these stressful times, and because of the severe lesson which they have learned, may there not grow henceforth—God grant that there may—a spirit of mutual forebearance and of sweet reasonableness when labour and capital come together to try and adjust their differences? And may each strive as never before to see and to appreciate the other's viewpoint. In my humble view, legislation will probably never be devised that will permanently establish a satisfactory standard of affairs as between capital and labour. Labour must never think that it may not run into the time when it shall have to walk the streets looking in vain for work; and capital need never presume that it may always be profitably active. May they both profit by the lesson of their helplessness. I hope that for a long time to come labour and capital are going to be more genuinely reasonable in meeting to settle their differences, whatever those differences may be. After all, as the poet of a former century said —and we have in this year of grace to sigh in common with him:

> How small, of all that human hearts endure,
> The part that laws or kings can make or cure!

I am glad to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the rebound is coming for this Canada of ours, and I believe that the rebound which we already feel, despite the depression in Europe, is a measure of the rebound we would have felt had conditions been anything like normal over there.

We have to welcome several new members to the House this session, and amongst them is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume). He shares with myself the honour of speaking to this motion, and I understand that he will second it in his own language. The fact that he has the right to speak in this House in his own mother tongue, and I in mine, however poor my effort may have been, is certainly not a thing to be deplored. I regard it rather as an evidence of that accord which is rooted in liberty. My only regret is, that though my ear may be able to catch some of the music of that language of charm the meaning of whose words and phrases would seem to be graded like the hues of the sunset, my understanding will not be able to follow except, like Peter, afar off, until I shall have seen the English translation. I remember when a very young man reading a speech by Sir John Macdonald, the then great leader of the Conservative party, whose very worthy successor, the present honourable leader of the Opposition, sits opposite me to-day. In beautiful language he pictured this dual liberty of the representatives of the two main partners in Confederation, and I remember those moving words of his: "The solace of the mother tongue, the language learned in lisping tones at a mother's knee."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for your considerate attention, and regret that I have occupied so much of its time. I do now move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. THEODULE RHEAUME (Jacques Cartier) (Translation): In rising, Mr. Speaker, my thoughts very naturally dwell upon my predecessor in this House, the late lamented David Lafortune, who, as the saying goes, died at his post, in full harness, in that court of justice which was particularly dear to him. His whole life was that of the toiler. In all the accepted sense of the word he was "a self-made man." Through hard work, unbending energy and perseverance he climbed to the highest station of life. A veteran of many a contest, he was able to command, together with the admiration of his friends, the respect and esteem of his opponents. A conscientious member, he faithfully served his fellow-citizens, his party and his country, and I believe myself to be the interpreter of the people of Jacques Cartier and of those who knew him when offering to his memory the homage of heartfelt sorrow and everlasting remembrance.

May I now thank the Prime Minister for the honour which he has bestowed on the county of Jacques Cartier by graciously inviting its representative, elected but yesterday and a new comer in this House, to second in French, according to custom, the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

No doubt, all will agree that I should see the justification of this choice in the importance of the riding which has designated me as its representative, a county both industrial and agricultural, synthetizing the economic aspect of the country, where one descries, not far distant from large factories, the finest farms of America.

It is the custom at the opening of parliament, to review briefly the conditions of the country. There was a time when such a survey was easy, when those who were called upon to speak on the Address had but to make a glowing picture of Canada's prosperity, shining proudly amongst nations that knew but abundance; to-day conditions have changed. Nevertheless, even in these years of depression, it seems to me that there is ample reason to cheer up and to have faith when it is seen by unmistakable omens, that Canada, burdened like others by the consequences of the world-wide war, nevertheless maintains its vigour and reveals a more promising future.

Being a young country, it had grounds to fear that its credit might not emerge safely out of this conflict. However, notwithstanding the fabulous amounts spent, the difficulties encountered, the financial steps which it was forced to take requiring heavy sacrifices from all, it did not founder like so many others. On the contrary: it is pleasing to acknowledge that it quickly recovered and, at present, offers to the world the spectacle of stability auguring well for the future. It seems indeed, from an economic point of view, that our position is, day by day, improving. If agriculture and commerce have reasons to complain, sure signs of recovery are given to us by the statistics which give the measure of our various activities. Our foreign trade maintains itself, notwithstanding the obstacles which have arisen through the custom regulations adopted by our neighbours to the south. For the eight months of the year 1922, from April to November, our trade amounted to $1,138,-175,366. If we compare these figures with those of other years we shall find that, for the same period, we have a surplus of $124,-000,000 over 1921. By taking into account the depreciation in values, we can verify that our external trade is very gratifying since the quantities are at least being maintained, when they are not on the increase.

Those who attach some importance to the net balance of trade have learned, no doubt with pleasure, that our exports of Canadian products have increased from $502,152,675 for the eight months of the year 1921, to $621,-705,316 for the eight months of the year 1922, while our imports have but slightly increased, in fact just by a little over $4,000,000, leaving a balance in favour of exports in national products of more than $114,000,000.

This balance in our favour added to the one of our foreign credits, has contributed to restore our exchange which in the end went up to par, after dropping as low as an adverse —19 per cent. We do not positively state that it will maintain that level, nevertheless we are led to believe that this established parity between the American money and ours is to us the indication of a fortunate state of affairs and is reassuring to trade.

If agriculture, particularly, is still suffering from the depreciation in values, at least it rejoices in a crop which no past figure has ever reached and which was transported to outside markets with extraordinary rapidity. These favourable conditions combined with the able administration of the late lamented Minister of Railways were responsible, no doubt, for the progress noticed in our National Railways.

Thanks to the recent initiative taken by the government, we are in hopes that our National Railways will succeed in extricating themselves from the difficulties which they have encountered within the last years.

There is a French proverb which says: "Quand le bâtement va, tout va". It

is specially in the building trade that the crisis was felt more acutely. However, of late, we have noticed in this essential industry a marked progress, for instance in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and in other localities. The same progress is noticeable in most of our industries, so that the future may be viewed more serenely.

In order to further secure our prosperity, we must have a larger population which will increase our output and take its share of the burden which we carry. It is not that empty cradles are to be feared in Canada, especially in our good old province of Quebec where it is customary for our spouses to generously respond to our patriotism; however, the immigration contribution is not what we might expect. A remedy must be found. The government has given proof of its solicitude for this all important subject. It will promote a sound agricultural immigration and in the same way endeavour to repatriate our people.

It is not sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to greet a person on his landing in this country, to offer him all the material advantages possible; we must moreover, and I lay stress on this point, create in the new comer a state of mind in harmony with the ideals of the new country which he has adopted and, Sir, such a mission belongs to us all.

In order that a people may exist and attain nationhood, an ideal which can create a national spirit is indispensable. Let us teach our new settlers the noble deeds of our history, whether in past or present times. Let them draw from those pages filled with great accomplishments the determination and will to ever be, before and above all things, a member of the great Canadian family.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if our economic conditions require that we should increase our population, the conditions which prevail in our industries and regulate our agricultural interests demand equally that our trade policy should find new outlets on foreign markets. In this connection, Sir, the country rejoices in the initiative taken by the government which, returning to its policy of the past, has renewed commercial conventions with France and Italy. Our gratitude is secured to those ministers, to whom the government so confided these missions, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. The government, Mr. Speaker, has endeavoured to establish the wealth of this country upon the basis of a prudent and rational use of our resources. To promote the agricultural interests, protect the consumer, maintain and encourage the industries that we have so patiently established; such is its aim. The people of Canada rely again with confidence on the distinguished leader of the government, a noted statesman and a wise economist and, also on the eminent men with whom he has associated himself, so as to fulfil their hopes, perpetuate these traditions of progress and lead our dear Canada towards the high destinies which await her. I have the honour to second the motion of the hon. member from Colchester (Mr. Putnam).

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the motion recurring each session, moved to-day by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), and seconded by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume) has received at the hands of both these gentlemen that courteous, brief and moderately non-partisan treatment that does honour, not only to the motion, but to themselves. I heartily congratulate the hon. member for Colchester on having, in a brief space of time, covered in language of precision and of dignity all that could be expected to be referred to on the motion, some things, indeed, on which the Speech from the Throne is silent. I am afraid I did not detect in his utterances any sign of the loosening of those hard Maritime partisan bonds, nor of the intrusion of light into the prejudices of the past; but nevertheless he spoke well and with credit to himself. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier is to be welcomed into this House to-day for the first time. He comes from a historic constituency, one that stands now far to the front of the progressive, prosperous districts of this country. His speech this afternoon indicates that, in point of standing as an orator, he worthily represents the great constituency from which he comes. May my words of welcome extend as well to the other new members of Parliament? In the most of cases, we regret that new members are necessary from those districts; but they will receive at the hands of those of us longer here a courteous and cordial greeting in this House.

We meet now under circumstances new in another regard. One of the great parties of this House has lost its erstwhile leader, he having severed that association with his party that he may devote himself more to other occupations. I shall not comment on any circumstances connected with that severance now. I refer to it only for the purpose of welcoming to the ranks of leadership the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke), who has been signally honoured by his fellows in an early elevation to that office. Rarely does the prize of leadership come after so brief an

experience in parliament. One session alone has the hon. member for Brandon served; but that session was long enough to enable him to impress most favourably hon. members of this House of all parties. I believe it can be said that his sincerity of belief, as well as his fairness of discussion, made a marked impression upon hon. members generally. I do not know that I look, myself, for any less evidence of Liberal affiliation than I looked for in his predecessor; but I do believe that the hon. member from Brandon approaches all problems from the entire, wide Canadian standpoint. I believe further that his heart is not only truly Canadian, but just as truly British.

Very few words of mine are necessary at this stage of the work of parliament. This is our second session. The Speech from the Throne is down, and it covers a range of subjects. I cannot say there is to be found within its paragraphs very much difficult of digestion, very much of weight or importance to command the attention of hon. members this session. Some things are there that appeared a year ago. There are promises repeated, promises made in the fervour of new-found power twelve months ago, promises never yet fulfilled, but which they do not hesitate to come back and reiterate, undertaking to do better in 1923.

Last year we found in the Speech from the Throne a commitment on a railway policy, a policy which, it is true, they had one and all declared themselves opposed to in order, in eastern Canada, to attain the reins of power, but to which, in the Speech from the Throne, they pledged themselves to give effect, namely, to continue the public operation, through a board of directors, of the National Railway systems of this country, specifically promising, as well, what was the declared and admitted policy of the previous administration, to bring what were then two great systems into one by what they described as co-ordination. Later in the session, when the railways were under discussion at the hands of the late lamented minister, that hon. gentleman further proclaimed that that co-ordination was about to take place, that there was to be such a unification—a word also used in the former Speech from the Throne—as would enable economies to be effected and the greatest efficiency to be brought about. This time those words are somewhat modified in their reaffirmation in the present Speech from the Throne. Instead of assuring parliament, as was done a year ago when this long-delayed amalgamation or co-ordination of the Grand Trunk with the National system was to take place, the Speech from the Throne to-day,—its author evidently feeling somewhat ashamed that that undertaking has never yet been carried out—makes no reference to the Grand Trunk system at all, but solemnly assures the people of Canada that the National system is to be co-ordinated, to be unified. Why, that co-ordination, that unification was all complete when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. It had been done. The roads, apart from the Grand Trunk, were all being operated under one board.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Grand Trunk had a separate board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly; I did not say the Grand Trunk. I said that the other roads were all being operated under one board, with all the advantages of unification. And all that the Speech from the Throne to-day pretends to say is that what was already done a year ago is still going to be done. No reference at all is made to the Grand Trunk. Now, the practical consideration for this House on railway subjects is this: Why is it that the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk with the National Railways is not yet a fact? Why is it that no progress whatever has been made in twelve months, and that we have had nothing but promise after promise, non-fulfilment after non-fulfilment, and now not even a promise? Why is it that to-day we have two railway systems owned by the country, operated, I know, nominally under a single board, but which are each run as a separate system, just the same as they were run under private management? We have a separate traffic manager for the Grand Trunk as well as a separate passenger manager. There is a whole separate organization for the Grand Trunk, including a separate freight department and all the rest, involving all the burden of duplication. And the Speech from the Throne to-day even suppresses the hope that the government purpose to do away with that unnecessary expense to this country. Now, I am quite aware that certain preliminary steps had to be taken, that probably some arrangement would be required to be made as regards the holders of bonds of certain of the individual systems. But I have not learned that any steps have been taken to make these arrangements, or that any progress has been made. All that has been done in connection with this entire policy has been to oust from office a board of directors and a manager who, on the admission of the Minister of Railways who sat in this House last session, had succeeded in a singular way in achieving great progress in connection with the

amalgamation and the betterment of that system, and in the reduction of its deficits. All that has been done has been ruthlessly to oust them from power and place in office some of the favourites of hon. gentlemen opposite. This question is of real and practical consequence because of its bearing on a larger subject to which I will refer later in my address. This country is not to-day getting the advantages that it ought to get from the unification of the railways it owns. On the contrary, it is suffering under a burden which it has no right to bear, because of the wholly unjustified delay, a delay now extending over thirteen months. There has been no cause for one of two months' duration, on the part of the present government. What may be the loss it is very difficult, of course, to say. But I do not think that any railway expert would place it under $10,000,000 per year. What is more, I observe that the government has made commitments in relation to the purchase of equipment and supplies aggregating, so the report would indicate, from $12,000,000 to $20,000,000, at least not less than the lower figure; and this for equipment and supplies, the necessity for which would seem to me to be very doubtful indeed, were the advantages of amalgamation first brought about. I am unable to understand why these large engagements should be made on behalf of this country before we know what the requirements are as the result of a survey, a survey that can be made only when amalgamation is effected. But I have another objection to these commitments. What authority did the government have from this parliament sanctioning commitments of between $12,000,000 and $20,000,000 for equipment? I am not aware that authority was asked for, much less granted, at the last session of parliament. All these matters had been reviewed and should have been included in the estimates of a year ago. There is no excuse whatever for commitments in between, commitments that could not have arisen because of circumstances unforeseen. If the need was there, then the need was known to the directors in the spring of 1922, and I doubt not if the directors and the general manager felt that those commitments were necessary they would have laid before the administration estimates covering the same, and parliament would have had the right to decide whether they were necessary. That was not done. We have since gone through a transport season, perhaps the largest in the history of the country, involving the carriage of grain to the extent of three-quarters of one hundred million bushels more, I think, than was ever transported before. That was done, it is true, mainly under the late management, but wholly without complaint as to car shortage or equipment shortage, so far as I heard. Besides this, earlier in the season large bodies of equipment were altogether unused. Consequently it seems to me that the government has some explanations to make to the House as to why they have joined with the new directors in binding the country to millions of expenditure without the authority of parliament.

May I also mention an ingredient of the pledge of a year ago, as to the fulfilment of which we have no word and no assurance? It will be recalled that in the Speech from the Throne of a year ago when the promise of co-ordination was given, His Excellency was made to say that that co-ordination was to be accompanied by a thorough inquiry in order that the people of Canada would at last know the real inside financial facts of the National Railway system. Has that thorough inquiry taken place? If so, by whom was it conducted? In the speech of the former minister, made later in the session, it was intimated that inquiry would be made by a body of men specially appointed for the purpose by the board of directors. Has that inquiry taken place at all? If it has, what is the result? Has it been found that the facts disclosed previously were in any way coloured, in any way misleading, in any way incomplete? If it has been made, the House should have known ere this what the result of the inquiry was. I venture to say it was one of those alluring manifestoes that are made only to be forgotten.

The other subject that is repeated this year from the sessional programme of the year before is the subject of immigration. In the Speech from the Throne of 1922 the House was informed that immigration had been necessarily neglected during the war, that there had been naturally a falling off of immigrants, but that now the blessing of peace had come the government was alive to the need of an aggressive immigration policy and was immediately addressing itself to the formulation of same. This time the Speech from the Throne says that they are still impressed with the need of an active and effective immigration policy, and that their belief is that the efforts of the government should be specially directed to acquiring United States and British immigrants. I can quite understand that the government would feel the country in need of some renewed assurance on this subject. We have had a number of speeches in the interim in various parts of

the country, chiefly from the mouth of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart), many of them emphasizing the labours of the administration to formulate a policy, one of them announcing that at last the task was complete and they had decided to increase the advertising, to increase the agencies, and to seek immigrants from other lands, and as well to stop the exodus of those already within our borders.

I was not able to detect anything in the way of a new idea in that formulation of alleged policy. But a review of the success of this administration on the subject of immigration is illuminating as illustrating its success with every other subject that it has turned its hand to since coming into power. I could detect a sense of humour coming back into the mind of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) when he asked himself the hypothetical question: What after all has this government done? If his mind should turn to the subject of immigration, he would see the real irony of the question. He spoke of the very great difficulties the government encountered when it came into power a year ago. Oh, what a pathetic situation this country was in! Our financial condition, he said, was so bad that it really constituted—and I waited for the word: finally it came—it really constituted a "problem." He forgot the Speech from the Throne of last year. In that speech the government which had in their election speeches described our national condition as perilous, as bringing forebodings into the minds of "masters of finance," in the words of the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), as making even rich men quail with fear, as indeed making patriotic men dread the day when, because of our obligations to the Republic to the south, we would drift into annexation,—in the Speech from the Throne these same men had His Excellency say, that the condition of this country was the best of that of any country that had been engaged in the world war. And as the hon. member reviews the year, dwelling all the time on the vastness of the task of the government, the conclusion his philosophic mind finally arrives at is this:

> How small, of all that human hearts endure,
> The part that kings or laws can cause or cure.

How little more especially can those of that name and quality in the present administration do in the matter of immigration!

Immigration during the war of course fell off. Our efforts during that time were not centred on that subject; they had other and bigger tasks to engage them. But nevertheless our immigration during the war was better than our immigration after the vast display of effort of the present administration. The average during the whole period of the war was about 90,000 immigrants per year. This year up to the end of December some 60,000 entered Canada, or a 25 per cent falling off from the year before. I have the correct figures before me. In the year 1920 we received 117,396 immigrants; in 1921, 148,477; in 1922, 89,999. That is the way immigration went on after the war closed. Our immigration from the beginning of last April to the end of the year is given me by the department at 60,247. The government affirm in the Speech from the Throne that the most desirable immigration is British and American. Well, British immigration has almost disappeared altogether. British immigration that a year ago was five to one is now less than two to one. As against European, British immigration absolutely is going down to the zero mark. That is the result of one year of operation.

But while immigration is stagnant, emigration appears to be active. The government somewhat boasts in the Speech from the Throne of the expansion of our exports. Our exports have gone up in part—there is no very great stimulus apparent, but there is a somewhat small increase. But there are exports and exports. With a crop transcending anything we have ever had before in the history of the Dominion, it is scarcely of much credit to the government that that crop has had to find an export market—it must go. We have, I should think, a 400,000,000 bushel wheat crop this year; our barley and our oat crop much exceeds that of any previous year in our history, and that accounts for the expansion of our exports. But there is something else that accounts for it as well. We are exporting settlers' effects at a very considerable rate. In 1920 the export of settlers' effects was valued at some $7,762,000, but in the same year there were imported settlers' effects to the value of $9,127,000. In a word, the balance was in our favour to the extent of $1,364,631. The year before—1921—we had a balance in our favour in the matter of export and import of settlers' effects of $1,161,000—$6,808,000 worth came in and $5,647,000 worth went out. But this year, after the exertion of the government, as promised in the Speech from the Throne of a year ago, we managed to have come in $5,068,000 worth while there went out $6,155,000

worth, or a balance against us of $1,086,767. Nothing will more clearly, more rigidly and more unanswerably illustrate the success of the government's immigration policy. The United States immigration figures show that the population of this country is going over to the United States at a rate which is increasing every month. That was the case throughout 1922; in later months the figures run up to almost eight thousand per month. That, by the way, is the cause—I regret to have to say that it is the main cause—of the diminution of unemployment in the larger cities of this country to-day. Well, the government takes to itself credit in the Speech from the Throne for the reduction of the unemployment figures as compared with those of a year ago. They would be more frank and more fair with this country if they explained that unemployment has gone down because the artisans of Canada have gone across to American cities where they are getting work that they cannot obtain in this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear hear"; they are apparently quite glad to increase the figures of our export, even though it is the export of manhood and of settlers' effects. No, the situation in Canada to-day has not improved over that of a year ago. I do not think all these things are attributable to government; I have never argued that. There are some things government can do; this government has not turned a hand to make work for a single individual in this Dominion. No policy can they point to that has brought meals to the mouths of the labourers of this country, no policy can they point to that has brought a taxpayer into this country to share the load we carry now. They sit in office,—well, I do not know that it is quite fair to say that they always sit; they did travel considerably. At all events, they enjoy the honours of office; but a Speech from the Throne that contained something of a specific policy designed to check the flow of emigration, designed to enhance the flow of immigration, designed to reduce the taxation of those who are here, designed to bring work and food to the people of this country—that would be a Speech from the Throne more welcome to the people than anything we find in the document now before us.

There was, however, mention of certain subjects in the Speech from the Throne twelve months ago upon which the government is conspicuously silent now. Hon. members—especially hon. members to my left and others interested in western Canada—will recall the note of triumph with which it was announced in the government press—yes, by the government itself—that the long-standing question of the return of the natural resources to the western provinces had at last been solved at the hands of this administration. Here was a question that had baffled ministers of mediocre talent in the days that had gone. Year after year incompetent men had struggled with it, but now a new government had come to power and in the space of a few short weeks had solved this intricate question by the application of the spirit of justice and of equality; and the Speech from the Throne pronounced that already a solution, or what was hoped would be a solution, had been sent forward to the premiers of the western country. In the interim the suggestion had been made—and it had already been accepted by the then premier of Manitoba—that if in the application of the principle of equality, when they all got together later on to solve the natural resources problem, any difficulty should arise, a tribunal should be erected to determine, upon a principle of accounting, just how these difficulties should be resolved. And so the announcement went forth that at length that could be decided; the question would be off the skyline of Canadian politics, solved by the superior talent of the present administration. There is no mention of it, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne this year. Does it mean that the prophecy or the promise of a year ago is fulfilled and the sky-line clear of the question? No; the question stands exactly where it stood when they came into office, save and except that they have messed it and retarded it. Not one foot of progress has been made: nothing was done whatever save the holding of a futile conference from which each participant went forth to say that he came down, discussed, and went home in vain. All indeed, that happened was this: a provincial election was approaching in Manitoba. It was important for the political associate of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that he go back with the solution of the natural resources question in his pocket, and so between them they contrived that this concoction of verbiage should be tried upon a credulous public. The people should be told that the two prime ministers had met and had decided to settle the whole matter merely by the introduction of the great principle of equality as between the citizen of Manitoba and the citizen of the rest of Canada Precisely, Mr. Speaker, as if two litigants had long struggled before a judge on the bench for the ascertainment of their

civil rights, and after many weeks of disputation and litigation their lawyers rose and announced to the court that they, the lawyers, had decided on a settlement of the entire matter, had entered into a formal, binding, sealed agreement to settle the whole question "on the principle of justice." That is what evolved from the promise of the Speech from the Throne of a year ago. Consequently, no reference to it appears in the Speech from the Throne to-day.

There is still another subject upon which the Speech is silent. It is a subject that attained no little prominence in the contest of 1921, a subject, indeed, that has been more a bone of political contention, that has been more the subject of illusory hope and final disappointment than any other subject in the politics of our country; I refer to the tariff question. Hon. members, of course, will do the government this justice, that the reference of a year ago was exceedingly delicate, exceedingly gentle, exceedingly vague;—there would be something done in the way of revision; it could not, unfortunately, be much on account of the short space of time that they had had, but something in the way of revision would be done and done last session. The budget, it will be remembered, finally came down, and I remember well how the feelings which I expressed in the debate on the Speech from the Throne were amply vindicated by the event, how the high hopes of the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply were dashed to the ground, how the hopes of hon. gentlemen to my left, which they more sincerely held, were dashed to the ground as well. So little was done, and that reversed by subsequent articles of the budget, that in the end we find the tariff average on our imports to-day higher than it averaged when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. But hope had not died in the breasts of certain hon. members of this House, and in all sincerity they expressed the conviction that having made a short step on farm implements, very short indeed, in the way of reduction, if that were accepted as a step in the right direction, as the half a loaf that was better than no bread, more would follow to vindicate the measure of confidence of hon. gentlemen on this side in the government of the day.

I wonder if there is any evidence this afternoon that there is going to be more to follow. The customs pledge of a year ago is, apparently, in the minds of the government, wholly fulfilled, and they believe silence the better part of discretion. This year they have forgotten the question of the tariff altogether. So that if the molecular step of last session is a "step in the right direction," I am afraid the hopes of hon. gentlemen now to my left will not be very high that that step is to be followed by others in the right direction; and, indeed, after the government took this long—promised step, heralded with the language of hope by hon. gentlemen behind them and diagonally across, after that was done and their manipulations with the tariff were over, when we reflect that the government collected $88,000,000 of customs tax on importation of $506,000,000, as against a collection of $78,000,000 on an importation of $502,000,000 the year before, those who were so ardent for tariff reform in the way of revision downward will hope that this step "in the right direction" will not be repeated very often. A tariff that averaged 15½ per cent up to the end of 1921 for that fiscal year, now averages, when the half loaf is delivered and the sales tax put on at the boundary, 17.5 per cent over the whole scale. Such is the fulfillment of the famous platform of 1919. Such is the end of the comedy on this tariff issue by virtue of which hon. gentlemen opposite sit in power to-day.

I desire to touch on a question or rather a phase of Canadian conditions that demands the earnest attention of every thoughtful citizen at this time. I refer to the general financial and taxation condition of this country. My mind goes back to the days that immediately followed the conclusion of the late war. The war was scarcely over when the government of the time was importuned by hon. gentlemen then on this side of the House for the reduction of the debt of this country. The war is over, we were told; other countries are retrenching, and that retrenchment is reflected not only in a diminution of expenditure but in a diminution of national obligations. I can well recall the speeches of hon. gentlemen who now sit on the government benches, stating that it was not enough to know that the consolidated revenue was equalling, yes far exceeding, consolidated fund expenditure. That assurance was no solace to hon. gentlemen at all. They wanted the capital expenditure cut down until we could show a reduction of the obligations of this Dominion. At that time the big policies that provided the means of the re-establishment of our returned men were being laid, and their principles were being applied in practice. Our pension scale was growing, our land settlement plans were developing; and our expenditure in these regards was very high. Our soldier re-establishment policies were in full effect, and larger amounts were required in respect of them than were required in the worst days of the war. But

5 p.m.

even under those conditions we were required at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite to show a reduction in the national debt of this country, instead of an increase, as was inevitable from year to year. The time has now come when those necessities are passed. We are not now at a time of an ascending pension scale; we are in the days of a descending pension scale. Already in the ten months of this year over $3,000,000 less is required for our pensions than a year ago. Instead of spending $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 per year on our soldier land settlement, we are spending about $1,500,000, and we are getting in more money than we are expending, according to the figures recently published by the department. Instead of requiring vast and increasing expenditures for our re-establishment department, that expenditure is also being reduced, naturally and inevitably reduced. There is being a saving made in respect of the soldier everywhere. That naturally follows the recedence of this country from the days of the war. The expenditure of that department is at least $3,000,000 less than it was a year ago. There are no new plans of re-establishment evolved. There is nothing new evolved by them in the world; indeed, nothing is more foreign to the mind of this government than the evolution of any new policy on any subject. But the expenditure keeps up; the debt keeps up, and it not only keeps up, but it increases by millions every month. A year ago when hon. gentlemen opposite came into office the net debt of Canada according to figures recently published was $2,366,861,252. The net debt of Canada when they turned the corner of the year 1922-1923, just at the very moment the Prime Minister issued that paean of praise reciting the achievements of his administration and the bettered condition of the country at that very moment the net debt was $2,412,496,151, or an increased obligation on the back of this country, and an obligation chiefly to the people of the United States of America, not to the citizens of our own country at all, of $45,624,899. That means that, in the days of peace, in the days four years after the great conflict, in the days when the expenditure in re-establishment of the soldier had generally gone down, the government was able to show a debt forty-five and a half million greater than when they came into power. Take away those expenditures that have diminished, the savings that they could not help making in relation to the soldier services to this country, and the consolidated fund expenditure to-day is greater than the consolidated fund expenditure a year ago. That is the success the government has achieved in that regard. And all this aggregation of debt piles up while the government exhausts its ingenuity, not in reducing the public expenditure, not in cutting down unnecessary services—for these are not reduced at all as they were in 1920 and 1921—but in ascertaining what new taxes they can place on the backs of the people of this Dominion. They have added to the revenue of the country something, I have not the exact figures, but it must run into tens of millions, by the imposition of a sales tax fifty per cent greater than the sales tax they found when they came into power. That is a tax that is placed upon the backs of everybody in this Dominion. All who use the necessities of life must pay their share of the sales tax. Around the neck of those people the government has placed a weight fifty per cent greater than they found when they came into office. They take all those engaged in business, large and small, in agricultural as well as industrial operations and, as they seek to do their business in the best, the cleanest, the most effective way, the way that leads least to litigation, the government comes in between and adds its impositions here, there and everywhere, until business becomes clogged and next to impossible. They have added taxes on business to the extent, at least of four million dollars extra in the way of stamps on cheques and the like. I find the receipts of the Post Office department, for example, increased from some $19,000,000 to some $23,000,000 this year, because by the law of the country everybody has to go to the post office and buy stamps day by day in order to transact the ordinary business that keeps himself and his family alive. We find taxes here and taxes there, stamps here and stamps there, plastered on every business document, until there is little but stamps to be seen; and the fact that that has to be done is made the basis of exuberant self-congratulations at the hands of members of the government, because this year the Post Office department is going to show a surplus. Such is the success the government attains in the imposition of taxes. One tax has followed another and there are indications, there are even intimations, that we may expect further taxes upon the overburdened people of this country again this session. The government has not addressed itself with any energy whatever to the task of reducing expenditure department by department as this country has the right to expect, year by year, as we recede from the days of the war. I will give an illustration. The late government undertook the

reorganization of departments. It undertook the reorganization of the Printing Bureau in Ottawa, of the Post Office department, and what savings we have to-day in that department in the matter of expenditure are the direct result of that reorganization, and if any hon. gentleman opposite wants any proof I refer him to the words of the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy), extracted from him last session, frankly indeed, given by him in this House. That department was reorganized. The Customs department and Inland Revenue were reorganized and millions were saved to this country in the process. Let this government pursue such work department by department, and they will save the people of Canada millions that are to-day going in waste services all over the country. Now, there is no question of this at all. The government takes great credit for reducing the hours the civil servants had to work last year, for increasing the holidays, as they say they have done. By this means I suppose they hope that votes will be attracted to their standard. The country looks in vain for substantial contraction in the expenditures of the Dominion. That contraction has taken place this year in very marked degree in other countries of the world. They talk in the Dominion about not being able to do anything in the way of meeting our honest share of Empire obligations, in the way of paying for what we enjoy in this country. We can do nothing, they say, because of the great debt of the Dominion. The government of Great Britain in the year that has gone was under the necessity of paying two-thirds of its entire revenue in the interest on obligations which that country incurred, that the liberty of the world might be saved. The interest on the obligations of this country, obligations that I know were great, obligations that I know were honourable and creditable—the interest on the obligations that were incurred in the war—is not more than about one-third of the revenue of this country to-day. The government have the other two-thirds. The government of Great Britain, with one-third of their revenue, are able to pay off a portion of their national debt; this government with two-thirds of our revenue available, none of which is applicable in interest upon the war debt, is not able to reduce any of its national debt, but rather adds to the national debt by forty-five millions in one year. Such is the comparison between this administration and other administrations that have been in power. So I say that the effort of this House should be directed this session to one end more than all others, namely, to the end of bringing to the government a realization of its duties in this matter of expenditure and taxation.

Considerable is stated in the Speech from the Throne about improved conditions in the Dominion. I have not observed those improved conditions myself. I do not come to parliament animated by a desire to paint in colours that are darker than the truth the actual condition of our country. So far from despairing, there is none of higher hope for this Dominion among its citizens than myself. We are in a good position yet, relatively to other countries, in the matter of national obligations. By the conduct of our finances through those years of war by procuring for this country a large share of the work of producing all kinds of goods necessary in the conflict, we were able to hold the debt of this Dominion pretty largely within the four corners of the Dominion itself. We were able in that time to add to our savings deposits in this country a sum no less than $550,000,000. We were able at the same time to provide, from the pockets of our people, a sum no less than $1,700,000,000 of the national debt of this country, so that of the interest on that sum, four dollars out of every five come into the pockets of the people of our country themselves. While that was going on our people purchased and paid for at least $600,000,000 worth of automobiles. That was the condition, the prosperity that prevailed prior to the end of the year 1921, and that was a fundamentally healthful and sound position. That process has not continued. The government, starting with the country in that position, with the necessities of the war and all that the war entailed contracting day by day, should have been able to show a splendid reduction of our national debt to-day; it should have been able also to show a reduction of our obligations owing to the citizens of countries abroad. The contrary is the case. We owe more abroad; we have a national debt bigger than ever; all the obligations and duties of government in this regard have been passed over and ignored.

In western Canada, it is true, our farmers reaped the largest harvest that that country has ever known. I would not say that this was true of every portion of the Dominion. Of the three western provinces, it is unquestionably true; of the Dominion, in the aggregate, it also is unquestionably true; but I believe it must be said—and it is only right that this should be brought home to the administration—that the condition of the individual farmer in western Canada, after the enjoyment of a year of government under the

present administration, is more difficult, more overshadowed with debt and trouble than it has been in the history of the last fifteen years. Of that, I do not think there is any question at all. The government says, in the Speech from the Throne: We are getting on fine; everything is going well; but, of course, we cannot be restored to complete prosperity so long as there is disturbance, disruption and chaos in Europe. There is a measure of truth in the latter part of that sentence. I am one of those who believe there is a very direct relationship between sixty-, seventy-, or seventy-five-cent wheat on the western prairies and a chaotic, moneyless Europe. I think one of the primary essentials for the restoration of sounder agricultural conditions in this country is the preservation over there, first of all, of securities for peace, for without peace there can be no order, no production, no prosperity. First of all, we must have the preservation of the securities for peace that the world paid so much for in the war, and next of all the restoration of those monetary and financial conditions and conditions of mutual trust that form the corner stone of anything that men enjoy in the way of commercial and economic prosperity.

Those things must be brought about, and I also lay this suggestion before the government —although this is not the time to discuss it in detail nor to make controversy over it— that for the restoration of those securities for peace that the best of the world fought and died for, Canada herself is not without some responsibility. Canada yearns for peace; Canada yearns for prosperity. Canada is bound to do Canada's share in bringing about those essential things without which there cannot be prosperity or peace on earth. We want peace, we want prosperity; but do not let us just keep on yearning for peace and the consequent prosperity, always at the expense of someone else. There is, I know, on this continent, a feeling in which, unfortunately, I think myself, one great nation places too much reliance, a feeling that here in America our safe and best course in the general interest of the world is to hold ourselves intact, to refrain from all participation in the economic rehabilitation of the Old World. From that position, I believe, there is a tendency to-day to recede, and Canada is in no position to point a finger at another country so long as we ourselves, as part of the British Empire, maintain that selfish part ourselves. I do not say there is any major part that we can play; but we can play a part commensurate with the part we played before, and it is the duty of this country to do its full share, joining with other countries of the world, to bring about those sure securities for peace and consequently those sure securities for economic recovery in those portions of the world that have suffered.

The Speech from the Throne makes no reference to an effort of the British government to join the whole forces of the Empire, to make still more secure the peace of eastern and southern Europe, and on that account I make no reference to it now. I noticed in the speech of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), that he applauded what he said was the action of the government—if there was action, I could not really define it myself—in refusing to submit a policy until parliament met. I only make this reference now that the programme of the session is before us in the Speech from the Throne, and I find that speech as barren of any suggestion or submission of policy to parliament as the government was barren when other parts of the Empire answered in September last.

It will, of course, be the duty of the administration—this should have been done already—to bring down to parliament, now that parliament has met, all the correspondence that has passed on those subjects between ourselves and the government of the Motherland, all the correspondence, all the information that this government has, to place this parliament in possession of the facts in order that the representatives of the people assembled here may know just the position this country has taken, may know just exactly the circumstances that surround us within the Empire and before the world, and, therefore, be the better able to judge what, in all the circumstances, is the duty of this country.

I stated, in opening, that there was no necessity of prolonged discussion now. We make better progress by concentrated, concrete devotion to individual questions, one by one. The Speech from the Throne, however, does refer to what is alleged to have been an achievement of the administration with regard to the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle. Well, the function of the Speech from the Throne is to lay before parliament in brief form the programme of its intended duties for that session. I have no particular objection to the singing of a song of praise if something really important has been accomplished to the credit of the administration; but it must be known to every citizen of this country, known very clearly to everyone who reads the reports of

the parliament of Great Britain, that whatever has been accomplished in relation to that embargo, whatever has been acceded to by the British parliament and the British government, is the direct and sole result of the obligation of honour felt by that parliament and that government in relation to the promise made by Great Britain in 1917 to the government of Canada then in power. No one can read the debates of the House of Commons of Britain; no one can read the debates of the House of Lords of Britain in particular; yes, no one can read the speeches of members of the government, in those debates, and not agree that had it not been for the word of Britain passed at the Imperial Conference of 1921, that after the war that embargo would be removed, had it not been for the feeling there that the word of Britain having been given, whatever the consequences, must be redeemed, there would have been not even a promise of a removal of the embargo in 1923. Moreover, is the embargo even yet removed? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is here; he shakes his head in the negative. That does not seem to me precisely in harmony with the words of the Speech from the Throne. But what the Minister of Agriculture tacitly admits is true; the embargo has not yet been removed. There is not an animal in this country to-day that could horn itself into the British Isles. All that this government has obtained—or rather all that has come to it, because it has not obtained it in any way whatever—is the promise of the British parliament that it will implement the pledge given in 1917 to Sir Robert Borden at the Imperial Conference of that year. The execution of that promise is still to take effect, and I believe the time at which it is to take effect is still very much in doubt. More than that, I express some apprehension—of course, it is difficult for anyone to know until the test of experience is applied—that the conditions agreed to by the representatives of this government will, in the actual working out of the trade following the removal of the embargo, prove onerous if not serious. I hope not. I earnestly hope that the flow of trade, particularly in the product of the farms of this country, over to Great Britain will receive a stimulus as a consequence of the removal of the embargo. I hope that all the blessings of trade will follow and that by this means something in the way of relief may come for what is at present a rather unfortunate condition of agriculture in many parts of this country.

Let the government not lull itself into any illusory belief that this Dominion enjoys to-day the measure of prosperity which, on this continent and relative to the United States, it ought to enjoy at this time. I do not believe it does. There is too much emigration; there is too much idleness, even if unemployment may have diminished somewhat. There is too much hardship, too much increase of debt, particularly on the part of those engaged in agriculture in this country. The condition of the farmer in the West demands attention. and I venture to suggest that the grievances against which the western farmer complains can receive no adequate investigation at the hands of such a committee as is foreshadowed to-day in the Speech from the Throne. The government says that the western farmer has been complaining of the mixing of grain and, as well, of the way in which his products are shipped; and it therefore proposes a special committee of the House of Commons to inquire into and report upon these complaints. Why, for fifty years we have had a committee of this House which has been empowered to inquire into every one of these subjects year by year, with all the powers that any committee wants. And still we have these complaints abroad to-day. Now, Sir, these complaints call for investigation at the hands of a body who will have no other duties to perform until it completes its task. Let this government launch such an investigation and it will be welcomed by the farmer of western Canada. These complaints to-day have reached an acuteness far past any stage that has been reached in the years that are gone, and naturally the cry for remedy is louder, because of the distressed condition of the country generally. The government, therefore, would do well to launch an investigation by competent men, whom, of course, they have power to choose, who should have full authority, and whose sole duty it should be to go into these complicated, difficult questions that harass the mind of the western farmer to-day. That is the suggestion I make to the administration. I see no value at all in merely appointing a committee of this House to do what has been the duty year by year for fifty years of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons.

I pass no further comment on the Speech from the Throne at this moment, save the following: A revision of the Bank Act is promised. Of that I am glad. I think it is the duty of this parliament at this session to complete the task of the Bank Act revision. I trust that that task will be approached in a spirit of liberality, in a spirit of determination that whatever can be done in the way of making more secure the savings of the

people, and of providing a more elastic and equitable distribution of the banking service, shall be rendered possible by that revision.

The Speech refers to a redistribution bill. That should have been brought down last session. It is overdue now. I welcome the appearance of that promise in the Speech, and venture the hope, in closing, that in carrying out their plans as to the redistribution bill the government will imitate the practice established in 1912 in submitting the question to a joint committee of parliament fairly constituted, doing so freely and without restrictions; and I trust that that committee will be commissioned to come to terms on the whole details of redistribution, fair and acceptable to all sections of this House. That is the right spirit in which to approach the redistribution problem. The government have an example in the procedure of 1912, and I ask that they follow it. If these suggestions are accepted by the administration, I venture to think that the labours of this parliament this session need be neither very onerous nor very long.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to me to have the privilege of agreeing with my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) and to find that we are in accord on any important matters. His speech to-day has been characterized by the moderation in tone which he has ascribed to the remarks of the mover (Mr. Putnam) and seconder of the address (Mr. Rhéaume). I shall endeavour to follow my right hon. friend in like spirit. May I, with him, congratulate the mover and seconder upon the speeches they have delivered. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) who moved the Address has been in this House for a short time. We have not heard him speak very often; his modesty more or less constrains him to be silent in debate; but I think that all hon. members who have had the privilege of listening to his erudite address to-day will hope that in the course of the debates he will see his way to take a larger part. He has referred to the compliment which has been paid his constituency, and I think it is natural he should so regard the choice of himself as mover of the address. The hon. member may, however, feel that his fellow members on this side of the House take pride, as well, in his achievements as one who in public life has taken an active and courageous part. Some men enter public life in the hope more or less that, after taking an active part in political controversies, they may find, towards the close thereof, some opportunity of public service removed from the uncertainties of politics. Very few there are who, having a position of security and of usefulness, are ready to give it up to embark upon the troublous sea of politics. The hon. member for Colchester belongs to those of the exceptional class; he resigned an important life position which he held, to enter the arena of politics at the last general elections and contest a constituency which was then held by a minister of the Crown. He contested it successfully. After listening to him to-day we can appreciate some of the qualities which helped to win him the great confidence of the constituency he now represents.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume) who has seconded the motion, has delivered his maiden speech. All of us who have had that experience realize how difficult it is for a member to make his first public utterance in this House. I am sure, as we listened to the hon. member to-day, many of us, had we not known he was but recently returned, would have regarded him as an old parliamentarian. As a matter of fact, I believe the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has just come through his first political contest. He has not before been a member of a representative assembly. If to-day is any prophecy of the future, we may expect that the hon. member will in course of time make a distinguished name for himself, as so many of his fellow-members from the province of Quebec have done. He is an orator in his own tongue; had we had the privilege of hearing him in the English tongue, in which he is also fluent, I am sure we would have found him equally proficient.

May I follow my right hon. friend also in extending to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) congratulations upon the confidence which his fellow-members of the Progressive party have reposed in him. We all regret the circumstances which have made it seem necessary to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) to withdraw from the active part he had previously been taking in the political life of our country. We are pleased, however, that he has found it possible to retain his seat in this House, and we hope that what will undoubtedly prove a gain for the business with which he is connected will not interfere too largely with his public duties, and thereby prove our loss, but that he will be enabled to take an active part in the discussions of this House.

I may say to my hon. friend from Brandon that we on this side feel that the confidence which has been placed in him by his fellow-

members of the Progressive party has been well placed. It has been a pleasure to me to notice that at the outset he has set his face against anything in the nature of class organization for political purposes. In so doing I think he has taken a stand which is very much in the public interest. He has seen, I believe, even in the short time during which he has been in this parliament, that one of the worst misfortunes that can befall the common good is that, in this country's political affairs we should become divided into groups on any basis, whether it be of occupation, of race, of religion, or other sectional or class interest however expressed. I am confident that he has taken a step which will be for the good of our country as a whole in advocating the wider view of the interests of all classes of the country in general, and setting himself in opposition to anything which looks to a narrowing of that broad basis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I also, with my right hon. friend, congratulate the new members who have come into this House, and wish them well in the discharge of their public duties.

I come now to some of the remarks which my right hon. friend made on the Speech from the Throne. His utterances were directed first of all to references in the Speech which seemed to bear similarity to references in the Speech of the preceding year. He thought this was a mistake; he took exception to any repetitions. But the latter part of his address was altogether in the nature of a criticism of omissions from the Speech from the Throne of references which had been made in the Speech of last year. That is my right hon. friend's favourite way of criticizing: he endeavours to place his opponents in the position that regardless of whatever they do, they must, somehow, be in the wrong.

My right hon. friend might well have paused in some of the criticisms he made in reference to repetitions and omissions. He seemed eager to attack the government on not having fulfilled some of the promises which it made on a previous occasion with respect to its railway policy. He was very definite and very positive in what he had to say in that regard. He asked, why is it that we have still to-day two railway systems, why is it that after the promise of co-ordination and unification there still remain these two systems, the National Railway system and the Grand Trunk Railway system, with their separate offices and all the additional cost which that involves? Why is it, he asks, that we have not even a promise in the Speech from the Throne that these two systems are to be amalgamated and brought together. He sought by his remarks to create the impression that the government in some way was not sincere in the pledge it had made that it would see that these two systems were amalgamated. He sought to imply that by avoiding some explicit mention in the Speech from the Throne, the intention was, to allow further time to elapse before these two systems were brought together as one, or else to evade this responsibility altogether. Well, may I tell my right hon. friend that he is much mistaken in his criticism in that regard. His remarks are not only wholly without foundation, but are absolutely untrue as respects what has been accomplished by way of the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk and Canadian National railways. My right hon. friend had to do with the drafting of the legislation under which these systems were to be amalgamated. That legislation provided a certain procedure whereby after a board of directors for the Canadian National Railway system had been appointed the other system was to be brought under that board. That has been accomplished, and I may tell my right hon. friend that the Grand Trunk Railway as a separate system no longer exists; that it has been amalgamated with the Canadian National Railways, that to-day there is only one National Railway system, that there is only one head office, that there is only one management, and that there is only one board of control in charge of both systems. Perhaps my right hon. friend hereafter will be a little more careful and not display such haste to criticise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a question? Does he say that the two sets of departments and the two sets of officers do not exist as before?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is exactly what I say. The two sets of officers have ceased to exist. There is now only one set of officers and only one head office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the right hon. gentleman tell me who is the traffic manager of the whole system, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend will only be patient he will get all that information very much in detail in a very short time. But for the present let me give him information which I think ought to satisfy him: to-day there are no longer two separate systems; they have been amalgamated and brought together as one national railway system.

My right hon. friend touched also on the subject of immigration and seemed to complain because the government made further mention of its immigration policy in the Speech from the Throne. He dwelt particularly on the absence of any large number of immigrants during the past year. If he had reflected for a moment he would have realized that what he was saying was in the nature of a criticism of his own administration, because, as every hon. member must know, the immigration of one year is largely the result of preparations that have been made for it in the year preceding. You sow fall wheat one year and you reap the harvest in the year following; it is precisely the same with immigration. The natural time for the influx of immigrants is the early part of the year; immigrants do not come to the country in any numbers in the latter part of the year. They come as the result of the preparations that have been made and what by way of inducing them to come has been accomplished in the year preceding. My right hon. friend was in office in 1921 but was busy with the general elections throughout the fall of that year. From August until December, when the immigration representatives of the government should have been active in Great Britain, in the United States, and wherever suitable immigrants could have been found, he and his colleagues were paying little or no attention to their departments; were allowing them, in fact largely, to look after themselves. My right hon. friend and his Minister of Immigration were busily engaged at the time in vainly trying to win the confidence of the electors at the polls; that is the reason why we have had so little in the way of immigration during the past year. But the pledge that was given in last year's Speech from the Throne has been fulfilled. Efforts were made by the administration as soon as it took office to improve conditions. Those efforts are being and will continue to be extended, and my right hon. friend's desire to see a return of the flow of immigration to this country will probably be fulfilled before very long.

In regard to the question of the natural resources, to which my right hon. friend also alluded, I would draw his attention to the fact that it is not unusual to find that some questions take a little longer to solve than others. The question of the return to the provinces of western Canada of their natural resources is one with which previous governments have grappled over a long period of years. Some progress, I think, has been made in the matter. Conferences have been held. It is quite true that the results have not been all that we had hoped for. We might have made a settlement had we been prepared to accept the terms that the western provinces proposed. But we felt that there were considerations affecting the Dominion as a whole of which account had to be taken, and we were not prepared to go the lengths that the western provinces wished us to go in the matter of returning to them the control of their natural resources. However, I think the discussions we have had have brought the western provinces and the federal government a little closer together on this issue, and we may hope as the result of further conferences to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem.

With the other subjects to which my right hon. friend referred — the tariff and financial matters — I shall not deal at present. I understand there is a desire on the part of hon. members that the House should adjourn at six o'clock, and that being the case I shall endeavour to bring my remarks to a close by that time. Perhaps I should touch more particularly upon a subject to which my right hon. friend made only a passing reference, namely, the despatches which have recently passed between the British government and ourselves respecting the crisis in the Near East.

My right hon. friend says he expects and hopes the government will bring down all the correspondence or communications which have passed between the British government and the Canadian government. Let me say that the government has all along been hoping that it would be possible to bring all the correspondence down. The moment the despatch of September 15 was received here, I made it quite plain in a communication to the British government that in all probability parliament would desire to see the correspondence that might be passing between the British government and ourselves. I have to inform my right hon. friend that we repeatedly asked the British government if we might be at liberty to bring down the correspondence. The British government has in the most clear and emphatic way indicated its wish that the correspondence should not be laid before parliament. However, the British government has stated that no exception can be taken on its part to a general statement being made by myself as to what has passed between us in the matter of correspondence, and I propose to give to the House, as clearly and as fully as I can, an exact statement of what has taken place.

First of all, may I say just a word in regard to the circumstances under which the first

despatch with respect to the situation in the Near East was received. I believe it was within five minutes of midnight on Friday, September 15, that the despatch was sent from Great Britain to Canada, and also, I understand, to other of the British dominions. That despatch was received in Ottawa, I understand, quite late that same evening. It was in cipher, and had to be decoded after its receipt here. Communications which come to the Canadian government from the government of Great Britain reach the Prime Minister's office through the Governor General's office. The despatch in question was received in my office some time between two and three o'clock on Saturday afternoon. With respect to that there is no difference of opinion between the clerks in His Excellency's office and those in my own; it was between two and three o'clock on Saturday afternoon that the despatch was received. In the meantime, the press of this country had received a cable communication from the Old Country to the effect that the several dominions had been invited to send contingents to the Near East. Indeed, the press of Saturday between twelve and two announced that the government of New Zealand had already sent an answer promising to send a contingent. On the Saturday in question I was in my constituency of North York. Some comment has been made with regard to the circumstance that I was not in Ottawa, and it has been suggested that had I been in the city, the despatch on the Near East crisis would have been received before the press announcement that Canada had been invited to send a contingent to the Near East; also that the answer of our government would have been sent with greater promptness. The circumstance that I was not here on that particular day made no difference whatever as to the time of receipt of the despatch being after that at which the announcement was made in the press that the dominions had been invited to send contingents. Had I been here the result would have been exactly the same. However, I may say—perhaps it is not necessary, but I should like to say it—that that particular day was one of about a dozen days in the entire year during which I was absent any distance from my post in this city. I think that through the whole of last year, I did not allow myself a single day's vacation; so far as I recall, there was but an exception of one day. On this particular occasion I was spending two days in my own constituency, the only two days I had been privileged to spend there during the year. When I reached Ottawa the following morning, immediately upon reading the despatch I sent a communication to the British government asking for an explanation as to how it came about that before any communication had reached the government at Ottawa, the press of the country should have had a statement to the effect that the British government had invited Canada to send a contingent to the Near East. At the same time I forwarded to my colleagues who were at Geneva a copy of the communication which had been received, in order that they might be fully informed, and in order that we who were at Ottawa might have the benefit of their opinion and counsel from Geneva where, with other delegates, they were attending the sessions of the League of Nations.

Perhaps I had better give to the House immediately, as nearly as I can, the substance of the despatch which was received, and then I will give the House the substance of the communication which I sent after seeing its context. The despatch was to the effect that the British cabinet had decided to resist Turkish aggression upon Europe, and to make exertions to prevent the Allies being driven out of Constantinople by Mustapha Kemal, and in particular and above all, to maintain the freedom of the Straits by securing firmly the Gallipoli peninsula. The French government, it was stated, had notified the British government that they were in agreement with the British government in informing Mustapha Kemal that he must not violate the neutral zone by which the Straits and Constantinople were protected, and had so instructed their High Commissioner at Constantinople. It was also stated that the Italians were in general accord. It was mentioned that the government of Great Britain was addressing itself to Roumania, Serbia and Greece with a view to securing their military participation in defence of the deep-water line between Europe and Asia.

It was further stated that the British government were notifying all the powers aforesaid of their intention to make exertions, and that they were placing a British division under orders to reinforce Sir Charles Harington, the allied commander-in-chief at Constantinople; that the British navy would co-operate, that these arrangements were intended to cover the period which must elapse before a stable peace with Turkey could be secured; that for this purpose a conference was being proposed probably at Venice, possibly at Paris, and that it was essential that the Allies should be strong enough to maintain their position at Con-

stantinople and round the Straits until this peace had been achieved.

It was further stated in the despatch that the British government did not think it was likely that the forces of Mustapha Kemal would attack if a firm front were shown by any large number of powers acting together. Mention was made of the fact that the total forces were estimated between sixty and seventy thousand men, who thus far had not encountered any serious resistance.

Mention was made of one or two other matters which, if the House had the privilege of seeing the correspondence, it would, I think, regard in the circumstances, as being necessarily confidential. The despatch contained one paragraph which I think may be regarded as the vital and essential one. It was to the effect that the British government would be glad to know whether the Dominion government wished to associate themselves with the action the British government were taking, and whether we would desire to be represented by a contingent. I wish to draw the attention of the House to these particular words, because they constitute the vital part of the despatch. The inquiry was—and I use the word inquiry because it has been used by the late Prime Minister of England, Mr. Lloyd George, in referring to this particular passage—as to whether the Dominion government wished to associate themselves with the action which the British government were taking and whether they would desire to be represented by a contingent.

Mention was also made in the despatch of reasons why possibly some of the Dominions would particularly wish to be represented by a contingent. It was stated by Premier Smuts in addressing the parliament of South Africa that his understanding of the communication was that it had been addressed primarily to Australia and New Zealand on account of their interest in the Gallipoli peninsula, and that its being subsequently sent to the other Dominions was due to the circumstance that the British government having sent it in the first instance to these two Dominions, felt they should send it to all four. I am simply giving the House the statement which Premier Smuts has given to his parliament as his interpretation of the despatch.

There was a further reference to the effect that the announcement that any or all of the Dominions were prepared to send contingents would undoubtedly exercise a favourable influence on the situation, and might conceivably be a potent factor in preventing any actual hostilities. Mention was made of the fact that the despatch was being sent to the different Dominions.

I am anxious, Mr. Speaker, that not only hon. members of this House, but the country as well, should have every reason to feel that nothing of significance contained in the despatch is being withheld, and I therefore propose to hand it to my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, who is a member of the Privy Council, and ask him to peruse its contents and satisfy his mind that I have in every particular given to the House what is essential in it. I should be happy if he would see his way, and I think it would be perfectly proper under the circumstances, to allow the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) who is leading an important party in this House, also to see the contents of the despatch. I think that would not be violating any arrangement which the British government would wish us to keep.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say that I appreciate being shown the despatch. I think it would have been of more value had it been shown me sooner. As to whether it should be shown to others, that is for the government and the Prime Minister to decide, not for me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of deciding the latter point. This, as far as I have been able to see it, is the first occasion on which it has seemed proper to give the despatch the publicity I am now giving to it.

I see, Mr. Speaker, it is nearly six o'clock. If it is the wish of hon. members that the House should adjourn to-night, and you are prepared to allow me to complete what I have to say at the present time, I shall try and not take long to conclude. The understanding between the Whips was, I believe, that after I had finished speaking, the hon. member for Brandon would move the adjournment of the debate, and under the circumstances the government has expressed a willingness to have the House adjourn.

May I say in reference to this despatch, that this was the first and only intimation which the government had received from the British government of a situation in the Near East which had reached a critical stage, and with respect of which there was reason to anticipate the necessity of making any kind of appeal for military assistance. I want it to be clearly understood that nothing in the way of an official communication respecting a critical situation in the Near East was received by our government from the British government prior to our receipt of

the particular despatch of which I have just given the substance.

Receiving the despatch in the manner described, I immediately sent a communication to His Majesty's government somewhat along the following lines: That before it was possible to have the contents of the cable which had come from London communicated to myself or other members of the government the press of Canada carried despatches from Great Britain announcing an invitation by the British government to Canada to participate in resistance of Turkish forces by sending a contingent. I pointed out that a most embarrassing situation had arisen in consequence, that I was being asked by press representatives if any communication, and if so what communications, had been received from the British government. As the message from Great Britain had been marked secret and was in cipher, I was not at liberty to disclose its contents and I asked if the British government would cable immediately stating their wishes in the matter, and whether I was at liberty to disclose the contents of the communication in whole or in part, and if not, what communication the British government desired to have made public as coming from them. I concluded the despatch by saying that our parliament would certainly wish to have copies of all official correspondence in this matter brought down. I asked the British government clearly to indicate, as regards communications, which they might send, what, if any, should be regarded as not coming within the sphere of publicity. I felt that a request for the correspondence was a most natural and proper request, and would be made as soon as Parliament assembled, and it was my desire that if possible this document and others which might pass should be given the fullest publicity. For this reason I endeavoured at the very outset—as soon as I saw the despatch on the Sunday morning, the day following its receipt at Ottawa—to make it quite clear to the British government that as soon as parliament met the government would be confronted, as it has been this afternoon, with a request for publicity in the matter of all despatches, and that I would like the British government to give their consent to have all the correspondence brought down. I was also anxious to give at the time the fullest publicity to the despatch.

The reply I received to the part of the communication to which I have just referred, asking for permission to make the despatch public, was to the effect that it was not suitable for publication textually. The British government indicated that the substance of the despatch might be given in a general statement, but expressed the hope that the despatch itself would not be given publicity. I then gave the following statement to the press on Monday, September 18th at 6.30 p.m.

> As already mentioned the only communication which our government has thus far received with respect to the situation in the Near East from the British Government is a cable despatch marked "secret," the contents of which, without the consent of the British government we do not feel at liberty to make public. It is the view of the government that public opinion in Canada would demand authorization on the part of Parliament as a necessary preliminary to the despatch of any contingent to participate in the conflict in the Near East. The government is in communication with members of the cabinet at present in Europe as Canada's representatives at the League of Nations, and with the British government, with a view to ascertaining whether the situation that exists in the Near East is one which would justify the summoning of a special session of Parliament.

I informed the British government that our cabinet would hold daily sittings, if necessary, that we would be pleased to receive the fullest information; in particular that we wished to be informed whether in their opinion it was desirable that the Canadian parliament should be called to consider this important matter. The reply which was received to this communication was to the effect that the British government saw no necessity for the summoning of parliament.

I should have made mention earlier in this general statement of the nature of the reply sent by the government in answer to the despatch which was received. It was to the effect that as respects the sending of any contingent, it was our view that parliament alone should authorize a step of the kind, and that we would be pleased to receive the fullest information in order to decide upon the advisability of summoning parliament.

Hon. members will recall that for some days there was considerable uncertainty as to the outcome of events, and during that time the government did not deem it advisable to press the British government further in the matter of the publicity to be given to the despatches, or for an explanation of the circumstances accounting for the issue of the circular press communication advising that Canada had been invited to send a contingent to the Near East before our government had received the despatch in question. However, when the crisis appeared to have passed, we did send a further communication to the British government, asking if it were possible to have an explanation, and mentioning again our desire to give publicity to the communications that were received. A change of government came about that time in Great Britain, and the government which succeeded

the previous government asked that they might have opportunity to give consideration to the matter before replying with respect to the request to make public any part of the correspondence. I have since received from the present government in Great Britain a communication with respect to publicity, and it is along the line which I have indicated to my right hon. friend.

In this connection, I might as well give to hon. gentlemen the substance of a part of a despatch which was sent on October 17. It was to the effect that as the need for the immediate summoning of Parliament was apparently passed, it was our purpose to adhere to the original intention of having parliament meet in January. That we should like to be free at that time to bring down all the correspondence that has passed between our respective governments on the Near East situation; that parliament would expect this, and that any refusal on our part to comply with the wish of parliament might create misunderstanding or misapprehension.

In reply to that request, expressing anew our desire to make public all of the correspondence, the present government in Great Britain has sent a further communication as recently as the 27th of January, stating in so many words, that they realize it may be necessary and essential for me to make a statement to parliament setting out the purport of the correspondence between the two governments, and explaining in particular the attitude of Canada, but that at the present juncture the British government would deprecate the publication of the actual text of the telegrams. Part of the correspondence it was stated was necessarily confidential. The request was repeated that a general statement only should be made and that I should refrain from laying any of the telegrams before parliament.

I have thought it only fair to the present administration in this country and to both administrations in the Old Country, to make perfectly clear the circumstances as respects the correspondence not being brought down It is solely because most of it is of that confidential character that, with the situation what it is in Europe at the present time, it would probably not be in the interest of any of the parties there that the correspondence should be made public.

I shall conclude, Mr. Speaker, by making mention anew of the words of the reply which was sent by our government on the 18th of September in reply to the despatch which came two days previously. After mentioning that the Cabinet had had under consideration the representations of the despatch received, it was stated that it was the view of the government that public opinion in Canada would demand authorization on the part of parliament as a necessary preliminary to the despatch of a contingent to participate in the conflict in the Near East; that we would welcome the fullest possible information in order to decide upon the summoning of parliament.

In this somewhat hurried manner, I have not, I regret, been able to give the House as much in the way of information as I should like to have been privileged to give; if there has been any reserve or reticence, it has been due solely to the endeavour to maintain the obligation of secrecy which has been imposed upon us in virtue of the character of the communications that have been received. As regards the part which our government has taken in this matter, I would say to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that we have felt and feel very strongly that, if the relations between the different parts of the British Empire are to be made of an enduring character, this will only be through a full recognition of the supremacy of parliament, and this particularly with regard to matters which may involve participation in war. It is for parliament to decide whether or not we should participate in wars in different parts of the world, and it is neither right nor proper for any individual or for any group of individuals to take any step which in any way might limit the rights of parliament in a matter which is of such great concern to all the people of our country.

On motion of Mr. Forke the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

Friday, February 2, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Fifty-fifth annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1921-22.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Return of leases of wharves, piers and breakwaters.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Return of tolls and dues of government harbours, etc., for the year 1921.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Fifty-fifth annual report of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the year 1921-22.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Report of the Canadian Battlefields Memorials Commission from April 1, 1922, to date.—Hon. Mr. Graham.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AMALGAMATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Referring to the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday, that there had been an amalgamation of the Grand Trunk with the National system, I should like to ask if he would intimate to the House to-day what orders have been passed under the Canadian National or other Acts effecting the amalgamation, and also if he will place such orders on the Table to-day?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may promise my right hon. friend that I will place the orders on the Table to-day. I will send and get them at once.

ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the same connection, some ten days ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is reported to have stated, I think in the city of Quebec, that there was to be added to the new Canadian National Board another representative from that province. Is that correct?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have discussed with Sir Henry Thornton the advisability of an additional director from the province of Quebec, and Sir Henry is of opinion and the government is also of opinion, that it is desirable to have a director appointed from the city of Quebec, and one will be appointed shortly.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Putnam for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, February 1.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the Governor General's visit to the West and North. I would like to say only this, that if the Governor General received as much pleasure from his visit to the West as the western people had in welcoming him there, it was a very happy visit that he had to the West. The Governor General made a very good impression, winning the hearts of all the western people, and there is nothing but the most pleasing recollections in connection with that visit.

Might I refer for a moment to the very kind notices that were taken of myself and the position which I now hold in the party in this part of the House? During the last month or six weeks I have been learning a great deal about myself, some of it very nice, some of it, perhaps, not quite so nice. Certain ideas, however, have been borne upon my mind, one of them being that I am canny. I have never failed to find that expression used by everyone in connection with myself since I have assumed the position of leader of the Progressive party. I hope that is true, and that if I am not going to shine as a brilliant light in this position, I am not going to make any very fatal mistakes anyway. I must thank the previous speakers for the very kind notice which they took of myself. I will say only this, that I hope, no matter what may be our political differences, they shall not interfere with our personal friendships. I am one of those who believe that we may have different points of view and yet all be thoroughly in earnest in what we advocate, working for the best interest of our country as a whole, so that I hope differences in politics will be no bar to friendship.

I must compliment the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I listened with a great deal of attention to the very eloquent speech made by the mover (Mr. Putnam), and I could not but feel a certain humility when I recollected the fact that I had sat in this House all during last session and scarcely ever heard that member make a speech in this chamber, and yet found that he had a gift of oratory and expression that, perhaps, very few can equal. I am sure that the House, as well as his constituency, is to be complimented on having an hon. member capable of making an address such as he made on that occasion. I remember, while speaking in the House last session, expressing my regret that I was unable to follow the speech made by the seconder of the Address. The same difficulty has occurred this year, and I still feel the same as I did last year, sorry that I am unable to understand the French language, and although a year older, expressing the same idea that I still would like to have a knowledge of that language.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You can learn it.

Mr. FORKE: I am afraid, however, that I lack the courage and the perseverance ever to attempt any such thing at this late date. But I am going to make this statement: I have in my household some people who are younger than myself, and I hope I shall have an opportunity of seeing that they at least understand the French language when it is spoken.

I should like to say a few words in regard to the resignation of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) as leader of this group. I can assure the House that there was nothing but regret on the part of members of this party, and, I think, probably of all members in this House over the hon. gentleman's resignation as leader. There was no difference of any kind, nothing but the greatest of respect and admiration on the part of his followers, and were it not for the business with which he is connected requiring his close attention, he would still, I suppose, be occupying the same place. We are glad that he still remains a member of this House, and we are likely to see him here just as often as he possibly can come to take part in our deliberations. He was five years in public life, for some time occupying the high position of a cabinet minister, and we are glad to reflect that during all that time he had nothing but the respect and admiration not only of the House but, as well, of the people back home where he was so well known. Let me assure the House that the change in leadership will make no difference in the policies of the group in this part of the chamber. We still retain exactly the same position we have held all along. We are neither supporting nor opposing the government; we are here to give expression to and to advance the ideas and principles which we hold to be in the best interests of Canada and to see them, if possible, carried into effect in the form of legislation.

Now, we all know quite well that we are passing through a very difficult and trying period; we do not need to be told this fact. We believe, however, all of our difficulties notwithstanding, that we are to-day in a very happy position in relation to the rest of the world. Over in Europe we see a very different state of affairs. During the years when the great war was in progress we buoyed ourselves up with the conviction that this was a war to end war. We told ourselves that never again would the world be called upon to sacrifice so much and to suffer such terrible hardships. We have been disillusioned to a very large extent. We realize that human nature after all is liable to the same old weaknesses and is just as apt as of yore to go astray. Over in the old continent, the home of civilization, we find hatred and jealousy still rampant, standing in the way of peace and the re-establishment of normal conditions. There, there is economic distress which brings untold misery in its train. This world, Mr. Speaker, is growing smaller day by day, and no part of it, no matter how remote it may be, can escape some of the consequences that follow the disturbances and sufferings that are caused in any country to-day. We are realizing in Canada to-day that we shall never have a return to normal conditions, nor have real prosperity, until stable governments are re-established on the continent of Europe, until trade once again flows back and forth as in days gone by.

The Speech from the Throne states that Canada is recovering from the depression following the war and that there is less unemployment. This may be, perhaps, somewhat optimistic, although I hope it is true. Probably there has been some improvement in the situation, but we have still very many difficulties to overcome. We cannot believe that we have surmounted those difficulties, and we must set our faces resolutely towards the future and earnestly seek a solution for all these problems. In reference to the matter of unemployment mention is made of the trek towards the cities. There are many causes to which this fact can be attributed. During the war the high wages paid in connection with war industries attracted a large percentage of the rural population to the cities. A great many of the returning soldiers no doubt went back to the land, but a large proportion of those who left the country districts to work in the cities at that time never returned, and this has naturally accentuated the difficulties that have arisen by reason of the congested state of population in the cities. This condition of things, however, existed to a great extent also before the war, and the country to-day has a serious rural problem on its hands. I would emphasize the fact right here, Mr. Speaker, that this is the problem we have to solve to-day in Canada. When you have made the countryside a good place to live in and have helped to make rural homes happy and prosperous, I have no difficulty in believing, you will have gone a long way towards solving your industrial problems. I really believe that people have attempted to build up the country from the wrong end; they have tried to build it up from the industrial, instead of from the rural, point of view. The development of the natural resources of the country is the first duty that lies at the hands of the govern-

ment, and nothing can be done in this direction by herding people into large cities. I might go on for quite a while stating just what was the trouble with the countryside, but I may tell you that one of the first things we have to take into consideration is the lack of remuneration. You cannot get people to stay anywhere or undertake any work if they are not going to receive adequate remuneration for their labours. In by-gone years it has not taken the young people in the country districts very long to learn that more remuneration and better conditions were to be found in the cities than in the country, and consequently they have sought them. We cannot blame those people; they did just what was natural, and what others would likely do again. Perhaps every dweller in the rural districts will agree with me in what I am about to say; at least I know it is true of my own particular district, where I am well acquainted. Look over that district and pick out the best homes and the most intelligent people, and in the great majority of cases you will find that the brightest and best of the children have left the countryside and gone to the cities. I am not going to attempt to solve the problem which that state of affairs presents; I am simply pointing out what is a fact, and I should like the government to take notice of it and endeavour to find some remedy.

The government may be congratulated upon the trade treaties which ministers have been able to make while they were abroad. I sometimes, however, wonder why such efforts should be made to secure treaties for the improvement of our trade when one of this country's policies has always been to erect barriers against international trade. It seems so contradictory. I believe that if artificial restrictions were removed trade would flow freely and naturally, to the advantage of all sections of the country. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) has been over in Australia, and we have learned that he has not been very successful in his endeavours to enter into trade arrangements with the people of that continent. I am rather sorry at this, because as a true Briton I should really like to see as close connection between the countries of the British Empire as it is possible to have. But looking back a few years I cannot help wondering that such desperate efforts should be made to enter into trade treaties with nations far distant after we have ignored the opportunity we had of making a treaty with the nation that lies at our doors. I am not going to be too critical of our ministers going abroad and trying to make treaties, but I certainly desire to see closer attention paid to matters at home. We have many home problems that need looking into. We have trade commissioners in these countries abroad, and I hope they are on the job and are trying to do the business they have been sent out upon. We have only one trade commissioner in the United States, resident in New York, and it seems to me that perhaps a little more expansion might be made in that direction.

We had the Prime Minister's assurance that the railways had been co-ordinated and unified. We were glad to learn this. I am sure we heard a great deal last session about co-ordination; we have made advancement, and we find that that has been carried into effect, and I am willing to congratulate the government on that step. A new board has been created with Sir Henry Thornton as chairman. He has made a very good impression on coming to Canada. I noticed that the right hon. leader of the Opposition criticized him a little at the time it was announced he was coming to this country. I have no doubt that Sir Henry is all the better of the little touch-up that he got from the right hon. leader of the Opposition and no doubt will be very careful to carry on his duties in the way he should. However, I think we are all very anxious to see that the new board and the new manager get a good start and be afforded an opportunity to make good the situation. It is far too serious a matter for party politics, and I hope that patronage and every political aspect of the case will be removed far away, that the board will have a free hand, and that public ownership will receive a fair and just trial in the Dominion of Canada at the present time.

Much dissatisfaction has occurred this fall in regard to lake freights. A royal commission has been appointed. I am not very sure just where to apportion the blame, but I know there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in the West that some move was not made a little earlier. It seems just a little like locking the door after the horse has been stolen, and as far as the trade last fall is concerned, no remedy can now be obtained. However, we will hope for better things in the future. The farmers—and I might say all the people in the West, because it is not confined to the agricultural population—were delighted that the Crowsnest pass agreement was brought into effect this fall in the carrying of our grain. I want to be perfectly fair, and I may say that I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition is very sincere when he says his heart is sore for the people and

the difficulties they have in the West; in fact I know he is sincere. But at the same time I could not forget that we had his active opposition while we fought, during the last session of parliament, for a reduction of the freight rates last fall. Perhaps it is a little hard on him to bring that up at the present time. At the same time I think it is just as well to remember those things.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the hon. member bringing the matter up, if he is faithful to the facts. I did not oppose any reduction of rates, but I opposed the House doing what parliament had delegated to another institution.

Mr. FORKE: The effect was exactly the same anyway. However, we will let that pass. Mention is also made in the Speech from the the Throne of the question of immigration. I know that this is a very difficult subject to deal with. A great deal of criticism is coming to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), because he has been slow in making a move in this direction. I do not know that I will blame him very much for trembling on the brink a little before he makes a plunge. However, I think he might talk just a little less about it, if nothing is going to be done, because the people have been looking for quite a long while to see that stream of immigrants, that has been so much talked about, begin to flow into the country. There is a good deal of diffidence among the people of the West in regard to the matter of immigration, and if we are holding a meeting in the western provinces and mention the matter of immigration, we are immediately met with the statement, Why are you going to bring more people her when the people already here are not contented with their position? However, Mr. Speaker, I believe in immigration, and I think that immigration will help us out of a great many of our difficulties. Whatever our conditions in Canada are to-day, if we look abroad, to the Motherland or to Europe, we find conditions a great deal worse than in Canada, and I do not think we need have very much compunction in asking people to leave these countries and come to take up their lot with us. They are not, to say the least of it, coming to any worse conditions. However, notwithstanding all our difficulty, I am optimistic enough to believe that unfavourable conditions in Canada are not going to last. We have not lost faith in our country. We are having hard times in the prairie provinces, but I have not lost faith in those provinces. This year in the West we had a splendid crop, a magnificent crop, and no fault could be found with the country. The country is just as good as it ever was. The trouble was on account of economic conditions, artificial conditions, and some of them world conditions, that no one could possibly help; but we believe that these conditions are going to change, and that this great country is going to be prosperous once again. And to make it prosperous we must have capital and we must have people.

Lord Shaw, speaking in Dunfermline, Scotland, after he went back from Canada, said it was almost ridiculous to think of eight and a half or nine million people occupying half a continent, rich in natural resources, yet unable to take possession of those riches, just because they had neither the means nor the people to do it, and I believe that with increased population, with increased capital, if we can possibly get it, all of us, those who are her now and those who come here, will be in better condition. I sometimes think, when we speak of our great natural resources in Canada, that we are like the small boy who sees something well worth the having but just a little out of his reach, and he cannot obtain it. That is exactly the position we are in to-day with the great resources we have in Canada. We cannot develop them or get hold of them, because we have neither the means nor the people. I believe immigration would help our trouble to a very large extent, but the difficulty arises here: Where are you going to get the millions of people with money to come here and establish themselves in the agricultural districts of Canada? I am sorry to say that I do not believe we are going to get many immigrants of that class. I may be wrong, but I do not think so. If we look to the country to the south of us, where we are likely to get the very best class of immigrants, what is the situation? I hardly like to say it, but under present conditions we find on this side of the line that the cost of living is higher than it is on the other side of the line, and the price of agricultural products on the other side of the line is higher than in this country. What is the inducement to bring those people here under present conditions? That is one of the difficulties we have to meet, and we may just as well face it. I saw another statement—I do not know whether it was correct of not—that the Anglo-Saxon people were not an agricultural people. That perhaps may explain the trend of the people towards the city, and if you go into the States the large percentage of the farmers is not of English or French descent, but is largely German, Scandinavian and other European nationalities. I give the House that statement for what it is worth. At the same

time we are quite ready to take the Scandinavian or German either, for that part of it. I do not know whether I should say that in this House, but I think it is all right. They are good farmers; we can get along with them, anyway. There is a class of immigrants we can get, and I am sure they would be a valuable asset to this country. Agricultural labourers from the British islands can be got by the hundreds—yes, by the thousands, and there is employment for them to-day right here in Canada. I do not know what the conditions are in Ontario and the eastern provinces, but I do know that there is a place for that kind of farm labourer in western Canada just as soon as he lands on this side. That is the only system of immigration that is any good—get the immigrant and have a place for him when he lands so that he can go right to work. I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior has given this matter a great deal of consideration, so that I shall not deal with it further. I reiterate the statement, however, that I would like to see this class of people gone after, and I believe they can be got if they are sought in the right way.

It has struck me as very strange—I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) also referred to it yesterday—that in the Speech from the Throne no mention is made of the tariff. I do not know that I have quite recovered from the shock I received on hearing that speech and realizing that the word "tariff" had not been mentioned in it. I have lived in Canada for forty years, and it is a word that has never been out of my hearing during all that time; yet here in the most important assembly in this Dominion the matter has evidently entirely escaped notice. I sincerely hope, however, that the face of the government is still in the right direction, and that with a little encouragement they may take another step forward.

I noticed that before parliament opened the government was receiving delegations from various interests protesting against certain methods of raising taxes. Their representations may have been right or may have been wrong, but I could not help wondering what delegation had waited on the government in the interests of the common people, who, in the final analysis, actually pay the taxes. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that at least in some parts of the House the interests of the common people will be as well looked after as possible.

I have mentioned the tariff. I do not think that in this part of the House we are going to give up the fight for a reduction of duties. I do not refer so much to ploughs or farm machinery—you know, we are sometimes accused of being a little selfish;—but we would like to see the duties reduced on all the necessities of life that have to be purchased by the common people. I say that we are not going to give up the fight until we reap some reward for our endeavours.

The decennial revision of the Bank Act is due at this session. I have noted with some alarm—I do not pose as a financial authority, but I believe the matter is worthy of some examination at least—the condition under which so many financial interests in this country are concentrated in a few hands, in a few institutions. Whatever is done in regard to a revision of the Bank Act, I hope that the interests of the common people will be well protected.

I notice also that in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the proposed appointment of a committee to inquire into agricultural problems. I understand from that that a parliamentary committee is contemplated. Now, I do not know that a parliamentary committee can go into this question just in the way that it ought to be gone into. The inquiry will have to be a real one; the matter will have to be gone into from a great many different points of view. The difficulties which have arisen in the West have been accentuated—matters affecting grain marketing and transportation—but these are not all the difficulties we have in Canada to-day. We have fruit industries; we have dairying; we have the difficulties experienced by the people down in the Maritime provinces. When I listened to the delegation that came from there the other day to interview the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I came to the conclusion that the Maritime provinces were in just as difficult a position as we were in the West. I only hope that if a committee is appointed there will be a real investigation and that some practical solution of the problems involved will be arrived at.

I have listened to a great many speeches during the last few weeks, some of them delivered by professors of economics who have spent a good deal of time elaborating upon the different movements that have led up to the present state of agricultural depression. With bated breath I have waited to hear what the suggested solution would be, but these gentlemen generally led you up to the brink and left you there. I do not know what our professors of economics are paid for if they are only able to show us that we are in trouble and are not able to show us the way out. However, I believe that agricul-

tural people will have to begin by helping themselves. They can do that in a great many ways, and it is my view that they have a perfect right to get into politics and try to help themselves in that way also.

All artificial restrictions must be removed and agriculture must have a fair show. And in speaking of agriculture, I want to speak for all Canada, because I go back to where I was and say again that we have got to solve this problem before we can have a prosperous country. We generally estimate the value of our products by what they will purchase. I suppose that down in the Maritime provinces, in the constituency of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) they estimate the value of their products by calculating how many commodities a bag of potatoes will purchase. Out in the western provinces we put it this way: How much can you purchase for a bushel of wheat? Money, after all, is only a counter, and that is the way we get at values. A bushel of wheat cannot purchase very much in western Canada to-day, and the large overhead expense is one of the reasons why we are in a difficult position.

I notice also that a bill is foreshadowed "to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers." Now, we will have a splendid thing if we can get any bill that will safeguard the consumer and the producer. I heard it stated not very long ago by a very high economic authority that in a great many instances there was a spread of 300 per cent between what the manufacturer or the farmer got and what the consumer paid; on an average the spread was 100 per cent. That is something that ought to be remedied; this whole question of the distribution and handling of goods and products from the producer to the consumer is well worth the attention of the government. But we have a policy that does encourage trusts, mergers and combines and makes it possible to have those very "gentlemen's agreements" that are the source of difficulty, from the point of view of the consumer at least. I think we might have a system of economics that would remove a great many of these troubles without very much investigation.

Just a word in connection with the cattle embargo. There was some little dispute yesterday as to whether the embargo was actually removed or not. At all events, I am inclined to believe that it is going to be removed, and I am glad that this is so, because from my knowledge of agriculture, even in the western provinces, I know that their salvation depends to a very large extent upon finding a market for their cattle. The lack of such a market has been one of the causes of bad times in the last few seasons, when there was no market whatever for our cattle. It would perhaps astonish the House were I to mention the price at which cattle were sold on the public yards in the city of Winnipeg last fall. In some cases a car of cattle scarcely paid the expense of shipping them to market. Agriculture can never prosper under such conditions. Though the removing of the embargo will help to relieve the situation, I am inclined to believe that the best market we can possibly have is that great market to the south of us, and I hope every endeavour will be made to see that that gate is opened to us once again, if it be at all possible.

I want to say a few words on the subject of economy. Economy is a word we hear repeated over and over again everywhere these days. We must economize and taxation must be reduced. The burden of taxation is becoming almost too heavy to be borne. The country is weary of the load and some remedy must be found. A halt must be called in expenditure, or we shall find the ship on the rocks in a very short time. I am sorry to see that we are still adding to our national debt. This cannot go on indefinitely. It does not take a wise man to see that something is bound to happen unless some remedy is applied very promptly. I am willing to admit that we have been passing through a period of extravagance. Individuals, corporations, and governments have all been extravagant, or, I will put it this way, too optimistic; there is no question about it. But we have learned our lesson. We in this Dominion, have spent the money, and we have now to meet the bills. We are beginning to practise economy, and I am sorry to see that the Dominion of Canada has added to its public debt during the past year. That is a cause for deep disappointment to all well-wishers of our country. It is all very well to devise measures for extracting money from the pockets of the people—and I pay this tribute to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) he is an adept at that; he deserves all the credit that can come to him as the financier for the government—at the same time, getting money in order to spend it will not solve any of our problems. I think all parties are agreed to-day that something must be done to reduce expenditure. We might have some measure of civil service reform, for instance. I believe that the government of the country is costing too much, and that economies could be effected in that direction. I think the three parties in this House might well get together

on a matter of this kind and try and work out some arrangement for reducing the expenditure under this head. I know it is very difficult for any government to attempt to reform the civil service. In fact, it is almost saying good-bye to office to do so. At the same time, I believe we are all sufficiently in earnest on this question to get together and try and do something to reduce the cost of carrying on the business of this country.

There must be no return to patronage. Since becoming a member of parliament, I have thanked my stars time and again that there was a Civil Service Commission. We want no return to the old order of things.

We are promised a measure of redistribution. That matter will be taken up in a way that I think will be satisfactory to all sections of the House.

Just a word in regard to our national status. I do not intend to take up any time in dealing with this matter at this particular moment, but I would like to say here, that I like to count myself a loyal citizen of the British Empire. I am proud of that connection, and I hope that nothing will ever occur to make me feel less proud of it. At the same time, I agree with the steps that were taken by the Prime Minister and with his government's reply to the telegram that was sent from the Prime Minister of Great Britain last fall. I agree with the position that the government took at that time. I hope that whatever measures may be taken, nothing will be done to retard the progress of Canada as a nation controlling her own destinies within the British Empire.

In conclusion, I would make a few recommendations:

Trade. I would say, increase trade by the removal of trade barriers, and increase the British preference.

Unemployment. I would encourage the industries where unemployment does not exist to-day—agriculture, etc.

Railways. I would give Sir Henry Thornton a fair trial, and in so far as possible, give government business to the government railways.

Great Lakes freight rates. Speed up the investigation, and make it a real one.

Anti-trust bill. It would not be necessary to find a cure if prevention were exercised, and the best prevention is to take away the tariff on which combines, trusts and mergers flourish. Every industry needing protection should be made to prove it. This would eliminate profiteering of this kind.

Immigration. The best immigrant that ever comes to Canada is the one which the stork brings to the Canadian home. We should study how to keep at home those we already have. Secondly, we should see that there is a job awaiting every immigrant. If there is no job, then no immigrant. There are plenty of jobs at the present time for agricultural workers.

The Bank Act. This needs careful study, not from the banker's standpoint, but from the people's standpoint. I am going to give all the encouragement I can in that line of business.

Redistribution. I should like to see a measure of proportional representation applied to the urban centres, as a trial.

Vimy Ridge Monument. I am glad that the French government has made a present of 250 acres to the Dominion government upon which a monument is to be erected. Putting up a great monument to the dead is doing what is right. But while we remember those who gave up their all, let us not forget the living who may need our attention.

International agreements. These should be in accord with the national and individual conscience. The Golden Rule might well be applied in an international sense. I believe Canada should stand by the League of Nations.

The Tariff. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne on the most important matter of policy which has been before this country for the last forty or fifty years. We still demand further reductions on the necessaries of life. Cheaper food and clothing are far more essential than cheaper ploughs and binders.

Civil Service. Fair warning—no tampering with the Civil Service Act. A return to patronage is unthinkable. If the Civil Service Act is not functioning properly, it is the fault of the personnel, and not of the Act itself.

Taxation. It is time that municipal, provincial and federal authorities learned to "cut the coat according to the cloth." There is too great a tendency to make estimates and then seek new ways and means of taxation to provide the money. For a change, why not approach the problem from the other angle? —Estimate what money can be raised without oppression, and readjust national expenditures to keep within those estimates.

National debt. No plan appears to be under consideration for the reduction of the national debt. An increase in last year of $45,000,000 is a matter for some alarm, but the government appears to have no project under consideration whereby this staggering debt of

nearly two and a half billion dollars is to be reduced. I would urge the government to formulate a plan whereby something definite and concrete may be done in the way of reducing this debt.

Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, I thank you for your very kind attention.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, there are certain points in the Speech from the Throne upon which I should like to comment from the standpoint of labour. When I came into this building I had rather a curious sensation of how far removed the concerns of this assembly are from the actual life of a large number of people of Canada. During the recess I have had the opportunity of moving back and forth, and talking to a great many of those whom the hon. leader of the Progressives has called the common people of Canada; and I think I would agree with him that they are the most important people in the Dominion. And yet in the Speech to which we have listened there is comparatively little that bears directly upon the welfare of that great mass of people. It is now more than four years since the great war came to a close. Conditions the world over are in a bad way. We know the horrible conditions in Europe; and I think no thoughtful man, or no student of economics but must realize that very fundamental changes are necessary if we are to be able to solve even our local problems. And yet, I submit, there is very little in the Speech from the Throne which would indicate any thoroughgoing changes in our policy. Some of the same old policies are brought forward that we have been familiar with since our childhood. We are told again, that now the war is over we are to bring in more people; as if we had not had a progressive immigration policy fifteen or twenty years ago. We are told that we have to arrange for foreign markets; as if the old national policy of Canada was not very largely built up on securing foreign markets. We have had these things; they have gotten us nowhere.

I think, perhaps, I am rather glad in many ways that the tariff was left out of the Speech from the Throne. It is possible that we are getting down to a rather more serious consideration of the actual situation—

4 p.m.

the recognition that, after all, the tariff is not fundamental in our economic solutions.

Although we have been running behind to the extent of some $45,000,000 there is no indication in the Speech from the Throne that we are to have any lessening of the taxation on the great mass of the people. Nor is there any scheme proposed by which this great debt may be in any wise reduced. Sometimes I think that those responsible for the policies of this country almost resemble a cornered rat, as he darts first into one corner and then into another in order to try a way of escape, and then even after he has been the rounds he starts again and darts into the self same corners.

It has been given out very generally that we have comparatively little unemployment in Canada and I think that this year, at least, as representing a section of the people largely interested in this question, I shall have to deal first of all with this subject. May I read an excerpt from the Daily Mail, of London, bearing date December 15, 1922:

> An appeal for more British emigrants to Canada was made by the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, at a luncheon given in his honour by the Empire Parliamentary Association at the House of Commons restaurant. He said: "There is no unemployment in Canada. There is work for all those who are anxious to do work—to work more than eight hours a day. We are anxious to increase our population of labourers and farmers, and we expect that that stock will come from the British Isles."

I trust that the speaker has been incorrectly reported; but the point is, that the information is going out very widely that we have little or no unemployment in Canada. I notice that in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the diminution of unemployment. May I read an advertisement that appeared a few weeks ago in the Manitoba Free Press of my own city:

> **Public Notice**
>
> The Council of the city of Regina have by resolution declared that the policy of the city will be one of utterly refusing relief to any person. Notice is further given that there is not sufficient work during the winter months for the present residents, and the public are warned against coming here in search of work.
>
> JAMES GRASSICK,
> Mayor.
>
> GEO. BEACH,
> City Clerk.

In commenting upon that the Manitoba Veteran says:

> We read and hear a lot about the various brands of "red" isms, which seek to undermine our freedom, our constitution, and our civilization; but if any thing more anarchistic can be found in all the red propaganda than this "starve and be damned" pronouncement of a constituted body, we would like to hear of it.

Let me now read a letter that was forwarded by the Mayor of the city of Winnipeg to the Prime Minister:

> This winter it has been necessary for the city to open up a special emergency unemployment relief office similar to that opened during the winters of 1920-21 and 1921-22. There are being relieved at the present time,

through these offices 583 married men with 1,630 children, making a total of 2,781 persons and 146 single men, making a total of 729 cases and 2,927. This certainly indicates an abnormal condition. Winnipeg, during the time of depression, is the focal point to which the unemployed of western Canada come in the hope there will be a better chance of getting work, and consequently it is called upon to look after persons who are not really citizens. These persons might be called "Dominion citizens at large," but at the same time they cannot be allowed to starve and this is one of the reasons why Federal aid is sought. Of the total of 583 families now being cared for, representing 2,781 persons, 202 cases are families of returned soldiers or over one-third of the total. In the case of single men, unfit for farm or busy work, the percentage of returned soldiers is considerably greater, out of a total of 146 men there are 104 returned soldiers. I quote for your information the particulars in regard to several typical cases in the classes of "returned soldiers" and "Dominion Citizens at large."

From England, three months, ex-army No. 203, married, three children, wife pregnant. The above-noted man arrived from England the latter part of September and with the exception of a few weeks work in October has been a public charge. His health is poor and his eldest child is only fourteen. This family, due to the condition of his wife, are unable to support themselves, having no person with an earning power in the family.

Ontario resident, No. 27, three months in Manitoba, married, one child, wife sick. The above man left Ontario to farm in Alberta in the spring of 1922. Attempted to return to Toronto and obliged to stop over in Winnipeg on account of wife's confinement. Is destitute and wishes to return East.

Soldier settler: returned soldier, married, six children. This man had farm under Soldier Settlement Board for three years, but was obliged to give same up this fall. Came to Winnipeg and with exception of temporary employment at Canadian National shops on arrival, has been out of work. No employment for two months before registration.

And there is a long list of similar cases which the mayor assures us are typical. This condition is not confined to Winnipeg. For example, in the city of Montreal an organization which is under the direction of one of the most capable and careful social welfare experts states:

The general secretary of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies is of the opinion that there is just as much unemployment and just as much distress this winter as last. In his report for last year he states that 1,777 came or were directed to them for assistance of one kind or another, as against 1,400 in 1921. Sixty per cent of these cases were classed as "sickness," and this amounted to about 1,080.

The report says:

Much of this illness had been preventable were it possible to provide right living conditions for these families. Among citizens who have sufficient means to live in houses decently built and properly heated, who have plain, wholesome food to meet the demands of normal appetites, who have proper clothes to secure protection against heat, cold, wind and rain, and who can enjoy recreational facilities, there is comparatively little illness. But to the man and woman who must leave a cold flat to face colder weather with thin clothing and poor shoes, who knows not the luxury of the necessitous pair of rubbers and work for hours in wet foot gear, to the ill-fed scantily clothed youngsters who lose much of the value of schooling because they are not in a fit physical condition to enable their mental equipment to assimilate the knowledge presented, illness of a more or less serious nature is a very constant and disagreeable visitor.

We in this country might well set our own house in order, might very well care for the thousands, the tens of thousands, of people who are more or less living the life described by the general secretary of social agencies, before we begin to talk very much of bringing in more people to swell the ranks of the unemployed. If my memory serves me aright, the government last year accepted a resolution which was passed by this House, that it was a certain responsibility of theirs to furnish a scheme to provide for the unemployed in Canada. We have yet to hear what policy the government is going to adopt on that point.

An immigration scheme has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and that scheme has been outlined and given to the press by the Acting Minister of Immigration. We find that it is proposed to adopt a progressive immigration policy again, to carry on an advertising campaign in the older lands and in the United States. We are told that our free lands are exhausted. Before, we had free lands to offer. We no longer can offer free lands in western Canada, and we are told that the immigrants who are desired are the tenant farmers and agricultural workers. For a great many years in this country it was our ideal for Canada that every man who went to work on a farm might ultimately own a farm of his own. Now it seems that that time is past and that all that we can offer as an inducement to the immigrant is that he may become an agricultural labourer or a tenant farmer. Secondly, we are told that we are to have household workers. I suppose that means young girls who will, for a time, serve in the homes, in the cities or on the farms. I might say that they are not going to remain very long in that condition and that that is not going to be any very great addition to the whole population and the permanent productivity of this country. We are told further that we are to have orphan children brought over to this country. I verily believe that if we would give simply half a chance to the people who are already in this country, they would be able to rear children in Canada instead of having to go overseas to secure them. This is a real trouble. To-day, whether in the rural districts or in the urban districts, the ordinary wage earner finds it is practically impossible to bring up a family in decency. Further, we have been told during the last few weeks

or few months that we are going to have a national settlement land plan. Paid advertisements were put forth some weeks ago in our newspapers. Let me read the opening paragraph from one of them, from the Calgary Daily Herald of September 12:

> The National Land Settlement Plan. The British and Canadian Governments have joined with the Canada Colonization Association and the Canadian railways in a co-ordinated land settlement plan covering all the provinces. An efficient colonization machine is being set up and will begin to operate forthwith. Colonization in Canada has been at a comparative standstill ever since 1913. Yet nothing is clearer than that effective land settlement on a comprehensive scale is the only available solution of the country's pressing economic and financial problems. By increasing the farming population and agricultural production throughout Canada, we shall lower freight rates, stimulate business, lighten the burden of the national debt to every individual family, lessen federal, provincial, and municipal taxation, and go far to eliminate the serious annual deficit on the National railways.

That sounds suspiciously like the old protectionist programme that most of us have listened to for a very long time. In fact, I cannot but be struck with the great similarity which exists between that programme and another that was given great publicity just three years previously, namely, June 25, 1918, as a national policy. I fancy the two are written by the same hand, and I would venture to suggest that the one will go the way of the other, because we are fighting against great economic forces and we are not attempting the real solutions. With regard to that land settlement plan. I should like to read what one group of workers thinks of it. I quote from the Alberta Labour News of September 23:

> The first thing necessary in order to intelligently criticize the plan is to examine the details thereof. We can do this by taking the figures of the Association. A settler buys a quarter section of land for twenty dollars per acre, or $3,200 for the 160 acres. He pays two dollars per acre down, or $320, leaving a balance unpaid of $2,880. For the first two years he makes no further payment, but the interest accrued during this period is added to the principal. This creates a curious situation. At the end of three years he owes more than the original price of the land, the $320 he has paid in cash being more than eaten up by the interest. In the third year the purchaser begins to pay $234.34 per year on the principal and interest. After paying this amount annually for eight years or ten years, after he started on the venture, the purchaser still owes $3.15 more than he did after making his first cash payment. Or in other words, after paying, $2,194.72 to the vendor after ten years of toil to develop a farm from raw prairie the purchaser has a smaller equity in the land than when he made his first payment ten years before.
>
> The plan provides for thirty-two years in which the purchaser may pay for the land at the annual rate of $234.34. At the end of the period he will have paid $7,350 for his farm, or $4,150 more than the nominal purchase price. In other words, he will have paid $4,150 interest on the $2,880 which was the unpaid balance after he had made his first cash payment.

I submit that no emigrant who understands the situation will fall for a real estate exploitation scheme of that character. Let me look for a moment at our immigration policy in the past. The expenditures in promoting and regulating immigration, from 1898 to 1908, the period during which our immigration policy was in full swing, amounted to $6,779,823. By the way, I take my figures from a United States Senate document, in which I find the best study of Canadian immigration problems that I have met with. Of the amount spent outside Canada, 45 per cent was spent in the United States, 38 per cent in the United Kingdom and 16 per cent in Continental Europe. Let us look at the figures in regard to the United States. In 1901, there were in Canada 4,761,815 native born Canadians. In 1910, when the census was taken in the United States, there were in that country 1,181,255 native born Canadians, as well as large numbers of trans-Atlantic emigrants who had been temporarily resident in Canada. Now, what has been accomplished with all this vast expenditure of money in the United States? In 1909, we received approximately 60,000 immigrants from the United States, of whom Scandinavians, Germans, Italians, English, Russian and Scotch predominated. But we lost 53,448, almost as many as we gained. And the American report notes the fact that a very large proportion of these were skilled labourers. According to their country of origin, our immigrants may be classed as British, Continental or United States. The British immigrants have invariably shown a tendency to drift to the cities, and afterwards a considerable number of them —especially skilled labourers—go to the United States. In the case of Continental immigrants, we are faced with the serious problem of mixed nationalities. We find that in the last few years large numbers of Mennonites, who were amongst our very best settlers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, have been forced to cross the border into the United States; and I believe that negotiations are now in progress looking to the Doukhobours leaving this country to go back to their homeland, Russia. So far as United States immigration is concerned, as I have said, we cannot even hold our own with that country, as has been proved as the years have come and gone. Classified according to the work they do, immigrants are very largely either farmers or farm labourers, or industrial workers. I suggest that before we adopt a progressive immigration policy we should very carefully consider the agricultural conditions in western Canada and the labour

conditions in the Canadian cities from coast to coast.

Let me say a word or two with regard to the financial situation with which we find ourselves faced. Surely we do not need to go very deeply into economics to understand that something is very radically wrong with conditions in Canada when we have abundant natural resources, with plants lying idle, when there is a world in dire need of goods, and when, on the other hand, there are large numbers of unemployed. I turn to our big financial institutions and ask what light they can throw on the question, and I find in their annual reports that they have to tell us of huge crops and large exports of live stock, greater than we have ever had before, and yet all these things at very inadequate prices. They have to tell us of large numbers of failures in the business world; they have to tell us of the immense deficits in our government and other public bodies. And yet at the same time they tell us of their own great gains. I wonder whether it will not make some of us suspicious as to whether or not the financial structure itself is sound. My colleague (Mr. Irvine) last year suggested that we should have an inquiry, not merely into the present system of banking, but, one deeper than that, into the whole present system of currency and credit itself. It seems to me that we are not going to get very far if we begin merely to tinker with the present banking system without getting deeper down than that. Most of us find ourselves somewhat at a loss to follow all the details of what the economists tell us about money. But I may venture to put forward several propositions in this connection. Sometimes we confound money with wealth. This country may be poor so far as money goes, but I submit we have all the wealth that ever we had. We are told we ought to economize, but it may well be that the more we economize the worse off we are. One of the great needs of to-day is that the ordinary people of the country should be given buying power, which they do not at the present time possess. Money is not wealth; at best it merely represents wealth, real or potential. Some of the banks are trying to delude us into the belief that there still exists a gold standard. The interim report of Lord Cunliffe's Committee on Currency and Foreign Exchanges says:

1. Before the war this country possessed a complete and effective gold standard.

2. During the war the conditions necessary to the maintenance of that standard have ceased to exist.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

I submit that Walker is correct when he says that "money is that money does" and that to-day the cheque currency is the real currency of the country. It is a well-known law of economics that the value of money depends on the quantity in circulation. It depends ultimately on the community credit, but is mechanically controlled by the amount issued. What do we see round about us to-day? That money is a public utility, as Adam Smith said many years ago, a highway through the air, and yet this is monopolized by a comparatively small group of the people. The banks may be quasi-public institutions, but they are managed in the interest of a comparatively small number of people. I have sometimes thought that the financial situation in Canada might be illustrated in some such way as this: Suppose that all this country was dependent upon irrigation for its agricultural production, and suppose that one group of people controlled the Fraser river in the west: another group controlled the great rivers that pour their waters through the Nelson river into Hudson bay: another group controlled the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence, and so on, and that through underground canals the waters of all these great rivers might be pooled. The men that controlled such an irrigation system as that would be absolute in their control. They could make of Ontario a wilderness, or they could make the prairies to blossom as the rose. Have we not the same condition prevailing with regard to our financial affairs to-day? A small number of people, some seventeen different groups, are able to draw a tribute from every country district, from every little hamlet and every town, and through the control of the community credit they are able to determine where things will be produced and what will be produced. Never was there a dictatorship so absolute as that which we have to-day. We are not going to get very far until we recognize that fact frankly, and get at the foundation of the financial control that exists.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the fact that we can never hope to have prosperous conditions in Canada until conditions in the Old World become more stable. I am sure we are all very glad to have seen that commercial arrangements or treaties have been made between this country and France and between this country and Italy. I sometimes wonder why it is that those in authority should feel free to make a treaty with Italy when they have failed to make treaties and failed to enter into commercial relationships with a much greater country, the great country of Russia. I take it, that if we de-

precate the Russian revolution which was brought about by a measure of force we ought also deprecate the revolution in Italy which was brought about by force. If we recognize the government of the latter country, for the life of me I cannot see any reason why we should not recognize the government of the former country. Personally—and I think I am speaking for a very large number of the labour people in Canada—I should like to express endorsation of the action of the government this fall in regard to its action in the Near East trouble. I am sure it was a tremendous relief to a great number of the people of Canada when they found the Premier of this country did not intend to plunge this country into war without the consent of parliament. I want to compliment the Premier on adopting a policy which is, I believe, essentially in line with the very best Liberal traditions. But, on the other hand, I take it that a negative attitude with regard to European affairs cannot very well be maintained. It would seem to me that we must ultimately face the alternative: that either we shall have to develop into what is practically an independent nation, or else we shall have to set up machinery by which we can have an effective voice in the affairs of the British commonwealth. I do not know which way events will drive us, but I think we ought to frankly face that alternative. I for one should like to have seen the government bring before us at this time some policy which would enable us to define more clearly our relationship to the British Empire. The Premier in his speech yesterday dwelt upon the right of parliament to decide this question of parliament being consulted before Canada embarked on war. I agree with him. On the other hand he refuses, at the request of the British government, to place before this House certain correspondence which was said to be confidential. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the people of this country, I claim that I, and the whole body of citizens, have a perfect right to know what negotiations are proceeding between Canada and the United Kingdom. It may be all very true that the present government may say that they will take no step to commit us to war without submitting the matter to parliament, but, on the other hand, we all know that negotiations may be going on steadily, which practically commit the country to war before we reach the final step where parliament is to be consulted. If we really believe in democracy we ought to do away with secret diplomacy in every form.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it his opinion, inasmuch as the British government have asked that certain cables which they have sent to this government should not be made public, that the government should decline to meet their wishes in that matter?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is for the Premier to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am asking the hon. member if he would kindly give the House his views.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would refuse to allow Canada to continue to be placed in such a position as that. It is impossible that we can continue in that relationship very long, and I think that we ought to insist, as I have said, on the adoption of one or the other alternative, either that of independence, recognizing that we are not in honour bound to do just what Great Britain says or, on the other hand, that machinery should at once be set up which would enable us to have an effective voice in the determination of the policy of the British Empire. Personally, I am afraid of Imperialism. I was reading the other day a book written some twenty years ago by Mr. J. A. Hobson, and I should like to quote one or two excerpts, because I am firmly convinced that whilst we all, I take it, in this House, as true Britishers, should have a profound respect for the Old Land, we recognize that many of the policies that have been given to the world in the name of Great Britain are, in reality, policies of only a very small section of the British people. A very few weeks after the attempt was made to involve this country in this imperial question we find the government was turned out of power, and another government put in its place. Mr. Hobson says:

> Imperialism is the endeavour of the controllers of industry to broaden the channel for the flow of the surplus wealth by seeking foreign markets and foreign investments, to take off the goods and capital they cannot sell or use at home. . . . It is not too much to say that the modern foreign policy of Great Britain is primarily a struggle for profitable markets of investment to a larger extent each year. Great Britain is becoming a nation living on tribute from abroad and the classes who enjoy the tribute have an ever increasing incentive to employ the public policy, the public purse, and the public force to extend the field of their private investments.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes, you remember, said rather cynically that "Her Majesty's flag is the greatest commercial asset in the world." Mr. Brailsford, in "The War of Steel and Gold," published before the war, says:

> In 1909, as Sir George Paish stated in a paper which he read to the Royal Statistical Society, our profits prove from foreign and colonial investments amounted to $140,000,000. One no longer inquires why the unaggressive, anti-militarist, anti-imperialist Liberalism of

the free-trading England, which was content to take Cobden as its guide, has given place to the expansionist, militarist, financially-minded Imperialism of today . . . . Both our navy and our army overseas are an insurance provided and maintained by the nation at large for the capital owned abroad by our business class. The formal rights of control which the House of Commons enjoys are exceedingly limited. . . . Its assent is not required for a declaration of war, which means that it cannot interfere effectually before the event to delay a rupture to enforce arbitration, or to overthrow a minister who has failed to exhaust on behalf of peace all the resources of diplomacy. . . . A secret treaty is for us no less binding than a public instrument.

Mr. A. G. Gardiner, the great publicist, the great Liberal of England, complained bitterly of the development which had taken place in British procedure when he said that the authority of the British House of Commons with regard to foreign affairs was little more than that of a village debating society. Now, if that is the development which has taken place in Great Britain, I say that we in Canada shall be very foolish indeed if we place ourselves in such a position that we must endorse, or feel in honour bound to endorse, the policies that may be carried out over there in the interests of a very small group. I think we are not encouraged to give easy endorsation to what may be said from London when we consider the last war. I say frankly that this country was tricked, as other countries were, with regard to the real causes of the last war. At the Conference held August 4, 1917, Mr. Lloyd George declared:

What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nation, carefully, skilfully insidiously, clandestinely plotted in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination.

That was the idea given to the world at large, but Mr. Lloyd George himself, after the war was over, says—on December 23, 1920:

The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before August 1st, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly, and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it.

Mr. Lloyd George tells us afterwards—after thousands and tens of thousands and millions of men had laid down their lives—that a discussion would have averted the war. In a book, "Peaceless Europe," which is really great in that it reveals much of the war, Francesco S. Nitti tells us:

I cannot say that Germany and her Allies were solely responsible for the war which devastated Europe. . . . That statement which we all made during the war was a weapon to be used at the time. Now that the war is over, it cannot be used as a serious argument. . . .

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

When it will be possible to examine carefully the diplomatic documents of the war and time will allow us to judge them calmly, it will be seen that Russia's attitude was the real and underlying cause of the world conflict.

Thus we perceive very clearly that the fairy stories that were told us concerning the war were told us simply to keep up the morale of the people at that particular time. We were deceived as to the causes of the war; we were deceived during the war as to the real aims of the allies. Secret treaties were made which are only now being brought to light. And then, by that infamous Treaty of Versailles, it was possible to carry on the war after the war. Some of the leaders of a great many of the European nations today are recognizing that we are not going to have permanent peace in Europe until we have a revision of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Some of you remember Mr. Maynard Keyne's characterization of that treaty. We remember that it violated the terms on which our enemy laid down their arms. The best statesmen have recognized that it has led to the chaos that exists in Europe to-day.

I wish to place on record a policy which I might almost call a world policy, given, as it was, to the peoples of Europe by the great Trades Union Congress which met recently at the Hague, and concerning which I have seen very little in our Canadian papers. In his opening speech on December 9, J. H. Thomas, from the chair, stated that this Trade Union Congress represented, due allowance having been made for overlapping, no less than forty millions of people. What do the workers in Europe believe? The main points which the congress supported were the following:

(1) Revision of the peace treaties.

(2) Resistance to militarism and armaments, and control of the armament industry.

(3) Admission of Germany and all nations into a revised league of peoples.

(4) The suppression of secret treaties and secret diplomacy.

(5) The use of all means to combat war, including the general strike if the outbreak of war is actually threatened.

(6) Educational efforts in all directions to ingeminate ideas of peace and internationalism.

(7) Opposition to the occupation of the Ruhr and all coercive action to secure reparations.

(8) Acceptance of the German promise to repair the devastated areas of France and Belgium.

(9) Submission to the League of Nations of the proposal for an international loan to supersede debts and indemnities.

Yesterday we heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) urge that we should give sureties for peace. Mr. Speaker, I submit that guarantees for the peace of Europe and for the world are not military guarantees. It is only as we bring

about fundamental economic changes in our industrial and financial system; it is only as we recognize more clearly that the world today has become a unit and that instead of my neighbour's welfare being disadvantageous to me, my neighbour's prosperity is my prosperity—it is only as we change this system and as we develop good will among the nations that we can hope for permanent peace. My greatest ambition for this country of mine is that Canada, lying side by side with the great American republic, a friendly country, allied also by ties of blood and sentiment with the great Motherland, and allied, I am glad to think, with other nations of Europe, should not follow weakly the policies of older nations and older periods but take a foremost place in bravely blazing a path to that better day to which I believe we are all looking.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to make a few remarks, some of them growing out of the Speech itself, and some of them prompted by the discussion that has taken place upon it. Like preceding speakers, I wish to offer my congratulations to the hon. member who moved this Address (Mr. Putnam). I listened with a great deal of pleasure as he expressed himself so felicitously yesterday in regard to the subject matter in hand, and I am sure we all regret that we have not heard from him more on former occasions. I am glad to say this because I intend shortly to offer one criticism upon one of the remarks he made in the course of his address. But first let me congratulate also the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume), who seconded the motion for an Address. Like most members in our corner of the House I am unable to understand the French language. That is our misfortune. But I have no doubt that the address given by the hon. member, from the way in which it was received by those who did understand it, was well worth listening to, and I shall look forward with a great deal of pleasure to his addressing the House in English, when I am sure I shall experience the delight I have so often experienced before, sometimes mixed with envy at the facility with which the French-speaking members of this House speak the English language.

I said that I would offer one criticism in regard to a certain remark made by the hon. member who moved the Address. It is in regard to the question of the natural resources of the western provinces. I shall quote his remarks from yesterday's Hansard:

> But when we approach these accountings and try to balance this unique ledger, I ask our friends from the West to remember that the boon of responsible government as a spiritual heritage for all Canada is something in the battle for which the eastern provinces alone bore the brunt, the tedium, the delay, the expense, and, here and there the bloodshed. Let our friends, as I think they will, give due credit for that asset which was won by the East.

Mr. Speaker, we glory in the past of our country. We honour and esteem those men who fought for responsible government. It is true the East fought for responsible government, because then there was no West; but that heritage, Sir, is as much our heritage as theirs, and in discussing this question of the natural resources we do not propose to trade off our share of that inheritance for anything else. I belong to a race which has been closely identified with everything that makes for freedom and liberty. I glory in the past, in all that has been done in the way of obtaining human freedom. I glory in the Cromwellian traditions, in the traditions of the Earl of Chatham, and in all that has been done in Canada to secure greater freedom for the people, and I would like to make this remark: that the principle enunciated here is no less, to my mind, a false principle when it is uttered in such a gentlemanly way as it was yesterday than when it is enunciated in the brutal form in which has sometimes been stated in the past. I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the danger of transgressing the bounds that have been set by good taste upon introducing personal allusions, but I think perhaps I can best impress upon the members of this House by a personal allusion what I regard as the fallaciousness of this argument. I again make an apology for this personal reference, which I am introducing only to emphasize the point I want to make.

About a hundred years ago there settled in the township of Caledon, west of Toronto, a township that is now part of the constituency represented by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Charters)—although, if I am well informed, he did not get his majority from Caledon, but it increased in proportion as he drew nearer to Toronto—there settled in that township a band of Scotch people who brought with them from old Caledonia the traditions of freedom and liberty that were inherent in the people of the Scotch hills. When the strenuous times of 1837 arose, where was the natural place for these men to find themselves? Side by side with William Lyon Mackenzie, and that is where they were. Among these people were my own ancestors. Three of my grandmother's brothers shouldered the rifle. Two of them stood their trial, and one of them, a younger

man, just a boy, was sent home. One of his sons told me the other day that he still cherishes as his dearest possession the rifle which his father carried on that occasion. My grandfather helped to take the grandfather of the present Prime Minister out of the country, and on one occasion he had him in that underground railroad, hidden under a bunch of straw on a sleigh.

I refer to this, Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize the point that I have an inheritance in this tradition of our family that helped to win responsible government, and I do not want the other members of my family who still live in and around old Tory Toronto to say to me: You have forfeited your share in that family heritage because you moved to the western prairies. I want to say this to the eastern gentlemen: Do not introduce an argument of that kind into the discussion of the natural resources question; for to my mind it is an absolutely fallacious one.

I shall not criticize the Speech from the Throne in its general aspect. I took occasion after some of the criticisms that were made yesterday by the right hon. leader of the Opposition to read over the different speeches from the Throne made in the years 1920 and 1921, and I find so far as his general criticisms were concerned, that they might just as well have been offered to those former speeches—and possibly the same kind of criticism was offered to them as was offered yesterday. I have noticed since being in the House that circumstances sometimes alter cases, and it makes a difference whose ox is being gored. There are two or three things, however, I should like to refer to.

I shall not elaborate at any great length on conditions in the West. The hon. leader of this group who has preceded me has, I think, done full justice to that subject. We do not like to appear in the position of being calamity howlers, but perhaps another illustration, and again a personal one, for which I must apologize, will show the condition of things better perhaps than anything else can do. In the year 1912 I bought a wagon for use on the farm and it cost me $78 cash. It was a fully equipped farm wagon with a three decked-box—a type perfectly familiar to gentlemen from the prairies. My crop, if I remember aright, I sold for 70 cents a bushel. Now remember—$78 for a wagon and wheat selling at 70 cents a bushel! Last fall I found that I needed a wagon box to put on this same wagon, the old one having become useless in the meantime. I paid $67 for the box alone, and for my wheat I got 78 cents a bushel net. Now I think these figures will show you that the thing which is confronting the agriculturist to-day is the fact that the old equilibrium between the price he received for his products and the price of the articles he bought for carrying on his work has not been restored. Illustrations of that kind might be multiplied indefinitely, but I think one is sufficient.

Reference has been made to the control of lake rates. I am certain that we hail with approval the action of the government in appointing a royal commission to investigate these rates. Just how far they have been dilatory in taking cognizance of the situation I am not going to say at the present time. Undoubtedly the loss to the western agriculturist during the past season has been serious; we have lost through the combine, if it be a combine, whatever advantage we hoped to have gained through the diminution of freight rates.

If the cattle embargo should be removed we will herald it as, at least, a measure of relief to the farmers of Canada who are producing cattle for the market. To my own mind the question of the cattle embargo today is not as serious a thing for Canada as it was thirty years ago when the restriction was imposed. Since that time we have had a large demand growing up in the United States for cattle of a particular class, which we could raise at a profit. My personal opinion is, could we secure that market for the class of cattle we have it would be of infinitely more value to us than the British market would be under present conditions. Nevertheless, I deem it desirable that every possible effort should be put forth to secure and to retain for us that market; and when the time comes to award the honour for the removal of the embargo I would like that the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Ontario should not be forgotten. Because he was responsible in a large measure, I believe, for bringing the matter to the attention of the British people—not perhaps to the attention of the British government direct, but to the attention of the British people—and was responsible for the organization of a campaign which finally resulted in the government of Great Britain taking action in the matter.

Were we assured that a full inquiry into all that relates to the grain trade was to take place forthwith we would look forward to it with a great deal of satisfaction. In my own judgment that can best be done by the appointment of a royal commission if we can get a good one. If we cannot get that kind of a tribunal it cannot do us any very effective service; but I believe a good royal com-

mission could serve the interests of the whole country better than any other body could. There is undoubtedly a feeling of dissatisfaction among the people of the West. It may be that some of the dissatisfaction is uncalled for; but the feeling of suspicion is there—that in some way certain interests are absorbing an undue amount of the value of our product in its passing through the various hands; and if it is only to allay this suspicion, and to show that this feeling is unfounded, I think the $40,000 set apart last year for the prosecution of such an inquiry would be well spent. To me it was a disappointment when I read in the newspapers the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) that that inquiry would not take place because there seemed to be no demand for such an investigation. I shall not deal at any great length with this matter; undoubtedly we shall have occasion to discuss it at greater length as the session goes on.

But there is one subject on which I would like to make a few remarks. It arose naturally in the matters dealt with by the 5 p.m. Prime Minister when presenting to us a statement as to the correspondence that had taken place between this government and the government of Great Britain —I refer to the question of the British Empire, or the British Commonwealth of Nations as some are pleased to term it. The British Empire is something unique. We have had nothing like it in all the course of human history. I have been reading with great pleasure during the last few months H. G. Wells' "Outline of History," and it is a wonderfully interesting book. He gives us a picture of the rise and fall of republics, kingdoms and empires; but in all the pictures which he presents to us of these various states and communities that have been created since the dawn of civilization there is nothing that in any way resembles the British Empire of to-day. It is something unique in that it is built upon mercy, justice and freedom. I appreciate the reference made by the honourable member (Mr. Putnam) who moved the Address yesterday to the expulsion of the Acadians, the hon. gentleman pointing out that such a thing could never be done again by British people. I think sometimes we forget to pay tribute to the great men of the past; and I think it were well to again remind this house of the great men who constituted the government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman—those statesmen who, after the South African war with all its bitterness, determined, in spite of the most strenuous opposition of their opponents, in spite of the prophecy of dire calamities that would follow, granted self government to the people of South Africa. Here again I want to emphasize that I believe that good politics, good morals, and good religion are built upon the same foundation. We can imagine what would have been the difference in the condition of South Africa when the great world war broke out, if the opponents of the British there had been turned into enemies instead of warm friends which they proved themselves to be. I am fearful sometimes of attempts at exact definition of our Empire relationship. I am convinced that the existing bonds will be strong in proportion to their elasticity and will become weak in proportion to the success of the attempts to secure rigidity.

Then there is the closely allied question of national obligations. There are some phases of this problem that are undoubtedly difficult of solution. There are some phases of the problem for which I have not been able to secure a solution in my own mind. Nevertheless there are two principles that seem to me to be fundamental, and to my own mind seem to be as clear as crystal. The first of these is the solidarity of humanity. We cannot, even if we would, separate ourselves from the rest of the world; no nation can live to itself alone. And here again let me refer to H. G. Wells. He says something like this: That we know more of the world of six thousand years ago than any living man at that time knew. And why? Because the people living in one part of the world, no matter how high the state of civilization, had no possibility of coming into contact with the people of other parts of the world. So, I believe his statement is correct that we know more of the world of six thousand years ago than any man living at that time knew of the world. He gives another illustration: He says that when the Spaniards came to America, they found two highly civilized communities, one in Mexico and the other in Peru, and yet neither one of these knew that the other existed. Such a condition of things is impossible to-day. There is no such thing as a self-contained nation. There is no possibility of any nation remaining aloof from interest in the general welfare of nations. We cannot remain aloof, even if we should decide in our own minds that it was desirable for us to do so. No nation can live to itself alone. We, therefore, must take some part. What that part may be may concern us at times and cause us great differences of opinion; it may not always be clear to our

own minds what that part should be; we may make blunders and we may make mistakes; but the possibility of blundering and of making mistakes does not relieve us of the obligation, and I heartily agree with what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) said yesterday, that we cannot consistently criticise, as we have done, and I think rightly done, the people of the United States for their vain attempt to remain aloof from world-wide problems, if we ourselves should take the same position. On the principle involved in that matter my mind is clear, in spite of the fact that as regards some phases of the problem we have not yet found the correct solution.

Another principle is equally clear to me, namely, that what we do must be determined by ourselves alone. Therefore, I must heartily endorse the position taken by the government when the situation arose last autumn, namely, that the representatives of Canada must be the responsible body to determine what we shall do under any set of circumstances that may arise. I know there is no such thing as a perfect analogy; but perhaps Kipling's words express the idea as well as anything else can: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own." As I say, there may be difficulty in solving some of our problems and deciding on a course at any given time; but to my mind our course under any set of circumstances must be decided in harmony with those two great principles, namely, that we cannot escape from obligations, and that the part we shall take in fulfilling those obligations must be determined by the Canadian people.

Mr. J. MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a small contribution to this debate, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I was pleased indeed to note the remarkable ability shown by those members in that regard.

I have noticed that in the addresses that have been given several suggestions have been made of a constructive nature; but I believe in some cases there was more of criticism without anything of a constructive nature. I have listened to addresses in various places, sometimes from pulpits, sometimes from professors of colleges and from the man on the street, and while all agree that something is wrong with our economic system, I note a great dearth of suggestions that will give any assistance or direction in the solution of those problems. I believe anyone who is able to tell what is wrong has rendered a service; but the one who can tell how to remedy those evils and how to solve those problems has rendered a greater service. I do not hope to be able to perform that task, but I may make some suggestions as I go along.

Let me touch briefly on the unemployment question. A short time ago I heard an address in which the speaker remarked: "There is something wrong when we have so much unemployment, and I think our government should find out what is wrong, should try to find a solution." I wondered if it struck that gentleman or any of his hearers that possibly our unemployment problem may be so complex that no simple formula will furnish a solution. It is possible that as regards unemployment Canada, at the present time, is in need more of a great moral leader than of a great political leader. Let me go back a few years, in fact, two decades. I can remember the time when the law of supply and demand seemed to operate well, almost unrestrainedly. Then there came a time when some wise person said to his fellows of the same craft: "In so far as the law of supply and demand affects us adversely, we will evade it; we will profit by it so far as it assists us." They put their heads together, and they prevented the law of supply and demand from affecting them. This has been carried during the last two decades to its logical conclusion. Almost everything we buy has its price fixed by arbitrary means. Combines have been formed in almost every industry. The time came when labour learned a trick from its masters. They learned to combine in order to set aside the law of supply and demand, to set aside competition, and they have been able arbitrarily to fix the remuneration which they shall receive for their work. They are so numerous and powerful that they have been able largely to block our economic machine. As soon as we remove an important part of a machine, we need not be surprised to see that it does not run smoothly; and when we begin to wonder why it turns out that things are not right, the fact is simply that the governor of the machine has been removed. You know what happens if you remove the governor of an engine—it goes crazy and runs away, and that is about what happens when the law of supply and demand ceases to operate. I have wondered if labour has been able to recognize the fact that it is in part responsible for unemployment. While organization of labour has been wise; while they have been able to remedy many abuses; while they are quite justified in organizing, yet I believe they have abused their powers, and the fact remains now that some in the ranks of labour are unemployed

and on the verge of starvation because others in the ranks of labour have been so exacting about demanding wages, remuneration that is exorbitant, and conditions that no industrial system can bear. It seems to me that a little educational work might be of very great benefit, and I was glad to hear the suggestion made by the Premier of Ontario the other night in his address to the Social Service organization that they should spend a great deal of their time in educating democracy. He made this terse remark: "If democracy fails, it will be through ignorance."

Let me say a word in regard to immigration, a subject which has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Recently, there came to me some figures that were startling. I would not say that they are correct; but this statement has been made as—from a very high authority—that for every settler that comes to Canada at the present time, fifteen have been leaving. What is wrong that we are not able to keep our population? The reason is simply that the people are dissatisfied; the conditions are so hard that they find they cannot continue. As regards the West, I do not think that our farmers can be justly blamed for being quitters. They have continued patiently during the past two or three years at a very heavy loss, but they have been hoping that something could be done to improve economic conditions so that they might be enabled at least to make a living. In this connection I might say a word with regard to the returned soldier—this is a matter that is closely related to the immigration question. The scheme launched by the late government to settle the returned soldiers on the land was, I believe, well-intentioned; but I am afraid that some very serious mistakes have been made. Not very long ago I had the privilege of examining some farms purchased by returned soldiers at about $30 per acre. I found these farms to be worth, in reality, probably, between $5 and $10 per acre. They were simply immense sand banks. I am quite convinced, and I have no hesitation in stating the conviction, that the inspectors that passed these farms at $30 per acre were either inefficient and incompetent or they were crooks. I can reach no other conclusion. These men have in almost every case been driven from the land. The last of them are leaving these farms at the present time, and in conversation some of them have given certain information. One of them says, in effect: "What worries me most is not the fact that I have lost about $2,000 of my own money, nor that I have wasted four years of the best of my life, but that after I have left this land I shall be hounded by the Soldier Settlement Board and be compelled by judgment to pay the loss upon the land". This man said to me that he was not a good judge of land, but that he had been advised that the farm would be satisfactory. He said: "I trusted the inspector whom the government sent out to safeguard my interests in this regard. But if anyone doubts, I can show him the land and he can see for himself that it is nothing but a vast sandbank on which the best farmer in Canada could not possibly hope to succeed". Now, I mention this largely for this reason: I understand that some suggestions have been made, originating, I believe, at Regina, to the effect that the same inspectors that served on the Soldier Settlement Board should be re-engaged in connection with the Canadian Colonization Association. It seems to me it would be wise for the government, if they contemplate anything of that kind, to be very careful and go over the work of these appraisers, because although in some cases their work has been eminently satisfactory, in other cases it has proved just as I have stated. I can give you a bright picture of this work. In a district some thirty or forty miles from Regina, known as Piapot, a locality well known, I think, to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), fifty-four returned soldiers were settled, and I was pleased to find that of this number only one had failed. As a matter of fact there were two failures, but as one of these two never really tried to succeed there is really only one failure to be considered. The difference seems to lie in this fact: the land was virgin soil, it was not improved in any way; and if the gentleman whose name I heard mentioned really was the appraiser, I can say he is a man who has a very great knowledge, and is an excellent judge of land, and, whose high integrity cannot be questioned. And there were no personal owners who might try to bring any influence to bear upon him. I think that has a good deal to do with the success in these cases. No doubt some of the appraisers sent out by the government were honest, but others were either incompetent or were not honest, and their work should be carefully scanned by the government or by the Colonization Association. Numbers of returned soldiers have been placed in a position in which their hearts have been almost broken, having settled on farms which they are now compelled to leave almost penniless, in some cases with no hope of being able to escape from debt and being faced with the only alternative of leaving this country. And those who have been guilty of placing these men

in this position should not be re-engaged either by the government or by the Colonization Association. In fact, I think it would be well for them to be sent to the hangman or to the penitentiary.

Reference has been made to a commission appointed to investigate grain rates charged on the lakes. I was pleased indeed to see a commission appointed for that purpose. One of the gentlemen appointed I know very well, and I cannot speak too highly of his integrity. I believe the work will be thoroughly done. I am afraid that we have fallen many times in the past into the habit of throwing suspicion on commissions the moment they have been appointed. We have had several commissions appointed in Saskatchewan, and I have some knowledge of commissions appointed by the federal government, and only in one case have I had reason to believe that there was good ground for suspicion or doubt. I believe that work such as this can be thoroughly done by a commission, and we might do a great deal to hinder and to destroy the effect of such work by casting suspicion on the commission as soon as it is appointed. An explanation was given me of the high cost of carrying grain across the lakes, and it seems to me that it may have had some bearing on the matter. At the port of Montreal, it seems, there was such a congestion of traffic that in a short time the grain was backed up to Port Colborne. The boats carrying the grain down the lakes had to remain for periods ranging up to a week, and sometimes longer, before they could unload, and instead of charging demurrage, the owners informed those who were chartering the boats that if they could make only half as many trips in the season as formerly they must make a greater charge. This has been stated on very good authority and has been given as an explanation of the high rates. Now, the loss to the shipper has been enormous. The statement has been made again and again, at meetings I have addressed, that all that has been gained by lower freight rates has been lost by the higher rates on the lakes. And to a certain extent that is true. I think something should be done to prevent a recurrence of this. In my opinion some change should be made at this session in regard to the coastal regulations. I understand that it is only by act of parliament that the coastal regulations can be amended. I think it should be so arranged that the minister in charge of the department, when he finds that there is a combine taking too great a toll from the grain on the lakes, should have the power to set aside the coastal regulations and allow American boats to compete.

No mention has been made in the Speech from the Throne in regard to deep waterways. This is a matter of very great importance. I fear very much that pressure might be brought to bear upon the government to persuade them to engage in this enterprise, which would cost a vast amount of money and the benefits from which, for a great many years at least, would not be sufficient to warrant the expenditure. I remember that in the discussion that took place in this House last year it was claimed by some gentlemen that a saving as high as five cents a bushel might be effected. I took the pains, during the last few months, to look into the cost of carrying grain from Fort William to Montreal over a period of years preceding, and I was surprised to find out that the total cost was about four cents a bushel. I cannot give the exact fraction, but I hope to have it in a few days. How in the name of common sense could six cents a bushel, or five cents a bushel, or four cents a bushel be saved, if the total cost was only about four cents?

In connection with the railway situation, reference was made to the appointment of Sir Henry Thornton as head of the government railways, and I must commend the government for their action in this regard. I think every member of this House should be very pleased indeed that the government has secured the services of a man of such great ability as Sir Henry Thornton possesses. I had the opportunity of listening to Sir Henry Thornton in the city of Regina, and at the close of his address the impression I carried away was that the great tact that he showed, and the great grasp of railway problems, and particularly the problems of the Canadian National Railways, were such that he was very likely to succeed in an almost impossible task. I was struck by a terse remark which he made in his address. In substance, he stated that, his friends in the Old Land had said that the task was impossible, that it could not be done, but, he said, that was one of the most attractive features in his view. I felt that the address on that occasion did a great deal to reassure the people in regard to our national railway problem. It did a great deal, I think, to inspire them and to secure their co-operation and support. I hope that the government will give Sir Henry Thornton and his colleagues every chance possible, in order that our national railways under government ownership will have a good chance for success.

With regard to the commission of inquiry that was referred to in the Speech from the

Throne with regard to agricultural conditions, I suppose its inquiry will include the marketing of the grain. I am speaking for western Canada now, but I do not forget eastern Canada and other parts of Canada have their problems to solve; but what we in western Canada need is more outlets for our grain. I have referred to the enormous loss on account of the congestion of traffic. It seems to me that if we had three outlets for grain instead of one, or instead of two, it would help us greatly. I suppose it might be said that we already have two, because some of our grain goes by the Pacific route. I hope in the near future to see a great deal more of it go by that route. The question arises whether the elevator facilities at Vancouver should be increased. I have been led to believe, from information I have received, that the trouble during this last crop season was not that there were not elevator facilities at Vancouver, but simply that those who control the space do not control the grain. Grain men had grain that they could not ship because they had not chartered any boats. Others had chartered boats but had no grain to put in them. In some cases they had chartered space hoping to sell it at a higher price than they paid for it. An adjustment had to be made, and I believe the Grain Commission served a very useful purpose in loosening up the deadlock there. The arrangements had been made, the grain had to be loaned and replaced. As soon as it was arranged so that this transfer elevator performed the service and the function for which it was intended, the grain was loaded out in the boats that arrived, and there was space for everey man. I believe I am correct in saying that later on the railway took this position—and I am not sure that they were not suported by the Grain Commission—a grain man had a quantity of grain at the elevator at Calgary and wished to have it shipped to the Vancouver elevator, and they said, "Where is your space? Show us your space and you will get the cars"; he said, "All right, there is the space"; he gave them the proof that he had the space, the cars were supplied and the grain went forward. In other cases the grain man said, "I want cars to ship out a quantity of grain", but he failed to show that he had space, and they said, "You cannot have the cars". An important question arises as to what elevators should be demanded for that western route. Elevator facilities should be provided at Calgary or Edmonton for the Canadian National Railways, or at Vancouver. I am not prepared to commit myself just yet to say where, but it is a matter to which the government should give serious consideration.

I shall not detain the House longer, but I shall have an opportunity to discuss many of these questions again in regard to the grain marketing problem. I have a resolution on the order paper that will enable me to discuss this question fully later on.

Mr. KYTE: There is an understanding between the Whips that the debate should adjourn at six o'clock, and that the House should adjourn thereafter. As it is now nearly six o'clock, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ORDERS IN COUNCIL RESPECTING AMALGAMATION TABLED

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The right hon. leader of the Opposition asked me to lay on the Table of the House such orders in council as had been passed with relation to the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk Railway system and the Canadian National Railway system. I beg to lay on the Table of the House five orders in council relating to this matter.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

Monday, February 5, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY, PRINTING AND RESTAURANT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House:—

That His Honour the Speaker, the Honourable Messieurs Bennett, Bolduc, Chapais, David, Gillis, Godbout, Gordon, Griesbach, Hardy, Laird, McHugh, McLennan, Poirier, Taylor, Turriff, and Webster (Brockville), have been appointed a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the Senate are concerned, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the said Library.

Also,—A message acquainting this House that the Honourable Messieurs Chapais, Dessaulles, DeVeber, Donnelly, Farrell, Forget, Green, Legris, McCall, McDonald, McLean, McLennan, Pardee, Pope, Ratz, Robertson, Sharpe, Thibaudeau, Todd, White (Inkerman) and White (Pembroke), have been appointed a committee to superintend the printing of the Senate during the present Session, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of Printing of parliament.

And also,—A message acquainting this House that His Honour the Speaker, the Honourable Messieurs Blain, Green, Hardy, Lougheed (Sir James), Sharpe, and Watson, have been appointed a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Restaurant of parliament, so far as the interests of the Senate are concerned, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the said Restaurant.

FRANCE-CANADA CONVENTION

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, February, 1st, 1923.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a Convention of Commerce between France and Canada, entered into at Paris on the 15th day of December in the year 1922 between His Majesty the King and the President of the French Republic.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Annual Report of the Department of Health, and copy of Regulations under the Proprietary and Patent Medicines Act.—Hon. Mr. Béland.

Report of the Department of the Secretary of State for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

Ordinances of the Yukon Territory, passed by the Yukon Council, second session 1921, and in the year 1922.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

Report of the Public Archives for the year 1921.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

Order in Council dated June 29, 1922, under the Soldier Settlement Act.—Hon. Mr. Stewart.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the hon. member please explain the bill?

Mr. STEVENS: Briefly, the purpose of the bill is to correct what appears to be rather an awkward and anomalous situation that exists by virtue of certain words in the Railway Act. The Railway Act provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall determine the question of freight rates and contains certain clauses against discrimination. But in every case in which the word "discrimination" appears, it is preceded by some qualifying word such as "unfavourable," "undue," "unjust." This bill proposes to remove these qualifying words, so that the effect will be an absolute provision against discrimination in the matter of freight rates.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LAUSANNE CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Has the government any information regarding the failure of negotiations at Lausanne?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Such information as the government has in respect of the proceedings at Lausanne is to all intents and purposes the same as what has appeared in the press.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Putnam for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Friday, February 2.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the motion before the House I cannot but feel that in dealing with the question which will form the greater part of my remarks I am speaking for another who is not now with us. The words I am about to utter will be in confirmation of his businesslike management of the department over which he so ably presided. I would not for one moment, Sir, mar the effect of the eloquent tributes to the departed, delivered by the three leaders, by any commonplace words of my own. Never in all my life have I heard more eloquent tributes more thoroughly deserved, and I concur in everything that was said in recognition of the personal worth and ability of our former comrade.

To those young members who have just entered the House of Commons I, with other speakers, tender my hearty congratulations and welcome. Young men can enter no better school for the development of their sum of knowledge and their intellect than this House; and, Sir, notwithstanding criticisms that we often hear of the calibre of the men in the Canadian parliament, as a man who has been in public life for some years, I believe that the membership of our two Houses will compare favourably with the membership of any other legislative body in the world. The two members who moved and seconded the Address in this House, as is usual, brought to their task both eloquence and information, and we look to them to be in the future a great strength not only by their debating ability, but for the quota of

information which they will impart to this House and to the country.

I would not for a moment, Sir, forget to congratulate my good friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke), who is not the leader of the "peculiar angle," but the leader of the second largest group in this House. His speech, to my mind, was fair in every respect, well reasoned and temperate. We all join with him in believing that the legislation enacted by Parliament ought to be for the welfare of all classes, and that the nearer we can arrive at one viewpoint on matters of controversy by each giving and taking a little, the closer we shall be passing legislation that will beneficially affect the whole nation.

Now, Sir, I want to direct the attention of the House to the railway problem that confronts this country. I do not hope to add anything to the information of the older members of the House who have been here since 1911, and I do not flatter myself that I can add much to the information of the younger members, but I think it not unwise that the sequence of events leading up to the present situation should be placed before the House and the country, not by way of argument, but as a statement of fact, so that those of us who were not here throughout the earlier sessions, and have not had an opportunity of becoming conversant with the conditions then existing and which eventually resulted in the problem that now confronts us, will be in a position hereafter to grasp that problem in a comparatively succinct form.

Let me first try to impress the House with the magnitude of the problem that our people are undertaking to solve. The National Railway System, as it will be in a few months, is the most extensive railway system in the world, and Canada in entering upon the experiment of public ownership is undertaking the solution of the greatest rail transportation problem that has ever been attempted by any company or by any country. The effort is worthy of a young country like Canada, and we will be judged, to a certain extent, as to our ability to grapple with great undertakings by the way we work out this problem.

The Canadian National Railway System comprises a total of 22,646 miles, made up as follows: Canadian Northern Railway, 9,900; Canadian Government Railways, 4,682; Grand Trunk Railway, with owned and controlled lines, 5,308 (this includes 1,164 miles in the United States); Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 2,756. The Government lines of which I have spoken are: The Intercolonial, 1,670 miles; the National Transcontinental 2,006; the Prince Edward Island, 2,076; Branch lines, 730; and the Hudson Bay Railway.

The value of this property as appearing on the books of the various companies is: Canadian Northern Railway, $681,822,115; Canadian Government Railways, $415,438,153; Grand Trunk Pacific, $256,768,407; Grand Trunk Railway and subsidiaries, $512,687,252; Central Vermont Railway, $25,861,823. The consolidated system owns 3,476 locomotives, 3,583 passenger service cars, 122,362 freight cars, and 7,719 work and company service cars. The total earnings in 1921 were $235,789,000, and the working expenses $247,509,000; the operating deficit, therefore, was $11,720,000. The magnitude of this system and its possibilities may be judged from a comparison of its working expenses with the total revenues of the Dominion of Canada. The working expenses of the system in 1921—it included then, of course, the Grand Trunk—were $247,509,000, while the entire Dominion revenue was $381,271,000. So that in the working out of this great railway problem we are facing a task which is second only to the task of administering the affairs of the Dominion of Canada.

The number of employees in 1921 was 102,454, the operating pay-roll for that year amounting to $149,426,849.59. I place these figures on record in order to give an idea of the great task involved in the administration of this system, and to impress on all the people—because the system is theirs—the necessity of giving it, without political preference or political prejudice, a fair chance under government ownership. Government ownership is on trial in respect of the largest scheme that man has ever devised for the purposes of transportation, and it rests with the people, the government and the parliament of Canada to allow the Canadian National Board to try this experiment untrammelled.

I wish to direct the attention of the House to the transactions which led up to the acquisition by the country of the various units that go to make up this system. We will take first the acquisition of the Canadian Northern Railway, which, as we all know, is made up of many subsidiary companies. Aid was given to that system by the federal authority as well as by the provinces. I may point out in passing, as it is a live question, that that part of the Canadian Northern which lies within the province of British Columbia was constructed with the assistance of and under a charter granted by the government of that province. Under the agreement entered into in respect to that road—

which connected with the Canadian Northern main line at the British Columbia boundary—the province had control of the rates. Later, when aid was given by the federal authority, that portion of the Canadian Northern system in British Columbia was declared by parliament, on the recommendation of the government of that day—the head of which was Sir Robert Borden, I believe—to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. The whole line of the Canadian Northern was thus made one complete system. There has been a good deal of discussion about the propriety of that action, but I want just to deal with the facts so that we may know exactly how we came into possession of all these roads.

Many advances had been made, much aid had been given to the Canadian Northern by the federal as well as by the provincial authorities, and as a result the government of Canada recommended to parliament in 1917 that the stock of the Canadian Northern should be acquired by the people. An act incorporating this recommendation was assented to on September 20, 1917. Prior to that date the majority of the stock of the Canadian Northern system had passed into the hands of the government on acount of aid having been given, and this act provided for the acquisition of the balance of that stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not the majority—forty per cent.

Mr. GRAHAM: A large portion of the stock, anyway, passed into the hands of the government on account of the aid given to the Canadian Northern. A board of arbitrators was appointed to determine what the balance of the stock was worth. When aid had been given to the Canadian Northern on a former occasion an act was passed by the House and approved by the Senate under which, in the event of default, the property of the Canadian Northern should come into possession of the government without process of law and without further remuneration. But the parliament of that day thought it better to provide that the value of that stock should be determined by arbitration. The board met, and on May 31, 1918, they made an award of $10,800,000. Then, under authority of an order in council, dated November 20, 1918, the Canadian Northern board was appointed a board of management of the Canadian Government Railways, which would include the Transcontinental, the Intercolonial, the Prince Edward Island Railway, and, I think, the Hudson Bay Railway. On December 20, 1918, an order in council authorized and directed the board of directors of the Canadian Northern Railway to use a collective and descriptive designation—"Canadian National Railways" — for the lines of railway and railway properties controlled or operated by the board. But up to last October the Canadian National Railways as such had had no legal existence. As I say, the system which included all the lines I have mentioned—not then the Grand Trunk —was designated by order in council as the "Canadian National Railways," but there was no Canadian National board; this group of lines was under the management of the Canadian Northern board.

My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition has asked the question why these railways, all these lines, were not amalgamated sooner, and I think he had particular reference to the Grand Trunk. Well, up to last October there was no board under which to amalgamate them, because the Canadian National board was only appointed on the 4th of October last. The name "Canadian National" previous to that time was really only a sort of advertising nomenclature, a billboard, so to speak, for the Canadian National had no existence until the order in council of October 4 was passed. I imagine the ex-Minister of Finance, Sir Henry Drayton, knows exactly why the Canadian Northern with all its ramifications was not brought in. Why, the act to amalgamate all these lines was passed in 1919, and the government of which he and my right hon. friend were members was in power until December, 1921, and up till that time there was not a foot of any of these lines amalgamated with the Canadian National system.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was no difficulty whatever, no reason for delay at all, in connection with the Canadian Northern. There was only one reason for the delay in our case and that was that we could not very well act until the Grand Trunk arbitration was over. That was the reason we delayed. I know of no reason for delay after that was concluded.

Mr. GRAHAM: You will bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, the reason given by my hon. friend why this entire amalgamation, which refers more to the Grand Trunk than it does to the Canadian Northern did not take place; I shall deal with that when I am dealing with the Grand Trunk.

As I said before, the Canadian Northern system is made up of a great many entities. There was stock outstanding on the Canadian Northern system which it was thought

not wise to have as stock of the Canadian National system—some five or six shares which have since been brought under the control of the government. In addition to that, there are certain Canadian Northern securities in the hands of the British Columbia government as collateral—I use that word for lack of a better term. We think we shall be able to get control of this stock. I would point out that no attempt was ever made to get control of this stock until a year ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that Canadian Northern stock? I think it is, from memory.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am so informed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The act of 1919 provides for the acquiring of that and paying for it in exactly the same way as the other stock was to be acquired.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not acquired, at all events, and we are trying to acquire it now, and hope to have the matter in shape in a little while. I would point out that if there were no reason why it could not be acquired in two months by the present government—

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they are in no hurry, I do not see why we should be.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amalgamation cannot take place until that stock is acquired. The stock may possibly be replaced by other securities and will not have to be paid for.

There is another question that has arisen concerning the amalgamation of the Canadian Northern which I am afraid my right hon. friend did not investigate. When the $45,000,000 guarantee was given to the Canadian Northern, there was a trust deed drawn up which is now in the hands of the National Trust Company of Toronto. Accompanying that is the stock of a great many of the smaller companies of the Canadian Northern system. Now when that agreement was drawn, it was thought that there was nothing in it that would interfere with the amalgamation, but the National Trust Company think that there is, and, as that company will have to vote the stock of these smaller companies in order to carry out the amalgamation, every impediment in the way of voting that stock by the trustees must be removed while at the same time protecting the bond holders of the Canadian Northern. There is a clause in that trust deed—I shall give it verbatim in a few moments—which provides that the Canadian Northern may amalgamate with any companies that belong to the Canadian Northern system; but it does not provide that the Canadian Northern may amalgamate with the Canadian National, for the very good reason that there was no Canadian National at that time. The National Trust Company takes the ground, that that point must be cleared up to the satisfaction of the bond holders. That cannot take place until a meeting of the bond holders is called and they agree, which they will, to the amalgamation of the Canadian Northern with the Canadian National, and then the agreement will be changed accordingly. Lest owing to my lack of legal knowledge I may have misstated the case, I shall read, if the House will permit me the advice given to me by the solicitor for the Canadian National Railways, who was also for many years the solicitor for the Canadian Northern and had much to do, I believe, with the drawing up of the various agreements, trust deeds, and statutes. Mr. Ruel, speaking of the non-amalgamation of the Canadian Northern company and subsidiary companies with the Canadian National, says:

"The reason was because of objection raised by the trustees of what we call the $45,000,000 mortgage. That was the mortgage executed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company to the National Trust and British Empire Trust on the 15th July, 1914, pursuant to the parliamentary enactment of 1914, chapter 20. Under that mortgage it is the duty of the Canadian Northern to carry on not only its own enterprise but the enterprise of its various subsidiary companies, and failure to do so would be an event of default under the mortgage. However, permission is given in the mortgage to amalgamate under certain terms, as follows:

"Article II

"9. Notwithstanding the mortgages and charges hereby created or anything contained in this Indenture, any Railway Company comprised in the Canadian Northern system (including the company which is now or may hereafter be subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, may with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into arrangements and agreements with any other railway company comprised in said system, which is now or may hereafter be subject to said legislative authority, or which has now or may hereafter have power to enter into the same, respecting the operation by or the leasing to or the sale and transfer to such other railway company of its undertakings, assets, rights, franchises and powers or any of them; and any railway company (including the company) comprised in the Canadian Northern system which is now or may hereafter be subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada may under the provisions of the Railway Act amalgamate with any other or others of the railway companies comprised in said system which is now or may hereafter be subject to such legislative authority, or which if not so subject has now or may hereafter have power to enter into such amalgamation."

The important part of this section 9 is the sentence at the end of the section:

"and any railway company (including the company) comprised in the Canadian Northern system...may... amalgamate with any other or others of the railway companies comprised in said system."

The statement made by the trustees is simply that the Canadian National Railway Company is not a company comprised in the Canadian Northern railway sys-

tem and cannot be so declared. The point is highly technical, and personally I do not agree with it at all. Power was given in the 1914 act to the Governor in Council to declare any companies to be companies comprised in the Canadian Northern railway system, and this same power was echoed in the Canadian National Railways Act, Stats. Can. 1918, chapter 13. We proposed to pass an order in council declaring the Canadian National Railway Company to be a company comprised in the Canadian Northern railway system within the provisions of the trust deed. The trustees say that we cannot do this because of the wording of Section 21 of the Canadian National Railway Company Act of 1919, which says that the company (the Canadian National Railway Company) may amalgamate with any company comprised in the Canadian Northern railway system. They say that indicates that the company is not comprised in the Canadian Northern railway system, and that the wording excludes any idea that it is so comprised. This seems to me to be splitting hairs with a vengeance. My reply, of course, is that there is nothing in the two enactments restricting the power of the Governor in Council to declare any company to be a company comprised in the Canadian Northern railway system, and unless you find an express restriction you cannot imply a restriction.

However, the trustees have the voting power on the stock of the subsidiary companies which is deposited with them, and the trustees will, of course, act only on the advice of their counsel. Under these circumstances, we have nothing to do but to accept the ruling of the counsel for the trustees and to take immediate steps for the amendment of the clause in the trust deed by the bondholders. This means that a bondholders' meeting will be called in London, England, as soon as we can get the notice published, and we will submit to the bondholders that the clause in question be extended so as to include authority to amalgamate with the Canadian National Railway Company or any other railway company approved by the Governor in Council."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that covers the ground. The statement is in legal phraseology and can now be referred to by any members of the House. That is the reason I have placed it on Hansard.

Now I come to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think I have made it clear to the House that the amalgamation of the Canadian Northern is not such an easy task and must be approached—not approached because we have approached it, but must be carried on—with all regard to the securities held against the Canadian Northern system, and the government of Canada accepts all the liabilities as well as the assets.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I merely want to get at what he is driving at. I am not clear myself and I do not think other hon. members are, as to what amalgamation he looks forward to, of the Canadian Northern with the Canadian National Railway system, other than what now exists. That is to say, what other amalgamation does he think is legally possible? I realize what he says is true, that the entity must be preserved because of the legal securities that are outstanding. I have never complained of the lack of amalgamation of the Canadian Northern; I do not know what other amalgamation of the Canadian Northern with the Canadian National system my hon. friend looks forward to. I understand the order in council of January 30, 1922, provides what can be done further in the way of amalgamation of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, as I understand it the government of Canada have become the shareholders of the Canadian Northern as they now are the shareholders of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are shareholders now.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have not all the stock, as I pointed out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all provided for by law. We do not want any further vote of the National Trust for that; there must be something in the way of physical amalgamation that the counsel has in mind.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, at the present time the Canadian Northern railway is being operated by the Canadian National Railway board—in fact, although not legally speaking, the Canadian National Railway board to-day is also the Canadian Northern board. By this amalgamation there will be operation by a Canadian National Railway board. Under the act of 1919 the Canadian Northern system will be brought in as an entity of the Canadian National Railway system, and not operated separately as the Canadian Northern system is operated separately now, even though that operation is by the same board of directors.

Now let me take up the Grand Trunk Pacific as one of the entities that make up this system. The Grand Trunk Pacific was an integral part of the great transcontinental system inaugurated a few years ago. From Moncton to Winnipeg, some 1,800 miles, it was called the Transcontinental Railway, and was constructed by the people of Canada. From Winnipeg to Prince Rupert the line was called the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and was made up of two sections—the prairie section, and the mountain section. Guarantees were given by the Canadian government to the Grand Trunk Pacific. In addition the old Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada gave a guarantee of bonds. That company did not meet the interest on these bonds under the guarantee, and aid was given year after year, both for operating deficits and to meet liabilities on securities which the government had guaranteed. A question arose with the government of that day concerning

a certain amount of money, I think it was something like $900,000, which the company wished to apply to the payment of interest on the bonds; but the government insisted, and I think rightly so, that that amount should be applied to operating deficit. As a consequence the company ceased operating the road. The government of Canada then took it over, and the Minister of Railways of that day became receiver of the company. That line is still under a receivership, although operated by the Canadian National board. Now, in regard to the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Company, the government's guarantee of course, on the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific was absolute. The guarantee given by the Grand Trunk Company on the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific was somewhat restricted, and provided that the interest on those bonds should be met out of the net earnings of the Grand Trunk. The purchasers of those bonds bought them on the understanding that the interest would be paid out of the net earnings of the Grand Trunk. When the Grand Trunk came to the point where it had no net earnings, no interest was paid, and none, I believe, has been paid since. In reference to the receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the act of 1919 provides, that when the amalgamation would take place and the Grand Trunk was brought into the Canadian National system it would be possible to dissolve the receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That has not yet been done, and there are many obstacles in the way of doing it. I believe the Grand Trunk Pacific will form an integral part of a road which will be a paying proposition in the future development of Canada, even though it is not paying now. It never was intended, in the construction of the transcontinental system, of which the Grand Trunk Pacific forms a part, that it should run from the Atlantic to the Pacific and stop there. As in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was hoped and believed that it would be connected with the Orient; that it would be possible to carry traffic from Europe to the Orient by a route several hundred miles shorter than by any other line. I look forward to the time when the system will give such a service, making connection at Prince Rupert with a privately or publicly-owned line of steamships. When that time comes the project will be an asset and not a loss to the people of Canada.

Now, Sir, I come to the acquisition of the Grand Trunk, but first I want to deal for a moment with the objection of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). Referring to the Grand Trunk, rather than the Canadian Northern, he gave as a reason for the former government being without proper energy for two years, the fact that the Board of Arbitrators appointed to determine the value, if any, of the preference and common stock of the Grand Trunk had not yet reported, and consequently it was difficult to make the amalgamation without this report. I submit that the report, no matter what it contained, would not stand in the way of amalgamation. When the Board of Arbitrators wished to extend the time, it was made a condition by the government that the operation of the road should be handed over to the government. That was done. Then the award of the arbitrators was made. I submit that whether the award was made or not, no matter what it meant as to the value of the preference or common stock, if it had been decided, as it in fact had, to amalgamate the Grand Trunk with the Canadian National system, there was nothing that has come to my knowledge to prevent the government of that day, from the year 1919 until 1921, making that amalgamation.

Now my hon. friend says that the fact that the award had not been made really prevented them from proceeding with the amalgamation. Perhaps there may be something in it of which I am not cognizant, but, speaking from my own knowledge, that should not have interfered with it, because the government of Canada was committed to take over the Grand Trunk, the terms had been agreed upon, and the only question was what Canada should pay for it in addition, if anything. But, take the other viewpoint. Suppose that were the case; the award of the arbitrators was not given until after the appeal was decided. There was an appeal made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and if the non-appearance, or the non-handing out of that award, made by the arbitrators, prevented my hon. friend from making the amalgamation for two years, then that time was extended automatically after the appeal was entered until such time as the appeal was decided by the Privy Council. Let me give a few dates to clear up this point. Notice of the appeal by the Grand Trunk to the Privy Council was served October 1st, 1921, but the case was not heard until July 10th, 11th and 13th, 1922, and judgment was pronounced on July 28th, 1922. We might call that August 1st. Two months after that decision was rendered the Canadian National Board of Directors was appointed by the present government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not amalgamation.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was much nearer amalgamation than anything my hon. friend ever attempted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not a particle.

Mr. GRAHAM: The first step towards amalgamation was to form a board under which amalgamation should take place, and for two years the hon. gentleman did not make an attempt to even appoint a board. They gave the one system the name Canadian National, but it was operated by the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk as separate entities. Two months after the Privy Council had rejected the appeal this government named a board of directors under the act passed in 1919, and that board set the wheels in motion for the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk with the Canadian National system. The award was handed out on July 28th. On October 4th the new board was appointed,—the House will understand the difficulties surrounding this matter, insurmountable for two years,—and the new board set to work with their counsel to see just how rapidly this amalgamation could be brought about. Even bringing in the Grand Trunk was not so easy, and I am not blaming the hon. gentlemen for not getting it through in two years, but I think they should not blame us for not getting it through in two or three months.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman cannot be really serious in what he says, if he understands the agreement with the Grand Trunk. Under that agreement the Grand Trunk board remained in control, pending the decision of the arbitrators. In the spring of 1921—only a few months before the award—when they delayed the arbitration as we believed we came to parliament and got authority to put our board in, but it would have been rude injustice to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk to have amalgamated and done away with the Grand Trunk altogether, when there was a possibility that they would require access to data for the purposes of the arbitration.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose these were all necessary for the purpose of the appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The evidence was in.

Mr. GRAHAM: Consequently my hon. friend's argument applies to us just as much as to him, and I am not blaming him, as I said before, for going so slowly for two years. There are many difficulties in the way. But I do blame him for saying to the House that in two months we could clear up all those difficulties and amalgamate the Grand Trunk, and I make the further assertion that, in two months we did take the first step towards amalgamation and appointed a Canadian National board, and on January 30, the Grand Trunk became a part of the Canadian National system.

4 p.m.

Mr. HANSON: Was there not a Canadian National board then? Were not Mr. Barnhill, Mr. E. R. Wood and Mr. E. T. Riley on that board?

Mr. GRAHAM: There was never any Canadian National board until October 4, 1922.

Mr. HANSON: That was when you promulgated the appointment?

Mr. GRAHAM: There was not any before that. By order in council the systems were called the Canadian National system prior to that, but the board was the Canadian Northern Railway board.

I want now to give the dates, so that we will have them in proper sequence. When the late government took control of the Grand Trunk they appointed a separate board for the Grand Trunk, not an amalgamated board, with Sir Joseph Flavelle as chairman. It became the duty of the present government when we wished to bring about the amalgamation, first, to retire the directorate of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern, for these were the only directors in existence, to make way for whoever we might propose as the new Canadian National board. The new Canadian National board when named was only a board, it had no railway to run except as an operator, and there was not one single mile of railway otherwise under that board; consequently it was necessary to appoint that same board as the board of directors for the Grand Trunk, the board of directors for the Canadian Northern and practically the board for all the subsidiary companies of the Canadian Northern. This continued until the Grand Trunk board was brought in a few days ago by order in council under the act of 1919 and the Canadian Government Railways were brought in. At the present time the Canadian National is operating the Canadian Northern and its lines until such times as they can be brought in, but it is in control, and practically the owner of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Government Railways, the latter for operation only. I will give the dates now, so that we will have them in sequence.

The formal transfer of control of the Grand Trunk was effected at the initial meeting of

the new board in Toronto on October 10. By order in council dated January 19, 1923, preference and common stock of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada was declared the property of the government of Canada in accordance with the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

I might say that was under the act passed in 1919, and that was the process by which the stock of the Grand Trunk became the property of the people of Canada. Under the agreement to which my hon. friend has referred the government of Canada guaranteed 4 per cent on what is known as Grand Trunk guaranteed stock. I think the amount is something like $8,000,000 anually in round figures on the preference and common stock—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two and a half millions on the guaranteed stock I think.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps my figures are wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two and a half millions is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: The agreement under which the government became responsible for interest charges on the debentures and guaranteed stock ($8,984,634.58 annually) left the value if any, of the preference and common stock to be decided by arbitration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, if you include the debentures, but you said only the guaranteed stock.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should have included the debentures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a big difference.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was a slip of the tongue. In addition to this $8,000,000 I mentioned there was the preference and common stock the value of which was left to arbitration. The arbitrators declared that of no value but that is the voting stock. That is the only stock, I think, that has any voting power. They had to transfer it to the government of Canada. One can readily understand it having no value as declared by the arbitrators, the identical certificates could not be obtained, but the act provided that a transfer could be made in the books of the company, which was done, and the Grand Trunk stock passed into the possession of the Finance Minister, in trust for the people of Canada. Before the shareholders of the Grand Trunk could agree to the amalgamation with the Canadian National a meeting was necessary. The Minister of Finance of Canada being the only shareholder of the Grand Trunk with any voting power, he alone had the exercise of that power. But he gave a proxy to Mr. Cope, Controller of the Railway department, who, acting for the shareholders of the Grand Trunk, in Ottawa a few days ago, agreed to the amalgamation of the Grand Trunk with the Canadian National system. This having been done, an agreement of amalgamation was necessary. This agreement was drawn up and acquiesced in by the two boards. Further, it had to be approved by order in Council, and that has been done; so that to-day the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Government Railways are part of the Canadian National system; and the Canadian Northern will shortly also form a part of that system, as soon as the legal technicalities can be disposed of. I have tried to give in sequence the steps that were taken to bring about this amalgamation. As I remarked before, we are entering upon an experiment which calls for the best that is in us all if we are to succeed. I believe that government ownership in Canada, even starting under the handicap of a deficit such as this great system has to face, can in time be made a success. If it is, we shall have given a lesson to the entire world in the matter of transportation.

My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) referred, I think, to the fact that certain rolling stock has been purchased without a vote of parliament. Well, as we know, that is not an uncommon practice in this parliament. But rolling stock cannot be ordered to-day and be ready for use to-morrow. The wants of next year—at least, that has been my experience ever since my first connection with railways—have invariably been anticipated, and rolling stock required a year ahead must be ordered now if it is to be available. I think I could produce some orders in council, passed under the late government and, as well, some passed by the government of which I was formerly a member, in connection with matters analogous to this. Now, the necessity must exist for rolling stock before such a procedure can be justified. Did that necessity exist in this case? My right hon. friend stated that it did not, because, under the old board, my good friend Mr. Hanna, who was at its head, was able to move crops and fill the requirements of the commercial interests of Canada without ordering rolling stock in advance. My right hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The greatest trouble I have known to exist through the lack of rolling stock, particularly in eastern Canada, to meet the needs of the lumbermen of Quebec and New Brunswick, and to keep up with the pulpwood business and all the other trade east of here, prevailed before the new board was formed

at all. Mr. Hanna and myself were communicating day by day on the question as to how the demand should be met, because there was such a shortage of rolling stock. The United States is also short of rolling stock. There was a balance of 20,000 cars of the Canadian National Railways in the United States, and consequently we were very short of rolling stock. To show how a shortage in cars can come about, I might mention a recent incident. A few days ago, at the urgent request of some coal interests, the Canadian Pacific Railway sent over, into the United States, fifty cars with the express understanding that they were all to come back loaded with coal for the Canadian people. Only fifteen came back; thirty-five were diverted. Early last autumn the people of eastern and western Canada were very much in need of additional rolling stock, but there was none bought last year. Now, we cannot hope to carry on the business of this country and have our National Railway system compete with other lines and, what is of greater importance, transport the commodities which the people produce or require, unless we are able and ready to provide the necessary rolling stock and motive power that are required for these movements. We hope to finance the purchasing of this rolling stock as far as possible without appealing to parliament for assistance. I am not speaking positively, but for the most part we expect to finance the purchase of necessary rolling stock through the sale of equipment bonds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Guaranteed by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM: They will not have to be guaranteed by the government; that is my information. The company will purchase it, just as any other incorporated company would do, and the government will not be called upon to finance these purchases. The transactions will be carried on as in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other incorporated company. For the most part, the Canadian National Railway Company will provide its own securities for the purchase of stock.

I have endeavoured in sequence to put on the records of the House the method by which this amalgamation was brought about, and I have outlined the difficulties that have attended it. The sky is not cloudless, either in regard to the railways or any other business. There are difficulties that have to be overcome, and an attempt will be made to meet them. I believe that the board is entering upon this work with an earnest desire to make the railways a success, and it is my conviction that with the help of the Canadian people this can be done. Now, Montreal has been selected as headquarters of the Canadian National system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is where the pull was.

Mr. GRAHAM: Transportation is based on pull of freight and passengers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Sometimes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I may point out that under the act of 1919 only the government has the right to name the headquarters. That duty is reserved to the government; all else comes within the purview of the board, such, for example, as divisions of districts and all that sort of thing. The board was asked to advise the government in regard to the question of headquarters, but that advice need not necessarily have been taken. I am not trying to crawl under the coat of the board at all. Personally, it would have been a great pleasure for me, as an Ontario man, to see the headquarters established in Ontario. But I have always advised that the headquarters should be in Montreal, and this from purely business reasons. What the people of Ontario, and the people of all Canada besides, need is efficient transportation at reasonable rates, and the fact that the expert who has been engaged to advise on such matters recommended Montreal as headquarters is, to my mind, evidence that that city should have been chosen. More than that—and I am not speaking in any way derogatorily of the Canadian Pacific Railway—when you have to compete in business with another you want to be as near your competitor as you possibly can. The Canadian Pacific Railway headquarters are in Montreal, and there, I think, is where the Canadian National Railway system should have its headquarters. Some of my friends say that the Canadian National headquarters have been taken from Toronto. Toronto never had the Canadian National headquarters any more than Montreal had. There were certain railways which were christened the "Canadian National" by order in council, but there was no Canadian National company until October 4th. Toronto was headquarters of the Canadian Northern, and not the Canadian National; and Montreal was the headquarters of the Grand Trunk and not of the Canadian National Railways. I fully concur with the chairman of the board, that the headquarters of the Canadian National system ought to be in the

same place as the headquarters of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Further than that, at the present time Montreal, during the summer months, is the great distributing centre, inward and outward; and where trade originates oceanward, either in or out, is where the headquarters of the Canadian National system should be, if that system is to get its share of that traffic. Many reasons perhaps could be adduced why some other place should have been selected as the headquarters of the system, but from purely a business standpoint I believe Montreal is the right place.

As to the divisional headquarters, that is a matter for the board to decide. Let me point out that the president will be glad to have any views or opinions from members of this House; indeed, he is anxious to listen to such views or opinions because the people whom we represent own this railway system, and their representatives have a right to advise, but not to order.

Now, as to this Canadian National railway system being removed from politics. In the smaller sense of politics, the operation of the system ought not to be interfered with by any outsider; that is a matter that only those in charge are in a position to judge and decide. But in the higher sense of politics, the management of the affairs of the nation, such a property as I have attempted to describe to you this afternoon, a property owned by the people who sent you here, may be expected to engage your attention, and our shareholders—the people—will naturally require their views to be presented to this House as would the views of the shareholders of any incorporated company be brought before a general meeting of shareholders. We hold the proxies for the shareholders, and it is the inherent right of parliament to discuss the affairs of the Canadian National railway system. The government is in a way a committee of this House which has by statute been given authority to name for you a board of directors. It is therefore the privilege of this House at any time, if the shareholders believe that the gentlemen to whom they have confided this duty have not properly discharged it, to put other gentlemen in their place—but they will not do so for a while.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that in the smaller things, the operation of the line, the men whom we have hired for the purpose must not be interfered with; but in the larger things we do not forget that the people whom we represent—every man, woman and child in the Dominion—are shareholders of this great national transportation system. Its success is their success, and if we allow it to become a failure, it will be a failure for the entire people. I believe that it will not be a failure, and I trust that as the months go by and the machinery gets working more smoothly as all these different entities are consolidated into one, that success will be achieved. And I ask parliament and the people of Canada to be patient, to give the board of directors and its president an opportunity to put the system on a sound basis, and a year from now begin to judge by actual results—not by promises, but rather by accomplishment.

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a very informative address, an address dealing with a subject of the most vital importance to the Canadian people, but a subject to which I have no desire to refer at the moment.

I cannot persuade myself, Mr. Speaker, nor can I be easily persuaded, that the Address of His Excellency the Governor General, which is ostensibly the programme of the government for this session, and which forms the basis of our discussion at this time, will on the whole awaken hope or kindle inspiration in the hearts of the Canadian people. It is defective in that it fails, seemingly, to come to close grips with the economic conditions confronting us. It must suggest to many hon. members, at any rate it suggests irresistibly to me, a lack of faith on the part of the government itself—that is, a lack of faith to deal successfully and effectively with the tasks confronting it; a lack of faith that is no doubt due to lack of unity within the government ranks. Without faith we cannot have those deep-seated, deep-rooted convictions upon which a true and adequate legislative programme must be based, and without conviction there cannot be that enthusiasm generated, the warmth and glow of which is so essential to national progress.

The programme, to me, is sectional, not so much because of what is stated, but rather because of what is carefully and guardedly omitted—notably all reference to a revision of the customs tariff. Evidently that policy last year of attrition is now to be displaced by a spiritual state of contrition on the part of the government itself. The programme is to me an eerie programme, and I am convinced that, had the government which adopted that attitude of austere aloofness to the Near Eastern crisis abroad—and with some measure of justification I am convinced—adopted the same attitude of austere aloofness to the near-eastern interests at

home, a different programme would have been submitted at this session. The programme, I am convinced, was framed during the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), at a time when the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) was sleeplessly engaged in his celebrated immigration policy, and prior to the departure of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) to take part in that little family misunderstanding in the province of Quebec.

That the people of Canada to-day are vitally and—shall I say?—intelligently interested in social and economic conditions, none will deny. The producers of Canada in general, and the western agriculturalists in particular, are interested in a rapid deflation of the price of foodstuffs which has not been accompanied by any corresponding reduction in the price of manufactured commodities. I have no desire to weary the House with lengthy quotations or to irritate hon. members with statistics, but in order that the House may grasp what that deflation means, let me quote just one short paragraph:

> The farmer who on November 1st, 1919, went to pay a one hundred dollar obligation, required 38 bushels of 1 Northern wheat. On November 1st, 1922, he would require 95 bushels to pay $100.00. If he paid it with oats he required 117 bushels 2 C. W. in 1919 and 218 bushels in 1922, 67 bushels of barley in 1919 and 190 bushels in 1922. If he was a mixed farmer he could meet his one hundred dollar obligation by selling a 952 lb. best butcher steer, four years ago. This last November his steer would have to weigh 1,818 lbs. If he sold hogs, 654 lbs. of selects would pay the bill in 1919, but it would take 1,025 lbs. to do the trick in 1922. In other words, one dollar's worth of the various farm products on Nov. 1st, 1922 were worth four years previous as follows:—wheat, $2.50; oats, $1.94; barley, $2,85; cattle, 1.90 and hogs, $1.56.

The western agriculturists, then, are vitally interested not only in the deflation of the value of farm products, but in a problem that is closely associated with that deflation, namely, the problem of the cost of production. Let me say here that if we ever turn seriously to consider the payment of our national debt—and I am not persuaded that we shall do so during the life of the present administration—we shall be forced to the conclusion that the national debt can be paid only by the disposal of our surplus farm products in the markets of the world—there is no other way, so far as I can determine. And when we reach that conclusion we shall realize that we can profitably dispose of our surplus farm products in the markets of the world only when agriculture is detached and divorced from every handicap now associated with that industry.

[Mr. Hoey.]

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) discovered a relationship between sixty-five- and seventy-five-cent wheat on the western plains and the impoverished if not chaotic conditions prevailing in Europe. But in what was an admirable address, no words fell from his lips that would lead me to believe that he grasped the real relationship. Hon. members will recall the three major struggles in which Great Britain was engaged during the nineteenth century—that struggle in the second decade of the century; the Crimea, just about the middle of the century; and later the war in South Africa. After the earlier struggle there were bread riots in Great Britain; the conditions were indescribable. After the second, in the middle of the century, squalor, poverty and penury were in evidence everywhere; men paraded the streets crying aloud for bread. After the South African war the conditions were not quite so acute, owing to Britain's free trade policy. It was conditions such as these that led Norman Angell, the author, to prophesy that if modern nations engaged in war on any large, any colossal, scale in the early years of the twentieth century, such a struggle would be followed by the complete collapse of modern civilization itself. Well, we engaged in the struggle; we have reached the post-war period, and there are no bread riots in Europe. There were one or two features that these prophets—shall I call them prophets of despair?—overlooked. The first thing that they overlooked was the efficiency and responsiveness of the agricultural machine, particularly on the American continent. They overlooked also the combination of circumstances—they had of necessity to overlook those circumstances, being unable to visualize them—that has forced the producer on the American continent onto a treadmill, a treadmill the revolutions of which he is forced to make prompted by the instinct of self-preservation. And when we discern that relationship we discern the only redeeming feature in the public life of the country in this post-war crisis. I see the Canadian agriculturist a depressed and discouraged but nevertheless heroic figure, toiling, toiling, toiling, that the world may be fed and that civilization itself may be saved. The Canadian agriculturist to-day is feeding Europe at a price considerably less than cost.

So much for the redeeming feature; what about the tragedy? Well, when the people who receive our foodstuffs say, in substance, though perhaps not in so many words, "The

cheap foodstuffs that we are obtaining at a price less than cost, coupled with our industrial efficiency enable us to produce manufactured commodities at a price considerably less than the price prevailing in your country for similar articles"—when they say that to us, what do we say? We put up both hands, and we say, "No; these goods can only be admitted at a price that will guarantee a dividend to the home manufacturer." You cannot with impunity treat natural laws with contempt; the nation that seeks to thwart these fundamental laws will be ground ultimately by their very force. That is the vital relationship existing to-day between the agricultural conditions in this country and the state of Europe. When men prate of Canada's selfishness and aloofness, they are simply overlooking the fundamental facts of the case.

Physical conditions will not permit me, Mr. Speaker, to speak at length, but I do want to make one or two suggestions. I want to suggest to the government, first of all, that in my humble judgment the time has arrived for the appointment of a Canadian ambassador to the United States. I am convinced that that appointment is inseparably bound up with the problem of wider markets. I am convinced that if the right man were secured,—and he ought to be secured; a man of tact, good judgment, and familiar, to some extent at least, with conditions on the North American continent at this time, a man who could become responsible for negotiations and take the initiative in starting negotiations that could be followed up by the administration here—I believe that if such a man were secured and ultimately appointed he could make a contribution of the first magnitude to the cause of a better understanding between the two nations at this time. Furthermore, it is my opinion that our foreign policy is going to be more and more bound up with the foreign policy of the United States, whether we desire it or not. For Canada to embark on an European struggle at this time with the United States remaining neutral, would mean, in view of our present financial obligations, bankruptcy to this young nation. If some people contend that no other nation of the British Commonwealth has ever taken this step, I reply that no other nation in the British Commonwealth is inseparably associated with the United States in the sense that this Canadian nation is.

The second practical suggestion I should like to make is one to the government, and it is that they should seriously consider at the earliest possible moment, or as soon as circumstances will permit, the advisability of calling a conference of representatives of the provinces who will meet with the federal representatives and clearly define, if they can, the respective sources to which each body may go in search of the revenue that is necessary to meet its needs. Nothing could be more irritating than to receive a notice from the Dominion government that your income tax is overdue, or at least due, and then to receive a similar notice from a provincial government. I think this is a conference the holding of which is long overdue.

Before I take my seat I should like to refer to the address delivered during this debate by the right hon. leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Meighen). I was surprised, I was amazed, at its toleration. We had from him at least a speech worthy of his mind. But there was one pronouncement in his address that seems to have remained with me in a peculiar sense. Referring to the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke), he said that he was a man who was not only truly Canadian, but also truly British. I could not help but think as the right hon. gentleman concluded his remarks that he himself was rapidly becoming Canadianized. But what of his immediate followers? I trust the Canadianization of my right hon. friend will not lead to the fossilization of his immediate followers. Why this ominous silence? The country did not expect much from them we know, but surely the country expects something. Well might an angel exclaim "Why seek ye the living amongst the dead?"

Believing, Mr. Speaker, that there is an aspect of our economic conditions that has not been emphasized in this debate, believing also that that aspect of our economic conditions is of the most vital importance to the Canadian people in this crisis, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell):

> That in view of the increased burden of taxation and of the hardship which many of the people suffer from this burden, and the unrest and dissatisfaction arising therefrom, and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to reduce the cost of production, and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of parliament, the House is of the opinion that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance.
>
> (1) Diminishing the very high cost of production, which presses so severely on the primary producers of the country at this time;
>
> (2) Reducing the cost of living to the great masses of the common people, many of whom are being forced out of the country by the prevailing economic conditions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment. I would point out that

the form is not in accordance with Beauchesne's Rules, but I suppose that can be changed without altering the spirit of the matter that has been submitted by the hon. member. His Honour, the Speaker, will deal with the question of the form of the amendment.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the mover and seconder of the resolution for the adoption of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne upon their efforts. They have worthily acquitted themselves of the task entrusted to them. May I be permitted also, Mr. Speaker, to tender my humble congratulations to yourself upon the conclusion of your successful and delicate mission overseas. Those of us who are familiar with the manner in which you fulfil your high office in this House had every reason to expect that in those delicate negotiations you would conduct yourself with becoming dignity, and with honour to yourself and credit to this country. May I also say that I am sure you have amply realized our highest expectations in that regard. It was a very fitting thing indeed that the government of France should donate to Canada as a gift to this country, 250 acres of land on the historic Vimy Ridge. It is a very fitting thing indeed that this government should not hesitate to erect upon that historic ridge a monument which I am convinced will be a thing of beauty and a joy forever, a monument which, through all the ages, will constitute a challenge and an inspiration to the growing manhood and womanhood of this country,—a challenge to greater service, and an inspiration to a fuller duty. May I also venture to say that it seems to me that through the coming centuries the children of France will have before them a constant reminder and a fitting memorial of the service which was rendered by the sons of Canada in the days when the liberty, the equality and the fraternity of the citizenship of the republic was threatened.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the challenge of the country to this parliament at the present time lies in two directions. I am convinced that first of all the challenge is to economy—to economy not only in expenditure, but economy also in the administration of the government. We must of necessity view with considerable alarm, as the responsible representatives of the people of Canada, the rapid and substantial increase in the public debt. We cannot fail but be impressed with the increasing and over-whelming cost of government. What can we do, what answer can this parliament make, to that challenge? Is there any way out of this increasing cost, which ultimately must necessarily if continued bring us to the very abyss of bankruptcy? I think there are several things we may do. In the first place I think we should make an effort to decentralize government. There seems to have been, through the passing years, a tendency towards centralization of government, and especially a centralization of government in this particular city. Let me give one illustration, because I think we should not continue the policy of bringing the people to the government—we should take the government to the people. The federal national parks of this country constitute an area, I think, of approximately 8,000 square miles. In the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia considerably over 7,000 square miles of the total area is found. In eastern Canada—and I mean by that practically the territory east of Manitoba—the national parks of Canada represent an area of only 160 acres. Yet we have established in Ottawa a large Parks Department, admittedly with a very efficient and able gentleman in charge. Now why should not that particular department, if we need such a department, be located at the very centre, where the activities of that department must necessarily be? If that were done, if that department were located at Banff, or some other convenient point, its work could be more satisfactorily and efficiently carried on than under present conditions. That is one thing, I think, that we must do; we must make a substantial effort towards decentralization of government. With that will come not only considerable economy but increased efficiency.

Co-related to the subject of economy in Canada, in both its expenditure and its administration, it seems to me the second challenge of our people to this parliament comes in the matter of taxation. If one were to examine in detail the various methods of taxation in force not only under our municipal governments, but also under our provincial and federal governments, I think he would be driven to the conclusion that governments first of all decide that a certain amount of money must be raised in order to meet their expenditures. Then they seek to impose a sufficient levy to secure, in the most rapid way, the required amount, without much reference to the accepted principles of taxation, without much reference to those accepted canons of taxation which have been undisputed for at least one hundred years. It seems to me that we should pay much greater

attention to this matter, and I propose, although the subject must be familiar to many of the members of this house, to suggest for consideration four cardinal principles or canons of taxation laid down by Adam Smith. I think that in the light of these canons we should examine the various methods of taxation applied, and endeavour to make them harmonize with these particular principles or else wipe them out altogether. The first principle I would cite is the following:

1. The subjects of every state ought to contribute towards the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state. The expense of government to the individuals of a great nation, is like the expense of management to the joint tenants of a great estate, who are all obliged to contribute in proportion to their respective interests in the estate. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists, what is called the equality or inequality of taxation.

2. The tax which each individual is bound to pay ought to be certain and not arbitrary.

3. Every tax ought to be levied at the time, or in the manner, in which it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it.

4. Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state.

These have been the accepted principles of taxation for over a hundred years, as I suggested, and yet in all our departments of government we virtually obscure the fundamental principles. I think there is much in the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Springfield (Mr. Hoey). We require some sort of a tax conference. We require a delimitation of the fields of taxation as between the existing tax levying bodies. That may require, and probably does necessitate in the ultimate analysis a change in our British North America Act, but nevertheless, some steps should be taken in this, which seems to be a vital and essential matter. We should delimit the field, as far as possible as between the various tax collecting organizations, and then see that the taxes imposed comply with the accepted canons of taxation.

The debate on the Address, Mr. Speaker, is a splendid opportunity for members from various parts of the country to become acquainted with the actual conditions which exist in other parts. Spread out, as we are, for hundreds of miles along the northern fringe of this continent, it is, doubtless, true that there must be many diverse and divergent interests. It is difficult, indeed, for an individual in one part of the country to come to any conclusion with regard to the economic conditions in any other parts, and so it is desirable that, in this initial debate, the conditions from all parts of the country should be brought to the attention of the House, in order that the House may be duly informed and may be able to act accordingly. And, therefore, I propose, for a few moments, to survey the existing conditions in that part of the country from which I come, and more particularly in the province of Alberta. It is actual practical facts that we desire. Principles are splendid, but we must first of all know the facts before we are in a position to apply the appropriate principles.

It is a platitude, indeed, that the agricultural industry, in its many ramifications, is the vital and the basic industry, so far as western Canada is concerned. In fact, I doubt not that I might go further and say that it is the essential and vital industry of all Canada, but looking at the conditions in this particular industry, as many hon. members are aware, nature has perhaps in the past year been unkind to large sections. The affliction of drought, hail, and other climatic conditions has left in its wake a considerable hardship, but nevertheless, so far as the western provinces are concerned, we find the largest crop in our history, and yet we find agriculture in a deplorable financial and economic condition. We find in Alberta that a large number of farms are being sacrificed and many are being abandoned, leaving as a heritage a weed menace for those to combat who are content to remain upon adjoining land. We find a large number of these farmers are emigrating to the western and northwestern states. In some portions of Alberta, afflicted to a considerable extent with drought, depopulation, as I am informed by one of the hon. members, varies in the district, extending south of the town of Hanna to north of the village of Tabor, from about thirty to fifty per cent. The beneficent effects of prosperous conditions in the agricultural industry are rapidly reflected in every other industry and business, not only in western Canada, but in eastern Canada, but as a result of the condition which now
5 p.m. exists in that industry we find very considerable urban depopulation. As an illustration we find, for instance, in the city from which I come, in the end of the month of December, there were something like five hundred vacant houses. An examination of the railway figures indicating the emigration through the port of Kingsgate, which is one only of the avenues of exit from the province of Alberta to the States, shows that in the three months ending December 31st last, there has been an excess of emigration over immigration of approximately 5,000 paying passengers.

Now these are actual facts and these are conditions which must be faced. I am not one of those who might properly be called a calamity howler, and I am not a pessimist. In fact, I think I would be a pessimist indeed if I failed to reveal to this House on this occasion these facts as I have found them. I personally have great faith in western Canada, I have great faith in all of Canada, and I trust these conditions may be but temporary and that they may shortly be removed.

What are the reasons for this condition in the agricultural industry? Because if we want to know the condition of western Canada we must ascertain the condition in the agricultural industry. None will deny—certainly I will not for a moment attempt to deny—that the chaotic political conditions in Europe have resulted in a chaotic economic and financial condition which is necessarily reflected in Canada to the detriment of our grain growers. But while it is true that these external factors are of great significance, it is also true that there are many internal handicaps to which I think this government might properly turn its attention. Before the war—there was a relativity, if you like, existing between the cost of production and the price which the farmer received for his product, which normal relativity is disturbed to-day. We find expensive production costs, we find expensive marketing costs, and we find only pre-war prices for the product raised.

I have endeavoured to make some little examination into the cost of production. It is a very difficult matter I admit but, many people have given it much consideration, endeavouring to take into consideration all the factors involved. I am informed that in the province of Saskatchewan in the year 1920 it cost approximately 72 cents to raise one bushel of wheat. I understand that in the province of Alberta it would necessarily cost a few cents more than that sum per bushel. The cost of production, as you will readily admit, is excessive. May I add to that sum the cost of preparation for market and the cost of transportation. Take the transportation costs from Calgary to Montreal. During the year 1922 examination revealed that the cost of transportation on a bushel of wheat varied from something like 40 cents a bushel to approximately 60 cents a bushel. Let me give the details of this figure. Threshing cost from 10 to 14 cents a bushel in Alberta this year. Haulage and elevator charges may be placed at the very modest sum of 2½ cents a bushel. Then railway charges to Fort William 15·6 cents per bushel; elevator and cleaning and inspection charges, 1¼ cents a bushel. From Fort William to Bay ports, according to the best information I have been able to get, the transporting cost would run from 3½ to 10 cents a bushel. Then railway or canal transportation up to Montreal would not be less than 5 cents a bushel; elevator charges at bay ports, ¾ cent per bushel; expenses at Montreal, 1¾ cents per bushel; insurance charges varying from ·33, or approximately one-third cent per bushel, upwards. That makes a total cost in transportation charges alone, varying according to the particular part of the country, of from forty to something like sixty cents per bushel.

Hon. members can readily see that, with these excessive production costs and high transportation charges, it was impossible for the farmers of western Canada to raise grain at a profit during the past year. It is all very well to indicate these conditions. But what can, or what should the government do to reduce production costs? They should, it seems to me, make some definite effort to reduce or, preferably, to eliminate entirely the customs tariff from the implements of production and from the necessaries of life, including food and clothing and the other articles that are so essential to comfortable living, at least on the western plains. In the Speech from the Throne there is not one ray of hope in this connection; the Governor General's lips have been sealed in this matter. I think it is unfortunate that the government have not given some indication of their desire to live up to the pledges upon which they secured a mandate from the people of Canada. Further I am glad to see that the government does not hesitate now to have an investigation into the grain business. That investigation has long since been overdue. I think that probably the government have been altogether too solicitous of the views of certain members on this side of the House. The investigation is necessary, and it should be conducted in the most thorough and the most complete manner.

Now, what can, or what should, the government do to lessen marketing costs? Last session we secured the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement through an act of parliament, or rather, perhaps, by the efluxion of time. The restoration of that agreement meant, I understand, a saving of approximately $30,000,000 to the farmers of western Canada. But what is the use of effecting a saving in that regard, when, at the same time, conditions exist upon the lakes which largely nullify the action taken by parliament? I notice that the government pro-

poses to inquire, by royal commission, into the alleged combine which exists on the Great Lakes; and I am glad to observe, also, that they are going to investigate the matter of insurance charges in connection with the shipping of grain. It has been a matter of common knowledge for many months past—in fact, I doubt not that it has been commonly known for years now—that some sort of effort is being and has been made to mulct the producers of western Canada in the matter of transportation rates and insurance charges upon cargoes carried on the Great Lakes. It has always occurred to me as a peculiar thing and one which, I admit, I cannot understand, why it is that season after season, this season like the rest, there is a constant discrimination against Georgian bay ports. I find that uniformly through the past season the rate per bushel on grain from Duluth on lake Superior to Buffalo varied between about two cents and, at the close of the season, five cents. But you take grain rates from Fort William to bay ports, competing points at both ends with American ports and you find that the rate during this season, and in prior seasons too, has varied from 3½ cents to as high, I understand, as ten cents per bushel. I cannot understand the reason for this discrimination, and I hope that in this connection the inquiry by the royal commission will be as thorough as possible. I trust that no effort will be spared to bring to bay any combine which may exist in regard to these matters.

I hope that the government, in their zeal to discover whether there is a combine on the lakes in the matter of transportation rates, will not fail to carry their investigation to the point where they can be assured whether or not there is any combine in connection with ocean rates; because, after all, these combines, if they do exist, are usually hydra-headed. You may cut off one head, but the others remain; and the government should see to it that the investigation shall be such that it may not be said afterwards that, while a combine has been robbed of its power in one section, nevertheless it can rise up in might in another. In connection with this inquiry I regret that the government did not long ago take some drastic action in dealing with the situation. I cannot see why the coastal laws of the country were suspended, practically at the close of navigation, when such suspension could do little good so far as grain transportation costs were concerned. The government might well have acted far more diligently in that regard.

There is another way in which the government can be of some service: I refer to an investigation of the possibilities of the westward movement of grain through the port of Vancouver. If that investigation justifies it, their support should be given in connection with the so-called western grain route. I know there are problems involved in connection with the shipping of grain from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan westward through the port of Vancouver. Some of these problems should be mastered by this government; others should be taken up and solved by the people of Vancouver and of British Columbia generally. This is the more necessary in view of the fact, as revealed upon examination, that this westward movement of grain is becoming a far more popular movement than heretofore. I understand that the amount of grain shipped this year through this route is considerably in excess of that shipped last year, despite inadequate terminal and elevator facilities. Account must also be taken of the fact that uniformly through the past season there has been a premium on the Vancouver price over the Fort William price of grain, extending from approximately three cents to between seven and eight cents per bushel. These are matters that should be carefully investigated by the government. I see no reason why the Board of Grain Commissioners should not long ago have been charged with the duty of investigating this matter with a view to ascertaining the feasibility of developing this western movement of grain. Is there anything the people of British Columbia can do to make it more feasible? That an investigation should disclose. In the years to come, in my opinion, this matter will be of increasing importance to this country, and I trust that the government will not neglect any opportunity to give, at least, what counsel and support they can to the western movement of grain.

Now, I have dealt to some extent with the matter of grain growing in western Canada. I propose to turn my attention for a moment to the cattle industry of western Canada. This industry, as everyone must realize, is one for which the province of Alberta particularly is naturally adapted. In past years it has been a very profitable and a very large industry. But unfortunately the high American tariff has excluded our cattle from the Chicago market, and the result has been a disastrous fall in prices, the sacrifice of cattle at very low rates that are utterly unprofitable and, most unfortunate of all, the sale of a large

amount of our best breeding stock in western Canada to purchasers from the States. So that if perchance the cattle industry should subsequently revive, it may be that our western cattle owners will not be able to take the fullest advantage of that revival.

Now, what are the prospects in connection with this industry? We are told the British cattle embargo has been removed. I understand that Mr. Duncan Marshall—who is, I believe, a six months' employee of the Department of Agriculture—has given it as his opinion that this is going to make a very great difference. Well, not being a cattle man, I cannot say, but certainly the largest cattle shipper in western Canada says that the removal of the embargo is not going to be of much significance for a considerable time to come. I am glad to say that some of the cattle growers of western Canada are showing an initiative in regard to this industry which, if not very complimentary perhaps to the government, is at least complimentary to the individuals concerned. In the province of Alberta they are endeavouring by a special method of cultivation, which does not involve very much expense, to raise the necessary fodder so that they can finish the cattle on their farms and ship the finished product to the market in the United States, and consequently be enabled to take advantage of a market that they were not able to exploit with grass fed cattle as heretofore.

But let me suggest in passing that what the Department of Agriculture wants in connection with these particular matters is experienced, practical, scientific men. We have had in the various departments altogether too many political agents and theorizing prophets. It does occur to me that it would be advisable so far as the Agricultural department of the federal government is concerned, to attempt to co-ordinate that department with the provincial departments of agriculture in order that there will not be this constant overlapping, with the consequence that inefficiency results and nobody is served. That is particularly, but not exclusively, true of the Department of Agriculture.

To add to the general difficulties in connection with these industries, some of the people of western Canada have been called upon to pay what might be called an excess rate of interest, a greater rate than that provided by the Bank Act. In practically every case the minimum rate charged is eight per cent, although the banks are limited to seven per cent, in many cases nine per cent is charged, and in some cases as much as ten per cent has been exacted. These conditions are unnecessarily severe. It is unfortunate that they exist, and it is no wonder that the people of western Canada are now directing their attention to this parliament, hoping that in the pending revision of the Bank Act some relief at least will be given them.

In reference to this revision, which I understand must take place every ten years, it occurs to me that in a country that is changing as rapidly as this Dominion is, it would be advisable perhaps to have a revision of the act every five years. I think that would enable parliament to size up the situation somewhat more frequently without interfering with that stability of financial conditions which I think banks and other institutions should enjoy.

In western Canada our attention has been specially directed to banking matters, and there has been an increasing realization that after all credit is the life blood of trade, that if that credit is denied trade must necessarily atrophy and decay. There is also a realization, I think, that credit is largely community created. Along with this realization we have witnessed the increasing centralization of the credit power of this country in the hands of a decreasing number of men, and to cap the climax we have witnessed the tragic fiasco in connection with the Merchants Bank. Many people wonder how it is possible that the interests of the depositors and creditors may be imperilled to the extent disclosed by the Merchants Bank scandal, how it is possible that false returns may be made to the government and yet absolutely no one be held responsible before the law. That is a strange and a depressing fact, and I think this parliament would be well advised to give serious consideration to remedying the defects in our banking law.

But now the government have under consideration another scheme to change and improve the existing economic conditions. Despite the rural depopulation which I have suggested is taking place, despite the corresponding decrease in urban population which is also taking place, the government now propose an immigration policy. That is what they pin their hope and their faith to. And the invitation extended to prospective immigrants is: Come in with us and share our debt! I am not altogether convinced that the intending immigrant would consider the invitation as entirely disinterested and charitable. In fact, I suspect, if I were to suggest to hon. members that I would be very glad to have them come and share my personal debts, there would probably be some misgivings on their part about accepting my invitation.

However, I am not opposed to any immigration policy per se. I am of opinion that an immigration policy under proper conditions and preceded by proper efforts by this government, is of value and is probably of vital consequence to the country. What has the government done? First of all, it has called to its councils the Canada Colonization Company, a company which seems to plan as a basic principle a certain amount of real estate exploitation. The president and some of the officers of this company made a grand transcontinental tour, and immediately thereafter the whole project lapsed into a state of coma—no explanation offered. The president resigned, and one at least of the directors also resigned—no explanation offered. Well, it seems to me that the explanation does not require much seeking to find. I think the whole scheme is foredoomed to failure in that it is predicated upon a false basis—it does not take cognizance of the economic conditions existing. But the government goes further. It says: We will bring in some tenant farmers and put them on the land. These gentlemen have not much money; indeed, it is suggested that the transportation charges are so high that it will be difficult for them to get here anyway. And then, the "most unkindest cut of all," they take helpless orphans and endeavour to formulate an immigration policy for these poor, defenceless children. They, of course, can make no objection. They are helpless, and I presume they must take the consequence. Now, a proper immigration policy must be predicated by an adjustment, or readjustment if you like, of our economic conditions. Make farming in western Canada profitable and then you do not need much of an immigration policy. The best immigration advertisement for this country, is a prosperous and a contented farmer; if you have that you do not need to go to much expense—certainly the expense will be less than would otherwise be necessary. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if as a result of the government's effort many men and women are, under existing conditions, brought into the country, Canada will simply become a conduit pipe through which these people will pass on their way to the United States, where economic and general employment conditions are much more satisfactory than they are here. The country looks to this government for leadership in connection with these pressing economic problems. It is a strange fact, but nevertheless true, that for some reason or other, as soon as governments get into office they become subject to a sort of creeping paralysis, a state of inaction and laissez faire. They become largely the numbed and chilled victims of circumstance. The people, therefore, are looking to parliament for a real leadership in these matters.

Turning for a moment, Mr. Speaker, from the internal conditions—which, I suggest, are not entirely without hope if you have a government of vision, a government of progress, a government not lacking in courage—turning from these conditions to external affairs, I think there is more ground for congratulation. During the time of the Near Eastern crisis the Cabinet indicated this country's position in regard to participation in war, and particularly in regard to the sending of a contingent to the Near East. I am glad that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet took the position that they did. They followed in the footsteps of that illustrious statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier; they indicated in no uncertain terms that the question of Canada's participation or non-participation in any war is a matter for the responsible representatives of the Canadian people in parliament assembled. In a matter so vital as war, involving, as it well may, the lives of thousands of our fellow-countrymen; involving the loss, perchance, of immense treasures of wealth; involving, as it well may in these latter days, the destruction of our whole civilization, it is imperative that the decision be made exclusively by parliament, or if not by parliament then by the people themselves. No group of men either here or elsewhere outside these two bodies should take any action committing the country to any condition of war. Action in respect to the eastern crisis was the more imperative in view of the fact, as those who are familiar with some at least of the circumstances must know, that the whole story of the Near East, both prior to the armistice with the Turks and subsequent thereto, has been a long series of secret intrigues, secret treaties, selfish aggrandizements. I would like to have seen the Prime Minister send a challenge to the old world from this new world of democracy indicating that so far as we are concerned we are through with that variety of old world diplomacy which has brought the earth almost to the brink of ruin, almost to the verge of despair. So I say that real progress has been made in the disposition of our external affairs during the recess.

May I say just in this connection that I believe Canada has latterly been looking altogether too much to Europe for its cue. I wish to quote, if I may be permitted, from a

statement made by General Smuts at the Imperial Conference in 1921, where Canada was represented by the present right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen. I commend this statement to the consideration of the House as Canada's policy. He said:

> In shaping our course for the future, we must bear in mind that the whole world position has radically altered as a result of the war. Europe is no longer what she was, and the power and the position which she once occupied in the world has been largely lost. The great empires have disappeared. Austria will never rise again. Russia and Germany will no doubt revive, but not in this generation nor in the next; and when they do, they may be very different countries in a world which may be a very different world. The position, therefore, has completely altered. The old viewpoint from which we considered Europe has completely altered. She suffers from an exhaustion, which is the most appalling fact of history; and the victorious countries of Europe are not much better off than the vanquished. No, the scene has shifted on the great stage. To my mind that is the most important fact in the world situation to-day, and the fact to which our foreign policy should have special regard.

Then, discussing the possibilities of the future, he asks the question, What will be the next chapter in human history? and says:

> What will be the character of that history? Will it be along the old lines? Will it be the old spirit of national and Imperial domination which has been the undoing of Europe? Or shall we have learned our lesson? Shall we have purged our souls in the fires through which we have passed? Will it be a future of peaceful co-operation, of friendly co-ordination of all the vast interests at stake?

In the latter part of that statement of Premier Smuts lies, I think, the course for this country to follow—a non-partisan course as between the nations, holding the balance of justice with an equal poise, seeking to extend our friendly help and co-operation to all nations in distress.

I say further that if we are obligated by any warlike commitments, we should seek release from them. We should not engage in any further war-provoking entanglements. If we do that much we shall at least have made some efforts to usher in, or perhaps to bring somewhat closer to realization, that day when—

> The common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe.
>
> And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

Now, there is one other matter to which I wish to refer, and that is my position before this House. There has been some misunderstanding. There has been, perhaps, to some extent some slight misrepresentation. Let me say at the outset that my position before this House has not changed in the slightest. I was elected as an Independent for the Calgary West federal riding. I was supported most generously by the United Farmers of Alberta within that constituency, and supported most generously indeed by the labour unions in that constituency. It was my duty, and it has been my effort to fulfil it, to co-operate not only with the Progressive group but with any group which was interested in the securing of democratic legislation. That is my obligation to my constituents; that is the course which I intend to pursue—that and none other. I am not fettered by any party consideration; I am not embarrassed by any partisan affiliations; and so I say I am prepared to co-operate not only with the government, not only with my friends of the opposition, but with the Progressive group in any legislation which appears to me deserving of favourable consideration by this parliament.

I have listened with considerable interest to the belated—shall I say?—amendment proposed by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). That amendment is worthy of some consideration. I think the challenge, however, of the country to-day to this parliament is the challenge to economy, not only in administration but also in the expenditure of government—the challenge to keep our expenditure within our income. I think the challenge to parliament to-day is to reduce and lessen the burdens of taxation which so grievously bear upon the people, and so in that spirit I desire to move an amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Springfield. The amendment which I propose reads as follows:

> That the following words be added to the amendment before the House:
>
> That this House views with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt, and urges Your Excellency's advisers to exert every possible effort to economize in the expenditure and administration of government, and to lessen the burden of federal taxation which bears so heavily on the people of Canada.

I offer that amendment, not for the purpose of embarrassing the government, for I believe the government is under no obligation to consider it as necessarily indicating a want of confidence, but because its adoption will indicate that the challenge of the country to this parliament has been answered to some extent at least.

Mr. E. W. ROBINSON (Kings, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any length on the question before the House. I might assure the House right now that it is not my intention to move an amendment to the amendment or anything of that kind. I shall be as brief as possible.

I believe that it is first of all my duty to express the pleasure that I had in listening to the eloquent address of my colleague the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam).

I have heard kind words spoken of his address from various parts of the House, and the only note of criticism that I heard was an implication perhaps that he had spoken from a sectional viewpoint, from the standpoint of the Maritime provinces principally. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are sectional by nature. In this Canada of ours there is a maritime section, there is also a western section, and I claim that it is only by hearing the opinions of various members from the different sections that we can ever come to any concerted action that will mean anything. Therefore, I shall make no excuses for the hon. member for Colchester having spoken from a maritime standpoint. It seems to me that we are expected to listen with patience while the members from the West tell of their grievances and while the members from British Columbia, for instance, speak of the peculiar questions confronting them; but if a member from the Maritime provinces tells of the needs and aspirations of that section we are at once accused of sectionalism.

There are one or two points in the Speech from the Throne to which I particularly wish to call attention. The first is redistribution. It is well-understood, of course, that after every decennial census it is necessary to have a redistribution of the representation. Redistribution will affect Nova Scotia perhaps more than any other province at this time, because we stand to lose two members. It might interest the House to know that our loss of two members is not due to the fact that we have exhausted our natural resources; it is not that our population is fading away because we have exhausted the country entirely; nothing of the kind. Our population has increased to a certain extent, but has not kept pace with the increase in the population of the province of Quebec. We have at the present time about 535,000 people in the province of Nova Scotia. We produced products in the year 1922 valued at $163,000,000, and I think all will agree that that is no mean total for a population of that size. I do not believe any other part of this Dominion, I was going to say the world, possesses as many and as varied resources as does the province of Nova Scotia. We raised coal last year to the value of $30,000,000; our farm products were valued at $34,000,000, and our fisheries at $12,000,000. No other part of the Dominion, I believe, has such a variety of resources as we possess.

The question may be asked: In view of these considerations, why is our population diminishing, or apparently diminishing? In answer to that I would say that we have, apparently, been side-tracked. In the Maritime provinces we possess advantages that are not enjoyed by any of the other provinces. We have communications with all parts of the globe, and we have the best harbours in the world. What we lack is communication with the rest of the Dominion, because of the fact that we are discriminated against as far as railway rates are concerned.

In the Speech from the Throne there was a reference to immigration. I do not suppose that it would be wise for the provinces of Canada to compete with one another in attempting to secure immigrants. If the West requires farm labourers I am sure that we in the East would wish them to have all they need. In the Maritime provinces we require money as well as men in order to develop our resources. The speech from the Throne refers to the necessity of advertising the Dominion in those European countries from which we desire to attract immigrants. I would ask, in all fairness, that when that advertising takes place the Maritime provinces shall not be overlooked. I am afraid that the advertising of Canada in the past has been almost entirely confined to extolling the resources and capabilities of the West rather than of the East. In this matter the Maritime provinces only ask for a fair show.

I am not one of those who expect the government to realize prosperity for this country while the rest of the world is suffering. It seems to me that we have only to look at the conditions in Europe to realize that those conditions cannot be removed by a simple wave of the hand. No magic formula exists by which a statutory enactment will bring prosperity to any country in Europe or elsewhere. I am sure that if we pause and consider the markets of Europe, where the prices of the world's produce are fixed to a great extent, we shall understand why the price of wheat, and other commodities, has been so low in the Canadian West. In this connection let me refer to conditions in the county I represent. There in a small valley, some sixty miles long and four miles wide, we raised 2,000,000 barrels of apples for export last season. To-day the price of apples is not nearly as high as it was a year ago. Where does the fault lie? We export our apples to Great Britain—to London, to Liverpool, to Glasgow. Yet when the markets became depressed we did not look for any government action to maintain prices.

I have no wish to occupy the attention of the House unduly, and will therefore close

with an expression of my appreciation of the excellent speech made by the mover of the resolution for the adoption of the Address.

Mr. W. T. LUCAS (Victoria, Alta.): In view of the hour, it being nearly six o'clock, I think I may be permitted to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is probable that a large number of members will be absent this evening, and I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not rise particularly to object to the motion but to sever myself and those I represent from acquiescence in it. It is no desire of ours that these early adjournments shall take place. The government must assume the responsibility for them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have nothing to say except that I understood that the whips had agreed to have an early adjournment, but my right hon. friend takes exception to their action.

Mr. BOYS: There was no agreement made.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 6, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 3, respecting The Royal Guardians.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 4, respecting certain patents of Leonard Clayton Ridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 5, respecting certain patents of Charles A. Channell.—Mr. German.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Superintendent of Penitentiaries for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.—Sir Lomer Gouin.

Shipping Report of the Department of Customs and Excise; also report of the Department of Customs and Excise for the year 1922.—Hon. Mr. Bureau.

[Mr. Robinson.]

Report and financial statement of the Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research for the year ending March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 6, to amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain, please.

Mr. NEILL: This is the bill I introduced last year, but owing to its being near the end of the session it did not go beyond the first reading. To be brief, it presents a simple and yet complete and unassailable method by which the people of Canada can exclude any form of undesirable immigration that they desire without at the same time becoming involved in any dispute with any foreign nation or government whatsoever. In the past the trouble has been that by endeavouring to exclude any particular race or body of people by name, you immediately involved yourself in objections raised upon legal or treaty, or even sentimental grounds, by the government of the people you sought to exclude. That has always been the trouble. This bill gets round that situation without any quibble, trickery or freak legislation whatever.

Like most effective things, it is simple. The vital clauses are sections two and five. Section two provides that any immigrant from wheresoever he comes, wishing to enter Canada, shall first ask permission to do so from his country of origin. Section five prescribes that the Minister of Immigration on receiving the formal application shall arbitrarily and without question decide whether or not that particular immigrant shall be admitted. He has to give no reasons to the government under which the intending immigrant lives, and therefore there cannot be raised the objections I have alluded to.

I may mention that in New Zealand, which is always the forerunner of advanced legislation in almost any regard, this act has practically been in force for two years, and the Prime Minister of that country in introducing some report on its working made the comment that it had proved so superior to previous legislation of a similar nature—because hitherto in New Zealand they had proceeded along the lines of imposing an educational test—that he was thoroughly of opinion that its provisions would finally have to be adopted by every possession of the British Empire.

As I said, this bill hits at no one in particular, yet it is applicable to all, and can

involve us in no international troubles. It is a very important bill so far as the interests of this country are concerned, and I might go further and state that in respect to the ultimate destiny of British Columbia hardly any more important bill could be introduced, and therefore I earnestly submit it for the favourable consideration of the government and of this House.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Putnam for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Hoey, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Shaw, resumed from Monday, February 5.

Mr. W. T. LUCAS (Victoria, Alta.): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations in this debate it is my wish first to join with those who have preceded me in complimenting the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The manner in which those two gentlemen acquitted themselves reflected credit upon themselves and brought honour to this House and to the constituencies which they represent.

It is not my intention to take up the time of the House by making any extended remarks, but in view of the serious condition that prevails to-day throughout this whole vast Dominion, and believing as I do that we have responsible government in Canada, I feel it is our duty as representatives of the people to place the viewpoints of our various sections of the country before the government so that they may be fully seized of the true conditions and endeavour to meet them in framing their policies at this time.

In crossing over half a continent in proceeding to this capital city, I came in contact with a great many men from different parts of the country, and in every conversation that I entered into I was particularly struck with the serious note that was interjected in regard to present conditions in Canada. I am not a pessimist, but I believe we would have been a good deal better off in Canada if we had had a little more pessimism in our make-up, and if the persons known as "boosters" had been classified as undesirable and rejected at the gates of our Dominion. The true optimist, in my opinion, is the man who really sizes up the situation, who does not underestimate his enemy, and who makes provision accordingly.

I would like to comment upon what might be termed the unfair criticism that has been levelled at hon. members in this corner of the House. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) referred to it in the opening remarks of his address, and reference was made on different occasions last year to the Progressives leaning on the government. While I am speaking only for myself, I believe I express the view of the majority of hon. members in this corner of the House when I say that the people having at the last election placed the reins of government in the hands of new men, this new and untried government should be given a fair chance. Those who believe in British fair play will not condemn anyone without a trial. Personally I am not supporting the government, nor am I opposing it if they bring down legislation in the interests of the country.

I did not want to introduce this subject, but reference has been made to the matter of our organization, and we have been criticized by the press and in this House from the point of view of our representing a class. I am sorry that the two old parties which up to recently had represented this country since confederation did not deal with national questions in a national way, and thus compelled one class of the people to organize in order to present their views before this House—indeed, in order to protect their very existence. I say without fear of contradiction that the agricultural viewpoint was never fairly placed before the House until the Progressives sat here in large numbers.

Since confederation we have had, as I have already suggested, two parties, one known as the high tariff and the other as the low tariff party. In my recollection there has never been an election in the course of which the political football of the tariff has not been hauled out and made the main issue before the people. We were told last year that the government, being new in office, could not at that time make sweeping reductions in the tariff, but that they had taken a step in the right direction, and we were given to understand that when another session came around a further similar step would be taken. I was greatly disappointed, therefore, to note that in the Speech from the Throne no mention whatever was made of the tariff. Irrespective of what party has been in power in the past, we have been governed by the same national policy that was promulgated in the early days of confederation. The

argument was made last year—and it may not have been without force—that our attitude in respect to tariff might be influenced by the attitude of our neighbours to the south when they practically placed an embargo on our goods. I do not believe that we should go down on our knees to men who will not deal with us, but I do think that the government lost one of the greatest opportunities they ever had when they did not at that time make a greater increase in the preferential tariff with Great Britain. I have here a press despatch which shows who our best customer is. It is dated August 26, 1922, Canadian Press, and says:

> The United Kingdom was a better customer of Canada than the United States for the twelve months ending with July. The total exports of Canadian produce to the United States for that period were $304,000,000, and to Great Britain and Ireland were nearly $307,000,000. These figures are the monthly summary of trade issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

The American people have practically slammed the door in the face of the Canadian farmer, leaving us with only one market that is sound, stable and steady, and that market is Great Britain. In 1922 about seven-eighths of our farm produce found a market in that country, and I think it is the duty of the government to endeavour annually to increase that preferential trade with Great Britain by building up an export trade—in other words, the task of the Dominion government should be to find new ways of promoting our inward trade with Britain as well as our outward. If we buy twice as much from the Motherland we enable her to buy more of our farm products.

We heard a great deal in this House both this year and last in regard to farming conditions. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Robinson) last night said that he presumed that the House had to listen with patience to the tribulations of the farmer. I think it is the duty of every man who is acquainted with conditions in his own part of the country to place them before the House in their true light. I am not going into the subject of farming conditions in any detail, but I should like to place a few facts before the House regarding conditions in the province from which I come.

Of 80,000 farmers in Alberta it is said that 20,000 are insolvent at the present time. The minister administering the Drought Relief Act has 3,000 live accounts of farmers who have placed their financial affairs in his hands. This indebtedness averages $5,000 a quarter, or a total of $15,000,000. The interest average is between eight and ten per cent, and at eight per cent the yearly interest amounts to $1,200,000. There is a debt of $5,000,000 for feed and seed, and $2,000,000 in unpaid taxes. As I said before I shall not go into any detail in speaking of farming conditions, because others will no doubt add something during the course of this debate, and the House will in that way get a pretty fair view of the true conditions under which the Canadian farmer works.

Lest anyone should have the idea that these lamentable conditions exist only in the province of Alberta, I should like to give a few figures, taken from the Bureau of Statistics, in regard to those who pay income tax. I find that 93 per cent of the farmers of the entire Dominion who are assessed for income tax are in western Canada; 46 per cent of the whole are in Alberta, and 33 per cent of the whole in Saskatchewan. The figures by provinces are as follows: Ontario, 396; Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, 12; New Brunswick, 4; Quebec, 30; British Columbia, 79; Manitoba, 1,654; Saskatchewan, 1,084; and Alberta, 2,822.

To give an idea of the prices we have to pay for our manufactured goods in the West in the line of farm machinery, I will mention only one item. In 1911 we could purchase an eight-foot binder for $180; to-day the cost is $276. Those are the conditions in which we find ourselves. It is not that we are kicking so much about the prices of our goods coming down, as against the fact that the other fellow has not come down in the same proportion we have been forced to reduce.

One of the great questions before parliament and the country to-day is our immigration policy. It seems to me, in view of the conditions that now face us, it is rather a poor policy to invite other men to come in and work under the same difficulties. We hear a great deal about our immense national debt, and when you consider the combined Dominion, provincial and municipal debts, amounting to $4,000,000,000 of funded debt, and $200,000,000 of floating liabilities no one can deny that we are living under a great burden, and I would ask the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart)—for I notice that the government intend launching a big advertising scheme for immigrants—if they intend to include in their advertisements that statement of our debt and say that the men who come here must share that load with us. We have been spending millions in the last number of years to induce settlers to come to this country, and yet, acording to the statistics that have been compiled by our own

government department, in the last ten years over two millions of people have left Canada. Would it not seem to be a good business proposition, before spending further money to induce immigrants to come to this country first to spend a little in trying to find out why these people are leaving the country? If we pursued that policy, I do not think we should require the huge sums that have been spent to bring in new settlers. I was talking to a gentleman this fall about our immigration policy, and he told me that very often a quarter section near him becomes vacant, and as he has a brother in the Old Land his wife has often said to him, "Why don't you invite John to come and take up that quarter section, and have him for your neighbour?" But the man said: "I have lived in this country for the last twelve years, and my conscience will not let me advise my brother to leave a fairly good position over there and come here and put up with the conditions he would have to face at the present time." I say that if we can bring about a condition that will make our farmers prosperous and contented it will be better for this country than any immigration policy that any government can bring in.

Some startling figures were given yesterday as to the number of people who are leaving Canada. I have not compiled any for my constituency, but I can give the figures for the little village in which I live and the immediate vicinity. From that district 113 people left last fall, and among them are many of our good Canadian-born men whom I have known from boyhood and who understand farming conditions as well as any man. Yet they told me this fall they could not stay here any longer, that they had stayed up till then on the strength of promises that times were going to get better, but now they had to pull out. It is bad enough to lose the immigrants brought in from outside, but it is a much greater loss when our own Canadian-born boys, who have been reared and brought up in this country, and on whom we have spent our energies educating and raising them up to a position where they are ready to go out and take their place in life, leave this country for some other.

I see by the Speech from the Throne that the decennial revision of the Bank Act is due, and I trust that when the legislation comes down it will receive the very serious consideration of the committee that will deal with it and of the House. I am not a financial expert, but I have looked over some figures and I find that in October of 1920 our entire circulation was $249,000,000 and in the following three months it was reduced by $43,000,000—and remember, that was the period when in other years it was always felt that circulation had to be increased. By June of 1921, the circulation had decreased by another $10,000,000. It seems to me, when we consider that in 1904 we had 34 banks in this country, and that that number has dwindled to only 17, that our financial system is becoming centralized in the hands of a small group of men who are able to dictate the financial policies of this country to the detriment of the masses. It is often said that we have the soundest banking system in the world. But does anyone claim that there exists anywhere in the world a banking or financial system operating for the best interest of the average person? There are many problems confronting the people of Canada to-day, and for which they are seeking a solution. You will scarcely meet a man but will agree that those problems are difficult, that we are facing serious conditions; and I think it should be the duty of the government to endeavour honestly to try and find a solution for the existing difficulties and put into force the necessary remedy.

To my mind one of the remedies for the existing situation is the development of our transportation system in such a manner as will afford an easy exit for our products from this country. In that connection I would like to say that we in western Canada, especially in Alberta, are looking forward anxiously to the time when the western route for our grain, via Vancouver and the Panama canal shall be developed. Previous to 1921 very little of our grain was shipped by the Panama canal, in fact the movement was in the experimental stage. From January to October, 1921, a trifle over half a million bushels, to be exact 563,065 bushels, were shipped by that route, but during November and December of the same year the shipment was 565,699 bushels, or a total for 1921, of 1,128,764 bushels. At the end of June, 1922, that amount had increased to 7,101,802 bushels; and it is hoped that this year more than twice that amount will have been shipped by that western route through Vancouver. One of the criticisms of the Panama canal route that we hear is that there are no bottoms available at Vancouver to take care of traffic. In view of the figures I have placed before the House showing that tonnage has been available to take care of the already large shipments developed in such a short space of time,

I think it is evident that when the freight comes there will be tonnage to meet it. With further reference to the amount of grain shipped let me quote a brief item which I noted in the press the other day, and which reads as follows:

> Winnipeg, Man.—Seven thousand cars of grain have been loaded since September 1, 1922, for the western coast by the Canadian Pacific railway, it was announced here. This represents 10,234,000 bushels of grain for export from Vancouver.

Actually over ten million bushels of grain were shipped by the Canadian Pacific railway alone, so that I was well within the mark when I anticipated that the export of seven millions in the first half of 1922 would soon be doubled. And here I would like to say to the hon. members from British Columbia that I was glad to see them acting as a unit last year on one particular question. On the subject of oriental immigration they forgot their politics and worked unitedly together. I would like to see the same unity exist in respect to this particular matter. If they are in earnest in desiring to develop this western route, and at the same time develop their own province, I hope they will assist us in seeking to increase the British preference so that when we ship grain to Great Britain, those vessels may return loaded with merchandise.

In further consideration of the western route I would like to cite some of the comparative grain rates that are in force at the present time. The average rate from Alberta to both Vancouver and Fort William is around 27 cents per hundred pounds. So that, under the present tariff, the rates to Vancouver and Fort William are on the same basis. From Vancouver to the United Kingdom the average ocean rate is 25 cents per bushel; the all-rail route from Fort William to St. John or Halifax is 35½ cents per hundred pounds, or 21 cents per bushel; the ocean rate from Atlantic ports to the United Kingdom averages 15 cents per bushel, or a total rate via the eastern route of 36 cents, showing a difference in favour of the Vancouver route of 11 cents per bushel. Now, previous to this year the lake-and-rail rate from Fort William to Montreal averaged about 14 cents per bushel; but owing to the grain blockade on the lakes this fall that channel was denied us and we paid the all-rail rate. In any case we pay that during the winter time, and the fact that Vancouver is a port which is open all the year round should make it apparent to the government that this subject should be given the most serious consideration at the earliest date possible, in order that when our crop has to be shipped next year we may be able to reap some advantage from the reduced rates.

Another matter that interests us out there very greatly indeed is the differential that exists on the mountain freight haul. Now, the people of Canada have assumed the control of our National Railway system. Whether we consider eastern Canada or western Canada, we are all assuming the burden of that great debt, and under the circumstances I do not see why the people living in western Canada, taking the territory from Alberta to the Pacific, should be paying a double burden in the shape of that differential rate to the coast. If that rate were equalized with the rest it would mean a further reduction of about 4 cents a bushel in the cost of shipping our grain. We are quite well aware that we cannot raise the price of our grain in Europe. Therefore we must follow the example of any business firm which, when it finds the price of its goods limited, immediately endeavours to reduce its overhead cost in getting its goods to the market. A great deal has been said in this House about reducing the high cost of production, and one of the things that would be of the greatest possible advantage to the farmers in the West would be some assistance in reducing the overhead expenses entailed in getting our products to their ultimate destination.

Another remedy, and perhaps one of the most effective in bringing about a change for the better, would be placing the administration of government on a strictly business basis. We have heard a great deal about economy, and it is undoubtedly one of the greatest needs of the country to-day. But how are we going to effect economy unless we work along busines lines? Take the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other large corporations which have been conducted with so much success in this country. What has been at the bottom of their success? Has it not been the fact that they have been conducted along sound business lines? We know very well that unless that system is adopted any business will sooner or later go to destruction. Whilst talking on the subject of economy and the conduct of the affairs of government on business lines, it seems to me it would be hard to expect economy under present conditions when our governments appear to be out for political rather than for business efficiency.

Since confederation we have had what is known as the National Policy, and I am free to admit that at that time, as the country was young, it was perhaps the best policy that could have been adopted for Canada. But we must admit that times are changing,

that we have developed into a vast agricultural country, and what Canada needs to-day is a new national policy that will not only meet one section but will meet all the interests within the country. Just as any business firm would do, we have to change our tactics to meet the changed conditions. We hear of a great many schemes being advised in many parts of the world to-day, and in fact there are so many that we often become a little alarmed and scarcely know what to do. We find that many sensible and intelligent people very often become alarmed and refuse to consider these schemes. I think when we look back over our history we will realize that we have always been changing, and that we have had to make changes to meet those changing conditions. Our life, to my mind, is like a mighty river flowing to the sea. Sometimes its course will be across wide level prairies and its advance so easy and gradual as to be almost imperceptible; again, it tumbles over rocks and waterfalls, and dashes up great clouds of foam and spray. So it is with this river of civilization. For generations, our ancestors may at times have appeared to be standing still, but they were never standing still. They were gradually adapting themselves to changed conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was born and brought up in Canada, and I think I have always been led to believe that we have had two parties in this country. But, as I stated before, irrespective of which party has been in power, we have had the same policy of protection administered to the people of the country. Owing to the very serious conditions that we are confronted with at present, I think this is the time for plain speaking, and that we should come out and face that serious situation as true Canadians. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), towards the close of last session, stated that the time had come when a show-down would have to be made. The people of Canada elected a new government last year on the platform on which they went before the country, and they are anxiously waiting to see how that government is living up to its platform. If you intend to keep the people of Canada along the old party lines, with the prejudices and the hatreds that we have had in the past, you have got to eliminate the educational system we are working under to-day. We have a compulsory educational system, whereby we are forced to educate our children. Are you going to educate the child to develop his brain, and then tell him he is not to use his brain? To my mind, under our old party system with its prejudices, there was very little intelligence used in our voting; we were either Liberals or Conservatives—our grandfathers and forefathers were the same. But we are living in a different age and the people of to-day are thinking as they never thought before. If any government think they can go before the people of Canada to-day with one platform, and come down to this House and carry out a different platform, they are vastly mistaken. I have heard it stated by our public men—and I have seen it in the press—that there is a great deal of hypocrisy in our government. I believe with the hon. member for Brome that the time for a show-down has come. I think that the amendment which the hon. member from Springfield (Mr. Hoey) has placed before this House is going to force a show-down that will make hon. members in this House place themselves in their true position.

The right hon. Prime Minister has done a great deal of talking throughout the country in regard to the rights of the common people. He will have an opportunity to declare himself and to show where his interests lie. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), who comes from those western provinces and knows the true conditions out there, will also have an opportunity of placing himself on record and of stating whether he is in favour of the reduction of the tariff, as we have always been led to believe he was. In regard to the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin)—being a director—

Mr. GAUVREAU: Be careful, now.

Mr. LUCAS: Being a director of many large companies, I presume he will have no interest in the common people anyway.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Very small interest.

Mr. LUCAS: In regard to my hon. friends to my right, I have a hazy recollection that I heard an hon. member say not many hours ago that they were dead.

Mr. STEVENS: False information.

Mr. LUCAS: If that is a fact, I think the least the hon. members can do in this House is to perform the last funeral rites to that "dilapidated" portion of a once great party.

I am speaking in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I say that conditions are serious in this Canada of ours, and I trust every member will come out in his true light and place himself in the position in which the country expects to find him. What Canada needs to-day is a bold statesmanship and men who will come out and fight for the

same principles in this House as they advocate before the people. In conclusion let me say:

> God give us men! A time like this demands
> Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will;
> Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
> Men who can stand before a demagogue,
> And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
> Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
> In public duty, and in private thinking;
> For while the interests with their thumb-worn creeds,
> Their large professions and their little deeds—
> Mingle in selfish strife, lo, Freedom weeps,
> Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South & Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish, in common with others who have spoken in this debate, to congratulate very heartily the mover and seconder of the Address. I have listened on seven or eight occasions to persons who have performed this duty and I in no way derogate from their ability when I say that I have never heard it more ably done than by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume). I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) on his elevation to the position of leader of a great political party in this country. I wish to congratulate the Progressive party on their choice. They have made a good one. It has, I think, been the pride of the two old parties in this country that they have always chosen from amongst them the very best men to lead them in a public and political way. Looking back over the history of this country to confederation, I must say that both the old political parties have succeeded amply well, and the Progressive party to-day has succeeded as well as either of the old political parties have in the past.

It has been suggested by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this motion that the Speech from the Throne does not contain enough. I am, however, one of those who think that if we do our duty by what the Speech from the Throne contains and do our duty well, we shall be here this year as late as we were last year. The Speech from the Throne suggests that unemployment is not so rampant to-day as it was a year ago. That is pre-eminently true of the part of Canada from which I come. One year ago distress, unemployment and practically starvation constituted the condition of the eastern part of Nova Scotia. To-day, I am proud to say that any man who wishes to work in the coal regions or the steel works in the county of South Cape Breton may have employment. In some cases it is true the wage is not large, but employment is to be had. On the 3rd of this month this news item appeared in the columns of the Sydney Daily Post:

> In conversation with Robert Ingraham, manager of the local employment office, the Post learns that almost every unskilled labourer in the city has work.

And it goes on to say that there is a scarcity of that kind of labour. I am not as familiar with conditions in other parts of Canada, but I believe unemployment in this country is not as great as it was one year ago.

One matter which appears in the Speech from the Throne must be of great encouragement to the army of consumers in this country and that is the promise therein contained that legislation will be brought down to keep persons who deal in foods and, indeed, generally in what consumers require, from enhancing the prices of those commodities. In Canada, there has always been a tendency—and I do not think this tendency pertains alone to what we sometimes call mergers, trusts and combines—amongst wholesalers and retailers to keep up the prices of the necessities of life. I hope, when this bill comes down and is enacted into law, that law will be able to lay its hand not only upon what we are pleased to call the combines, but wholesalers and retailers as well. I hope the legislation will be effective. We have had such legislation in the past, and I am sorry to say that it has not been the benefit to this country which many of us were led to believe it would be. Such legislation, in order to be made effective, must be enforced under government control. It must not be left to the say-so of a man here, there and everywhere, whether or not a person shall be indicted, if you will, punished, if you will, because he has broken the law. It is a somewhat different law from the ordinary criminal law of this country and yet our people, our legislators pay criminal lawyers to punish persons who have committed a common assault; they appoint and pay well criminal lawyers, the best in the land, to indict and to see that persons are punished who commit small, petty thefts. It is therefore, the duty of this government or some other government to see to it that persons who unduly enhance the prices of the necessaries of the ordinary consumer should have criminal lawyers at their heels to see that they get the meed of justice that is due them.

With regard to the matter of immigration, the Minister of the Interior, (Mr. Stewart) has not yet announced his immigration policy

in this House and it may, perhaps, be a little premature for me to say very much upon that subject. There are, however, a few comments and a few impressions which I wish to make. I am one of those who do not think that we should allow free entrance into this country of every Scotchman, Irishman, Englishman or American who, perchance, wishes to come to our shores. I am not one of those either who say that we should turn away from our shores every Austrian, German, or inhabitant of one of the southern or central parts of Europe who wishes to come here. If English immigrants, Scotch immi-
4 p.m. grants, Irish immigrants, American immigrants are good, let them in; and if we do get a fairly good type of immigrants from the central part of Europe who will develop into virile Canadians, as such immigrants have done, let them in under the same conditions as the people of Anglo-Saxon countries. Much has been said regarding the advertising and publicity work which a government must do in order to induce people to come to our shores. I am afraid that in the past the mistake that was made by both governments in this country was that there was too much advertising and too much publicity of the wrong nature. I believe it is a mistake for government agents to go to any country and paint conditions in Canada as blessed. I believe that facts and not fiction should be told the intending immigrant. I fear that in very many cases the imagination of our publicity agents in foreign countries runs away with their better judgment, and that they paint the conditions of this country in too glowing colours. It is unfortunate that in the earlier days people were enticed to this country under false information. While I say that, Mr. Speaker, I also say that it is a mistake on the part of Canadians to spread broadcast the impression that conditions to-day are so bad with us and the tide running so low that we should not have any immigration at all. The type of immigrant that the government would rather have to-day, I presume, is he who will settle on our vacant lands or who who will hire himself out to a farmer.

Some time ago I happened to see a resolution which was passed by the East Edmonton District Association of the United Farmers of Alberta. With the resolution itself I have little fault to find, because I do not know the conditions of the Edmonton district sufficiently well to criticise their action. However, I shall read the resolution:

> Whereas, we believe that the occupation of our vacant land by prosperous settlers is most desirable, the prosperous settler being the best immigration agent, and,
>
> Whereas the economic and financial burdens on this, the basic industry, are such that it is impossible for farmers to continue to carry on under existing conditions,
>
> We therefore wish to point out the folly of any immigration project until the aforesaid burdens be removed, because; first, any large influx of settlers would but tend to intensify for those already on the land the conditions now existing; and, second, we consider it a gross injustice to those who may be induced to come.

That resolution on its face seems to me to be all right, provided the conditions are as painted. But, Mr. Speaker, that resolution was sent to the Weekly Scotsman, a newspaper published in Edinburgh, Scotland, with this letter attached from a gentleman in the city of Edmonton, but I do not know his name. The letter reads, in part:

> I should like to bring to your attention the following resolution of the East Edmonton District Association of the United Farmers of Alberta, as it may serve as a reliable guide to anyone thinking of coming to western Canada in the spring.
>
> Speaking as a farmer myself, I advise all to stay away, as farmers are producing everything at a loss and are only staying on the land because they are too poor to move elsewhere. The reports in the papers of great crops, etc., are only put there in the interests of the grain speculators.

I do not think I am going too far, Sir, when I brand that letter as a gross libel on western Canada in particular and on Canada as a whole. The farmers of western Canada are not raising everything at a loss, and they would not all move out if they had the means of doing so. There are thousands and thousands of farmers in the West who are comfortably situated—as comfortably situated as is the capitalist in Montreal or Toronto. Therefore, I have no hesitation in branding such propaganda as a gross libel upon the fair name and status of Canada.

Mr. KELLNER: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? I should like to ask him what line of farming is paying a profit in Canada to-day, and also where those prosperous farmers are located.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know enough of western Canada to tell my hon. friend where there are prosperous farmers. I can tell him that in a twenty-five mile circle around Winnipeg he will find the most comfortably situated farmers in the world; I can tell him that stretching from the international boundary line to the city of Regina and from Regina to ten miles north of Saskatoon he will find the same class of farmers. I am not so well acquainted with farming conditions in the great province of Alberta, but I can tell him that there, too, he will find comfortably situated farmers. Surely in a country where every twelfth man owns a

motor car, such as is the case in the province of Saskatchewan, there must be some farmers who could get out if they wanted to—they could readily use their motor cars. I find in a report issued by the government of the province last fall the following:

> Saskatchewan now has one car for every twelve of its population, according to provincial government statistics. The total amount collected in license fees for the past ten years is reported as $4,226,642, while for the same period there has been spent by the government from revenue alone $6,918,517 in providing for the construction and maintenance of main market roads, ferries and revenue bridges. During the same period the provincial government had expended on capital account on main roads, bridges, etc., a total of $7,870,514.

Here is a province which in ten years has spent approximately $16,000,000 on improvements to its highways; here is a province which in the past decade has paid into the treasury $4,226,642 in automobile license fees; here is a province in which every twelfth man owns a motor car. And yet the contributor to the Weekly Scotsman says that every person in the three prairie provinces would get out if he had an opportunity of doing so. I have no doubt that the farmers of the prairie provinces have probably more difficulties to contend with than any other class of people in the Dominion. It is a new country, but it is a splendid country. It has perhaps been retarded somewhat in the past for lack of transportation facilities, and it is to-day suffering agony —may I say?—because the transportation rates are not what they ought to be. But notwithstanding all that, it must never be forgotten that our forefathers, especially in the eastern provinces, went into the woods, hewed down the trees, and raised their potatoes in the burnt lands, and their descendants forty or fifty years later were able to send their sons to college—pioneers from whom have sprung one of the most virile races not only on the North American continent but in the world—these men met and overcame every discouragement and difficulty, and remembering this, I believe that our friends should not be discouraged by the reverses of a year or two and lose faith in the prospects of the great Canadian West.

The thought has occurred to me that we may have in one of the present government departments some means by which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) may be assisted in his immigration policy. This thought is not, perhaps, original with myself. I have had it in mind for some time, but I see that a gentleman who spoke some days ago at a dinner in this city expressed a similar view. In the past, as I understand it, the great difficulty in bringing immigrants into this country, especially to the Canadian West, has been the fact that they were simply thrown on the prairies; they were not told that certain land in Alberta was suitable only for grazing, that certain land in Saskatchewan was suitable only for a particular kind of farming, that certain land in Manitoba was suitable only for another kind of farming. In short, they were strangers in a strange land. I say that we have in a department of the government the means by which at least this difficulty may be overcome. We have in that department persons whom we should send to the old country as our agents—persons who are good farmers, and not merely able to talk glibly and smoothly with a view to inducing immigrants to come to our shores. I am referring particularly to the Soldier Settlement Board. That board, anybody to the contrary notwithstanding, has done and is doing a splendid work for Canada. Their work must continue for some years, and I do not think the government can do better than engage the services of members of the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board, especially of the field men, in connection with any policy of inducing immigrants to come to western Canada. My experience has been wholly in the East, where we have a large number of the field men of the Soldier Settlement Board, every one of them a practical farmer. These men know the soil of the various sections of the Maritime provinces as no other men know it. In most cases they are graduates of our best agricultural colleges; and I have no doubt that the same is true of the men who have been operating in the central and western provinces. These men we still have; might we not use their services? Send them to the United States and the old country—and by the old country I do not mean England, Scotland and Ireland alone; I mean Europe or any place where good immigrants can be got. Send them over there and let them explain the conditions of farming in this country as I am afraid our present agents there are unable to do. Then, when the immigrants come to our western country, field men of the Soldier Settlement Board can meet them and explain the different conditions in the various sections. If that is done we shall not have the trouble that we had from 1900 to 1910, when people who were brought here, hoping that in a few years they would become rich on the western prairies, were simply thrown into the wilderness of the West, in complete ignorance of the conditions existing there. The result was discontent, and if the same system is now followed the

same discontent will be produced, and in the end there will be the same discouragement and the same emigration from the country.

The question before the House, Mr. Speaker, is, first, the motion of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam); then comes the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and then the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). The amendment to the amendment simply asserts that the House should view with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt and make every possible effort to economize. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who will have any fault to find with that amendment to the amendment. So far as the public debt is concerned, which goes into the billions, the question should be asked, have we assets to overbalance those billions? If we have, then the public debt is not such a very bad thing. As to economy, there are two kinds of economy, true and false.

I noticed on the order paper a day or two ago a notice of motion which indicates that the government proposes to expend $5,000,000 on the improvement of Vancouver harbour. Now, that is a large sum of money, and there are people who will say that that is not economy. But I ask my farmer friends from the West, I ask hon. members from British Columbia on both sides of the House, what they think on that subject. Is that sound economy, or is it false economy? Undoubtedly it is sound economy, and they will answer, that better facilities will be afforded on the Pacific coast for shipping their grain around by the Panama canal and thence to Europe. I say, therefore, that no government should be alarmed at this continuous cry of economy, economy—so long as our economy goes in the right direction. Last year the government undertook an expenditure of, I think, $5,000,000 on Quebec harbour —a large amount of money. But, surely that is true economy, because such expenditure will result in better transportation facilities for our products. Years ago the Conservative government spent millions of dollars in the equipment of the harbours of Halifax and St. John, thus making it possible for the farmer, the fisherman, the lumberman, all classes in the country, to send their products to foreign lands in the best, easiest and cheapest way. So that the government should, to my mind, look after the public services even at the cost of adding a little more to the national debt. They should not let the magnificent harbours of Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, Halifax or St. John go into disrepair because, forsooth, the expenditure of money upon them adds a million dollars to the public debt. The government should not, through the fear of adding a few million dollars to the national debt or because they are afraid of the bogey of economy, refrain from expending large amounts of money on new undertakings which are for the national good.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a problem in this country which I think the government should do something at the present time to solve. I refer to the fuel problem in this country. I am sorry that I have no really effective solution to offer myself. This present year we are told by our good friends the Americans that we can depend upon receiving only a certain number of tons of coal, and if that amount does not satisfy our demands, then we and our children may freeze. I say that is an unfortunate position for a nation such as Canada to be placed in, and it is one that the government of this country assisted by all parties should tackle and attempt to solve.

We have great coal resources in Canada. Our coal mines in the Maritime provinces are illimitable; in the West there are also magnificent resources; and I believe that they are sufficient to fill all the fuel demands of the country. Is the problem so great that it cannot be solved? I fear that we Canadians are sometimes led astray by ourselves. We are too prone to criticise conditions in our own country and to enlarge upon the beauties and fine conditions in other countries. Four years ago, if you were to ask a citizen of Ottawa to throw a scuttle-full of soft Nova Scotia or New Brunswick coal into his grate, he would look at you and say, I suppose: "Do you want an explosion in my house? Do you want the beautiful faces of my children to be blackened and besmirched that their mother will not recognize them when she comes in from ski-ing?" There is a tendency in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, to disparage the qualities of western bituminous coal and of our soft maritime coal. However, a little advertising is going on. I see my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) smiles, and I am bound to say it is a smile of pleasure. To-day this building in which we are seated and all the surrounding public buildings, which are heated by a common heating plant, are being heated by New Brunswick coal from Minto. Are we any less comfortable? Are our faces less clean than formerly because we are using maritime coal, instead of the American anthracite which we cannot get?

The Public Works department is also doing good work, and has been doing it for some years, though not very many, I am sorry to say, in introducing bituminous coal for heating the public buildings as far east as the city of Ottawa, and this maritime coal was selected after very close competition with American soft coal. The Public Works department gave the contract to the Minto mines, and that was made possible through the adjustment of the freight rates that was made. If a campaign was undertaken to show the people of this country that maritime and western soft coal is just as good, if not so clean, as American anthracite, and much cheaper, we should have solved to a large extent the fuel problem in this country. I see that the government has appointed a commission to investigate this fuel problem, and I hope that it will arrive at some sensible solution. It is undoubtedly a problem which should be settled, and if it be a political problem which could be put into the hands of the present Board of Railway Commissioners, the government at Ottawa should tackle it. Freight rates must be brought down in this country in order to solve the fuel problem. It will be practically impossible for us ever to be safe as regards fuel until we are self-supporting in that respect. I am one of those Canadians, Mr. Speaker, who do not wish to be at the mercy of a foreign nation, however friendly that nation may be, for the bite that I eat or the coal or wood that I burn to keep myself and my family warm.

The Welsh miner is taking advantage of the conditions in Canada to-day. Of course, I would far rather see the Welsh miner making inroads upon the coal trade of Canada than the coal operators of some other country. A few days ago there returned to England Sir D. R. Llewellyn, one of the greatest coal owners in Wales. He had just made an extended business tour in this country to investigate fuel conditions, and I understand that as a result of his investigation immense depots are to be built at Montreal and other places in Canada for the handling of Welsh coal. They have transportation down to a nicety, because he reports that on the question of freightage coal could be carried from British Channel ports to Canada and the New England States for $2.50, as against $4 for transport from Pennsylvania.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the government of this country, assisted by the representatives of the people in parliament, could undertake no more pressing problem in Canada to-day than this one of our fuel requirements and how they may be supplied. No better service could be done by this parliament for the present and future generations than to give some of its time during the present session to the solution of this problem.

The standing committees of this House include a committee on mines and minerals. I have been a member of that committee for seven years, but the remarkable thing is that during that period it has never met except for organization purposes. And yet that committee, among other subjects, deals with one of the very essentials of Canadian life. Might it not be a wise thing for the government to consider the advisability of placing before the Committee on Mines and Minerals, as now constituted or otherwise, the question of a fuel supply for Canada? I advance this suggestion in all earnestness, believing that it deserves a fair meed of consideration at the hands of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken somewhat longer than I intended. The hon. member who preceded me—

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the hon. member leaves this question, which is a very important one, may I ask him to give the House his views regarding the possibility of preventing the stoppage of mining through strikes. I ask my hon. friend, could a method be devised for overcoming this difficulty?

Mr. CARROLL: That is a big problem, and I am not going to tackle it just now. Strikes have been resorted to in this country for many years, and I have no doubt there will continue to be strikes long after my hon. friend and myself have passed away. I agree with the hon. member that the problem is a serious one. I agree that there are times in certain industrial fields in this country where strikes do some good. I also know there have been times when strikes in other industrial fields in this country have ruined operators and men alike. I am not against the strike as a weapon in the hands of men to better their conditions in life. Neither am I against the strike as a weapon for any legitimate purpose for which the various unions my think proper to invoke it. However, the question is a big one, and I shall not undertake to discuss it any further at the present time.

The hon. member who preceded me referred to the wants, the ambitions, and the aspirations of the farmers in this country, and assured us that these were never looked after or considered until a few years ago, when they themselves undertook to organize a political party. I am bound to say that the farmers themselves best know their own requirements

and how to fulfil their own ambitions and aspirations. Nevertheless, I would point out to my farmer friends that the Laurier government went down to defeat in 1911 fighting the battles of the farmer. I am also bound to say that when we talk of the East being against the West, and the West against the East, that was not the condition during the reciprocity campaign of 1911. The Liberals carried every seat in the island of Cape Breton, which is an industrial, coal mining hive, notwithstanding the fact that the reciprocity agreement made provision for the reduction of the duty on coal. At that time we fought the battles of the farmers of the West and of the farmers of the East—we fought for the farmers generally throughout the country. I have no doubt that to-day the farmers, organized as they are, are well able to fight their own battles, but where are they going for better markets? A year ago the country to the south erected a tariff wall against the products of this country, a tariff wall which is absolutely prohibitive so far as the products of the farmers are concerned. Where are our farmer friends going for larger markets? They cannot get into the United States at the present time; and surely they do not ask us as free born Canadians to let down the tariff walls of Canada at a time when our products are debarred free entrance into the country to the south? Speaking solely for myself I consider that the government have undertaken to solve this problem by the best method which lies in their power. Our neighbours to the south met us with high tariffs. The Minister of Finance went to Washington a year ago, but there was no use in dickering any longer, the Canadian people having turned down the reciprocity pact. Accordingly members of this government crossed the seas to Europe, hoping to find there some solution that would afford relief to the farmers of the West as well as of the Canadian people generally. There lies the solution of the problem with respect to wider markets if wider markets we need.

The question of whether there should be a reduction in the tariff is one for the government of this country to consider. I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues will be able to advance adequate reasons why no mention has been made of the tariff in the Speech from the Throne, but I wish to say this: As good Canadians, as broad-minded Canadians, as Canadians who have at heart the interest of our country as a whole, we should unite in every possible way in order to find a solution for the problems which confront us. For only in that way may we hope to fulfil the aspirations of those who made Confederation possible. In that way we shall best develop this country and make it a happy and prosperous land for our children and our children's children. In that way likewise we shall be doing the work we were sent to this parliament to perform.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, at the very outset of the Speech from the Throne His Excellency the Governor General refers to his visit to the Yukon territory, the constituency I have the honour to represent in this House. I am sure it will be very satisfactory to Yukoners to learn from this public declaration that Their Excellencies retain pleasant memories of that distant country, and to know that the willing efforts of the people of Yukon to make the viceregal visit an interesting and comfortable one evidently met with success. I can assure you, Sir, that the keen appreciation displayed by Their Excellencies in the somewhat unique conditions under which the people up there are living, in the history of the country, and in the hopes and plans of the people for the future, won the hearts of all with whom they came in contact. The name of General Byng, Commander of the Canadian Corps, national hero, was already a household word in Yukon; but by meeting Lord and Lady Byng, the man and the woman, hundreds of Yukoners were able to understand and to share the admiration in which the distinguished soldier is held by so many thousands of Canadians who served under his leadership.

I join with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) in regret that the Speech from the Throne is of necessity so barren of any statement of substantial achievement by the government in the improvement of Canadian affairs. I cannot say that I am very much surprised at that necessary absence, because I am not one of those who expected that a change of government would usher in the millennium. Coming into this House for the first time as a member at the last session of parliament, at a time when industrial conditions in Yukon were in a most unsettled condition, when the great industry of mining was in a transitory state, when new developments undertaken up there were of somewhat doubtful results, I hesitated to call the attention of members of this House to that part of the country, and I think members of the government with whom it was my duty to negotiate for assistance in development

will bear me out that I did not paint to them a too glowing picture of the prospects of that country. To-day, I am happy to say, the situation is different. I can speak with assurance that the existence of a very highly mineralized area has been demonstrated; no failures have been encountered. Everywhere that development work was undertaken in that area rich high-grade permanent mines have been established and the returns have been highly remunerative. The population of that section of the country has greatly increased and the general population of Yukon Territory is also increasing. Prosperity is returning and the people are filled with an optimism for the future. That is the condition of affairs in at least one section of Canada.

Now just a few words to give a general idea of that country. I find that the members of the House of Commons are, after all, just representative Canadians, and that the average Canadian has a very hazy idea of conditions in that northern section of Canada. That is not to be wondered at, in view of the unwarranted quantity of slush that has been published on the subject, some of it very readable, highly entertaining and unduly sentimental, having somewhat the same effect in conveying ideas of the country as the eloquent language used by the mover of the Address here a few days ago in regard to the Acadians and their unfortunately necessary removal from the land of Evangeline. Doubtless those and similar ideas were founded on or greatly influenced by the picture so beautifully painted in that poem of Longfellow's, written, in my opinion, on false premises and by no means conveying a correct impression of actual conditions in that place at that time. Beautiful to look at, but not quite accurate. Many people associate the Yukon only with the Klondike gold excitement of a quarter of a century ago and think of it as a land of icebergs and fearful hardships. Most of those yarns of hardship were told by early gold-hunters, and more recently by globe trotters seeking to attract attention to themselves. I will give the House an instance. In 1914 at Dawson I met a lady going through the country on the ordinary tourist's trip. She had come up the coast in one of those palatial coast steamers operated by the Canadian Pacific Company. She had crossed the pass in an up-to-date observation car and come down the river in a very comfortable passenger steamer. She was well received and accepted the hospitality of the people. In 1917 I heard her addressing the Royal Canadian Institute in London, and I was astonished to hear her state that she was the first white woman who ever made that trip, as late as 1914 and when in fact thousands of women had preceded her to that country. She told of the perils of crossing the pass. She did not mention the observation car, but she stated that on going ashore at the very peaceful town of Port Simpson she was obliged to fly for her life to escape from hostile Indians. Of course such a thing never occurred; you could not blame the Indians if it had. I have told this story just to show how these yarns are started. The Yukon is the extreme northwestern point of Canada. Its northern boundary is the Arctic ocean, on the south British Columbia, on the east the Northwest Territory and on the west Alaska, that long strip or pan handle of Alaska that cuts us and a large portion of British Columbia off from the sea. The Yukon has no seaboard except the Arctic ocean. Everything taken in or out of the Yukon must pass through Alaska either through the port of Skagway at the head of Lynn canal, that wonderful arm of the Pacific ocean, or around by the coast of Alaska to the Bering sea and up the Yukon river from the port of St. Michaels. Owing to international bonding privileges, we have not suffered up to date any great inconvenience because of having to pass goods through the United States territory, but at the present time a rather awkward situation exists in that regard.

Yukon handles the liquor question much as it is handled in the province of Quebec, or, perhaps, more correctly stated, on the same system as British Columbia. It abolished the bar; it allows no private sales of liquor. The local government sell it all, and do not permit liquor of any kind to be sold in the hotels or restaurants. They differ from British Columbia in that they are willing to stick to the goods of the Old Country distillers. They do not try to put off on the public any home brew of the local commission as liquor. The United States interpretation of the Volstead act prohibits the transportation of liquor across any part of the United States, consequently they block the Canadian government in Yukon from taking liquor into that part of Canada. It is an arbitrary stand not taken for cause so far as Yukon is concerned, for the liquors were imported from British dealers, unloaded from British ships direct to the railway cars and within three or four hours crossed the Alaskan pan handle into Canada again. There has been no illicit dealing in Alaska from those shipments, and the United States' laws have been strictly com-

plied with. How long the United States intend to maintain that, in my opinion unreasonable, position, we cannot tell. That remains to be seen, but I am in hopes that this government will be able to induce them to recede from their present position.

The area of Yukon is about 200,000 square miles, and I should like hon. members to note that, of that area of 200,000 square miles, only about one-third has been explored. Of that one-third, only about one-half has been prospected for mineral, and from that one-sixth of that territory, we have produced to-day over $200,000,000 in gold, or almost one-half of the total output of gold from Canada. When you realize that that amount comes from that small area, you will understand what wonderful possibilities there are for the future in those thousands of miles which show indications of mineral deposits.

The Yukon, as such, was created by act of parliament in 1898. Its boundaries were defined; it was cut out from the Northwest Territories. The Yukon Act became its constitution. The country was given a court and a local government. The court had three judges, the three sitting in appeal from judgments of any one of the three. Later that was changed and the court reduced to one judge, appeals now being made to the Court of Appeal of the province of British Columbia. The local government was composed of a commissioner and council. At first the council was appointive, consisting of the senior judge, the officer commanding the mounted police and other officials. The commissioner is directly under the authority of the Minister of the Interior of the federal government. In time the appointive council was done away with and an elective council introduced. The council has practically the same legislative powers as the legislatures of the provinces. It has no cabinet; the executive power is entirely in the hands of the commissioner. During the war, for purposes of economy, the membership of the council was cut down to three members, although it should be four, more properly to represent the whole country. I understand the government has that change under consideration, and I strongly recommend its adoption. During the war, the office of commissioner was discontinued, the duties of that office being vested in the gold commissioner or chief mining recorder without additional pay, and this arrangement still continues. The official residence formerly maintained in the territory for the accommodation of the commissioner was closed up during the war, and it remains closed. The number of officials was materially reduced and offices were co-ordinated. All this was done in the interest of economy and to reduce expenditure of public money and the cost of government.

The climate of Yukon has always been a fruitful source of story telling. We really have there about five months of warm, bright summer weather. The rivers open early in May and do not close again until late in October or early in November. For three months of the summer we have continuous daylight and for two of those months we have almost continuous sunlight. This accounts to some extent for what is considered the remarkable speed of plant growth; but when one considers the quantity of sunlight to which a plant is exposed, the speed of growth is not so wonderful. The winter season on the whole is not so bad. Each winter we get a few weeks of extremely cold weather with the thermometer down to about sixty below; but that does not last and, indeed, some winters we escape the extreme cold weather altogether. The snow fall is light.

5 p.m.

The Yukon is almost exclusively a mining country, everything else, including agriculture, depending upon the mining industry. It is true that agriculture can be successfully pursued, but that depends entirely on the success of mining. The country is so situated that there is no possibility of raising agricultural products for export; therefore you are limited by your local market. All sorts of vegetables can be grown splendidly. Wheat, oats and barley may be ripened, cattle are successfully bred and raised for beef; hogs locally bred and fattened on locally grown barley can be had on the market, and during the past year farmers have undertaken the experiment of sheep raising. Horses are wintered out, and without any artificial feeding or artificial shelter come through in good shape in the spring. That cannot be done in eastern Canada.

The Yukon is not looked on as a country to settle in; but a great number of splendid families have been raised there, and fine healthy children have been given their primary education, up to and including examinations for entrance to the universities. Upon entering the universities or going into the various walks of life in other parts of the world, they are found to be as well equipped with education as other young people of their ages. Good schools have been maintained in Yukon from the very earliest days.

Yukon, as a big game country, is unsurpassed; it abounds with moose, caribou, mountain sheep, bears and, unfortunately, wolves. The fur trade is an important factor and large shipments of marten, mink, fox, ermine, otter, wolf and bear are made annually. Game birds are plentiful and myriads of migratory birds breed there every year. Fur-farming is assuming important proportions. Fur-farming struck the territory as a fad as it did other parts of Canada; fabulous prices were paid for breeders, and some investors were stung. But it is down now to a business proposition and some people have persevered with intelligence and are now producing annually good silver-gray and black pelts at a handsome profit.

As I have said, however, mining is the chief industry, the back-bone of the country, the industry to be fostered and encouraged. It had its hard knocks during the war. A very interesting statement was made yesterday by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) in regard to the reduced purchasing price of a bushel of grain. I could give just as interesting and, I think, a more startling statement as to the reduced purchasing power of an ounce of gold on account of war and general conditions. The cost of everything used in mining went up 100 per cent, and in some cases more during the war. The value of gold, the price of gold remained stationary; it did not go up with that of other commodities. Consequently, the miner was hard hit; but those conditions are changing, and prosperity in the mining business is returning.

With the news of the big discovery of gold in Yukon in 1896, thousands of people rushed in there from all parts of the world. There was plenty of gold; it was easy to get by the most primitive methods. The wilderness was transformed into a hive of industry. Many fortunes were made by individual effort. Gradually the cream of the rich "pay" was taken off, then capital stepped in and purchased practically the whole known mining area. Good cash prices were paid, coal mines were opened up, hydro-electric power plants were established, fleets of gold-mining dredges were put to work in the valleys, and water was brought to the mines from long distances by a system of ditches, flumes and syphons. Tons of gold were dredged from claims which had supposedly been worked out. The operation of the mines by dredging and hydraulic did not entail the employment of nearly as many men as the old method did, consequently those who had become rich or obtained a competence by their own efforts in mining, or from having disposed of their holdings, removed to other parts of Canada and to the United States. The output of gold from twenty million dollars a year gradually lessened until now and for some years past it has remained stationary at about a million and a half dollars a year. It will remain at that figure for many years to come, although liable to be increased at any time by new discoveries. The history of other placer gold camps is repeating itself up there—lode mining is developing. In 1919 a wonderful discovery of silver ore was made about 150 miles from Dawson city, and as I said at the outset of my remarks silver mining is fast assuming large proportions and is bringing an increase of population.

The chief difficulty to be contended with is the cost of transportation and lack of telegraphic communication. I have brought these and other matters to the attention of the ministers in whose departments they are dealt with, and I am free to say that I obtained fairly satisfactory results from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). But the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) before authorizing the modest expenditure required to connect the silver camp with the government telegraph line preferred to "wait and see" how those mines turned out. That was characteristic caution on his part. Well, I am glad to be able to tell him that the most optimistic predictions in regard to those mines made by miners and engineers are being realized and the time has arrived when he is amply justified in giving those people communication over the government telegraph line.

Now, hon. members may say: How does the prosperity or otherwise of Yukon affect the rest of Canada? Let me show them. The Yukon is part of Canada. Its people are one hundred per cent British and proud of it. They are a healthy, energetic people, maintaining themselves at the very outskirts of civilization—true pioneers developing a wilderness. There is no poverty there; there are no paupers, there is no distress. There is no unemployment; there is work for all who want to work—and no one can stay there who does not work. There is no returned soldier problem. Yukon's returned soldiers who were lucky enough to get back have all been re-established. They were welcomed back by employers and by the people generally. The percentage of enlistments from Yukon was very high indeed, as also were the money contributions to patriotic purposes during the war. Unfortunately the casualty list was correspondingly high, and the war left its scars on Yukon families just as it did on other Canadian families.

The Yukon has produced hundreds of millions of dollars in gold and silver, and will proceed to increase that output. As a business proposition the Yukon is a good thing for Canada in this way. We have up there nothing but mineral resources and sufficient timber to carry on our mining and build houses. We have to buy everything else from other parts of Canada. We have the mineral, but you have to feed us and clothe us. In return, we have the gold and silver which we can dig up to pay for our food and supplies. All our flour, bacon, sugar and everything else in the food line, our clothing, our boots and shoes, our mining equipment, our machinery and tools have to come from other parts of Canada. These figures are impressive. The Yukon has imported and used over 300,000 tons of Canadian-made goods, and paid for them, $100,000,000 cash. We have to have your goods, and you have to have our cash. That is a home market worth having and worth keeping. Over a thousand tons of goods went into that new silver mining camp last year. They will all be used up by spring, and then we will have to get more from the manufacturers and merchants of Canada. In addition to that 300,000 tons of Canadian goods taken in there, probably a greater quantity of foreign goods was purchased, for the American west coast cities are very active in following up that trade, an example that might very well be followed by our own people. You can see at a glance what a customs revenue that importation means.

The Yukon is not a tradition or a thing of the past, it is not a played out or worked out mining camp. It was hard hit by the war, but it is coming back. It has a community of wonderful people, face to face with nature, developing the great mineral resources of the country, and their success of necessity redounds and adds to the general prosperity of Canada.

TREATY WITH ITALY

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), the debate was suspended and the order for Motions called to permit of the following message from His Excellency the Governor General being presented:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a convention respecting commercial relations between Italy and Canada, entered into at London the 4th day of January, 1923, between His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas and His Majesty the King of Italy.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House reverted to the Order of the Day.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to review generally the Speech from the Throne or the debate which has arisen on the Address in reply thereto. Much that has been said during the debate might, I think, properly be said at a later stage in connection with the budget. However, we must deal with some of these questions now.

Let me say that with the eloquent tributes that were paid by the three leaders to the memory of our departed comrades; with the good words of welcome offered to the new members; with the cordial congratulations offered to the member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume) in regard to the moving and seconding of the Address, and last, but not least, with the tributes paid to the sterling Scottish character of our friend, the member for Brandon (Mr. Forke)—with all these things I would desire to associate myself.

I wish now to proceed to the subjects which I think, call for special mention on my part. First, I want to invite the attention of the House to the remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in relation to the tariff. My right hon. friend had a good deal to say about averages. Averages are often useful, but sometimes they are misleading, and I am inclined to think that in his search for averages my right hon. friend allowed himself to be misled and unconsciously helped to mislead the House so far as the impression has been conveyed that there had been no material reduction of customs duties. My right hon. friend says that the government collected $88,000,000 of customs tax on an importation of $506,000,000 as against a collection of $78,000,000 on an importation of $502,000,000 the year before. Then with some other remarks he proceeds to say:

A tariff that averaged 15¼ per cent up to the end of 1921 for that fiscal year, now averages . . . when the sales tax is put on at the boundary, 17.5 per cent over the whole scale.

As my right hon. friend puts it, it would almost seem that he was including the sales tax in the first year but not including it in the second. However, I think perhaps he said a little more than he intended, for I find the figures he gives with regard to customs duty, apart from sales tax, work out the increase to 17·5 to which he has referred. But my hon. friend forgot to mention several things which are necessary to a proper under-

standing of his averages. In the first place, he forgot to mention that in giving the figures for the calendar year it should be had in mind that, at the most, during only six months of that year was the new tariff in application. For at least six months of the twelve on the basis of which he made his computation, the old tariff, with all its virtues—if they were virtues—was still in operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not have reference to the twelve months at all; my figures were for the first nine months of the fiscal year, from the first of April to the end of the year. I had them officially from the department.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my right hon. friend's figures were for the calendar year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, only from the first of April.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my right hon. friend is mistaken. He may look into that, but my impression is that the figures he gave were for the calendar year. However, that is only one point, and perhaps not the vital one. But another point is that the valuation of the goods is a very important consideration in the working out of averages. If all our duties were levied on the ad valorem principle it would be easier to make fair comparisons of averages. But a large portion of the duties is collected under the system of specific duties; we levy so many dollars or so many cents, as the case may be, per ton, per barrel, per pound, or according to whatever unit the trade is accustomed to handle. When the value of these goods varies you get a very different result in the matter of averages—a result that may easily be most misleading. For example, in the year 1911 the duty on the staple article of refined sugar, converted into ad valorem—for it is a specific duty—yielded a rate of 24 per cent and a fraction; in 1921 the duties showed an average of 13 per cent. Apparently, then, there was a great reduction of duty—24 per cent in 1911; 13 per cent odd in 1921. But in reality there was no reducton of duty—on the contrary, the sugar duties had been doubled. They were 87 cents per hundred pounds in 1911, producing an ad valorem rate of 24 per cent; they were $2 per hundred pounds in 1922, producing an ad valorem rate of only 13 per cent. What is the explanation? When the valuation is high the specific duty works out a small percentage, but when the valuation changes your percentage changes. Take an article costing $100. A specific duty which, converted into ad valorem, produces 25 per cent, remains the same when the same article later costs $200, but your average is reduced because it is applied to $200 instead of to $100. Now, all through these calculations it is necessary to observe the variations in value. We had high valuations, and the duties imposed on the basis of those valuations produced certain results. We are now passing through a time of low valuations. Prices are falling; some of us are glad, and would like to see them fall still further. But when the value of goods falls, then undoubtedly there is an apparent increase in your average rate. As a matter of fact, you may have a low average rate when your taxation is high, and you may have a high average rate when the taxation has been reduced; and so it will be found in this case. I say it is important, therefore, that in looking at this question of averages we have regard to the changes in the values. With the exception of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, every change made in the customs tariff last year was a revision downward.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me before he goes further? Will he not admit that it was when valuations were high, and consequently the incidence of duty low, that he moved to reduce the duty?

Mr. FIELDING: The motion to reduce the duties has been carried out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With regard to sugar?

Mr. FIELDING: No, not that particular item. I do not think I ever moved to reduce the duty on sugar. I did vote for a resolution that it was desirable to reduce the duties upon as many articles as possible, and we did reduce a large number, we did reduce a great many duties last year. My right hon. friend told us at one time that the reductions were microscopic and at another time that they were molecular. But I noticed that, having described them as microscopic, he turned to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) and warned him that these changes in duties were going to cause the workmen of Brantford to be idle in the streets. So my right hon. friend easily adapts himself to conditions.

Now, that view of matters may easily be enlarged, but I think I have said enough to show that before you treat seriously these values one needs to look into them more carefully and make an analysis—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say I have here the figures from the department showing the months I quoted, and the statement I made in interruption of the hon. gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my right hon. friend say that his figures were not for the calendar year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. They were only from the first of April—the fiscal year, just as I said.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, even so, there would be three months of that year under the old tariff; is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: April. May and June? No.

Mr. FIELDING: The change was not made until the last of June.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In May.

Mr. FIELDING: The tariff bill making effective the changes embodied in the last budget was passed, I think, on the last day of June or thereabouts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But does the budget not take effect from the time of the making of the budget statement?

Mr. FIELDING: In some respects it would. There were many changes; but my right hon. friend must know that tariff changes do not immediately produce reductions. Increases of tariff reach the consumer very quickly, but reductions are slower to reach them. The good results of the reductions that were made in the tariff last year will become manifest from time to time. If they were not fully manifested in the short time between the date of the passing the tariff bill and the close of the calendar year, there is very much reason to believe that if we are only patient in the matter we shall find good results still following.

Now I turn to a statement made by my right hon. friend regarding an increase in the national debt. He said we increased the debt last year by $45,634,000. He will admit that in that case he did certainly refer to the calendar year. Am I not correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I gave the dates.

Mr. FIELDING: Now for purposes of comparison it is always better to take the fiscal year. These statements are published from month to month and have some value, but they really ought not to be taken very much as a basis of calculation. There are periods early in the year perhaps when the revenue comes in freely and expenditure is not very large. Indeed, there have been cases where at such a time you will show a decrease in the public debt; but it would be very unfair to assume that that represented the whole business of the year. But since my right hon. friend prefers to take the calendar year I am going to take the calendar year too.

According to his statement we increased the public debt in that year by $45,634,000; but he overlooked an important point. Of that calendar year only nine months at all events were under the fiscal control of this government. For the first three months of the year this government had no power over the finances. The right hon. gentleman and his friends made the estimates, they carried them through committee here, and carried the Supply Bill. They enacted all these things; they gave directions for the expenditure, they made contracts, they carried on all the business for the fiscal year, and all we had to do coming into power in mid-winter was simply to pay the bills as they came in. Down to the 1st of April the finances were controlled under the budget and tariff and policy of my right hon. friend and his friends, and for three months of the twelve at all events, this government had no particular responsibility. However, I am going to waive that.

But my right hon. friend forgot to mention something more. He forgot to mention the part that the railways played in this matter. He says that we added in that period $45,634,000 to the public debt, but he forgot to mention that in that year we provided for the railways—I have the exact sum here, but I cannot find it at the moment—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Far less than the year before anyway.

Mr. FIELDING: If we added $45,000,000 to the public debt for that twelve months, for only nine months of which were the expenses under our control, may we not place it in comparison—I shall not go back to the war years—with the year 1921, when there was an addition to the public debt of $92,000,000. Then in the year 1922 there was an addition to the public debt of $81,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, 1922 was the year I gave. The hon. gentleman was in power then.

Mr. FIELDING: The year my hon. friend gave was the calendar year 1922, not the fiscal year I am giving now the figures for the fiscal year. In 1921 the administration of my hon. friend increased the public debt by $92,000,000, and in 1922 to the 31st of March by $81,000,000, and if we in the last year have got the increase down to $45,000,000, as compared with $92,000,000 and $81,000,000, I think it is a record we need not be ashamed of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You did not have 22,000 miles of railway to put in shape.

Mr. FIELDING: Unfortunately the 22,000 miles of railway which was willed to us is the cause of our troubles every year. Without these railway obligations we would be able easily to provide for all our public expenditure and have a balance to the good. I say that in this present year—I do not want to anticipate the budget and speak too positively—but speaking broadly, and subject to later correction, this year we shall be able, if you leave aside the railways, to provide for all the ordinary expenditure and all the capital expenditure and all the war expenditure, for everything but the railways, and have a balance of some thirty odd millions to the good. That is the amount we shall be able to show as a surplus, if you care to call it a surplus under these conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will not the hon. gentleman be good enough to say that last year on the same basis of comparison the surplus was $35,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING: No, the comparison I have given my hon. friend is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Thirty-five million dollars, if you leave out the railways.

Mr. FIELDING: This year we are providing $67,000,000 for the railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Far less than before.

Mr. FIELDING: If you separate the railways from the other expenditure we could conduct the affairs of the government this year and provide a surplus of about thirty odd million. I do not want to enter into a long discussion of who is responsible for the railways. I think there is a large degree of responsibility resting on my hon. friends opposite. They at all events were responsible for wishing upon us the Canadian Northern, and for taking over the Grand Trunk under conditions which have landed us in the midst of great trouble.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that his government did not authorize the construction of the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental and that the contracts were not all made under his government?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in British Columbia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the best part of the system.

Mr. FIELDING: I have already said that there would be differences of opinion upon that point. I do not think the Laurier government made any mistake when they decided to have a second transcontinental.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A third.

Mr. FIELDING: The time had arrived when we wanted competition, when we wanted a real transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean on British territory—and we did not have it before. The Laurier policy in that respect, in the main, was a sound one. The cost was more than was expected; we all know that. Practically every public work costs more than the original estimate. This building, under the administration of my right hon. friend, has cost twice as much as was estimated. Every public work has cost more than was expected, and nobody is going to be much alarmed about that. But I say that the Canadian Northern as a prairie enterprise was a good enterprise, and if the promoters had been content to operate it as a prairie road, utilizing other connections with the East, things would have gone much better for them and the public at large. I say that the second transcontinental was all right, but the third transcontinental railway was regrettable from every point of view. For the first stage of that, for the eastern part at all events, the Liberal government was responsible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear,' and it is true. But I want to say that the hon. gentleman and his friends were responsible for carrying it through to the Pacific coast, and incurring all the expense of mountain construction. Does he say, "hear, hear," now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. That to-day is the best part of the system, and most essential of all.

Mr. FIELDING: I say, like Mr. Mantalini, it is the "demnition total" that is the cause of the trouble with which we are dealing. The result is that for this present year of our Lord we have to provide $67,000,000 for the railways, and but for that we could come to the budget and show a surplus of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000. If we are going to have this question of debt talked of all the time, let us never forget that this debt is upon us year after year because of the railway obligations.

My hon. friends sitting in the Progressive district are very warm sympathizers as a rule with national ownership, but when they come to an expression of their views, let them

bear in mind that national ownership may be a good thing, but like many other good things, it is rather expensive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman explain then why he does not get rid of national ownership and carry out the pledges of so many members of this government?

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot speak for anybody but myself. I do not understand that there was any pledge on the part of this government to get rid of national ownership. I have understood that some members doubted the wisdom of it, but they are all prepared to give national ownership a fair trial. That is the attitude they have assumed from the beginning towards national ownership, and that is the attitude they are assuming to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is the right thing, do not complain about the cost of it.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, there are differences of opinion as to whether a thing is the right thing or the wrong thing; men may honestly differ in that respect. What one man may think right, another thinks wrong. I am not enamoured of national ownership myself, but I realize that we are in for it and we had better make the best of it honestly and give it a fair trial. I have grave doubts as to whether national ownership can be as successful as some hon. gentlemen would like it to be. If you advocate taking our railroads out of politics, do you know what it means? It means taking them out of the control of the people, out of the control of the people's representatives, and putting them into the hands of some irresponsible body. The idea seems to be that this parliament of Canada would be content to vote sixty, seventy or a hundred million dollars every year—turn that money over to the National Railway Board and ask them to make the expenditures. I can tell my hon. friends who are so full of national ownership that the time will come—it may come at any moment—when they will find difficulty because of this board set up between the people and the government. When that time comes the people will brush aside the board and they will come to the government, and whether you like it or not you will discover that these railroads have to be in politics, because politics is the business of the people.

Another point in connection with my hon. friend's speech. Not only did he say that we are increasing the debt but—shocking to say—we are increasing our obligation to the United States instead of getting the money at home from the Canadian people. That is based upon a fallacy which I want to dissent at once from. The idea that you ought to get your money at home—and it is a good thing to get it at home—may be carried too far. It was a good thing during the war. When we needed money so desperately it was a good thing to appeal to the Canadian people, and we are all proud of the response that came, we are all proud of the revelation it gave us of Canada's financial strength. But that was a war effort. The war stirred the patriotism of the Canadian people; but if you were to renew the appeal to-day you would not get the same response. Now, there are several reasons why it may be wise to go abroad for your money at times. You may go abroad first for the simple plain business reason of getting it cheaper. We, for example, quite recently adopted the rule of going to our own people for our money. We offered a conversion loan of $178,000,000 among our own people. The greater part of it was taken up, but we had to pay our own people 5½ per cent, and we had to pay certain expenses,—large advertising expenses. I have not attempted to figure it out, but I am afraid the money cost a good deal more than 5½ per cent. We placed $100,000,000 five per cent bonds in New York a short time ago. We sold them at a price which made the cost a little over five; I think 5.12 or 5.13 was the computed rate; and I am going to put it to cold blooded people—to Scotch people in view of what I have said about my good friend the member for Brandon—that when you get good honest money in New York for 5.12 per cent why do you want to pay nearly 6 per cent for the privilege of asking your own people for money?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member will do me the justice to say that I introduced that with reference to the speech made by the Minister of Justice, who stated that we owed the United States so much in 1921 that we were drifting towards annexation.

Mr. FIELDING: No, my right hon. friend did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes.

Mr. FIELDING: I think I have what my right hon. friend said. What he may have had in the back of his head I do not know, but what appears on Hansard is the simple statement that we were increasing our obligations and increasing our obligations to the United States. That was our great offence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I referred to the speech of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend, in the speech to which I am replying, to the best

of my knowledge, made no allusion to the Minister of Justice. However, it does not matter whether he did so or not. At all events he preferred the charge against us that we were borrowing money in the United States, that is the plain thing. I want to say it may be good policy to borrow money there simply because you get it cheaper. Another reason: Canada must continue to be a borrowing country. A country that is only partially developed needs money for many things. We want money. Capital is necessary for our development. If you are going to lock up the surplus money we have at home in government bonds, where are you going to get the money for mortgages, farm improvements, for business enterprises, for the thousand and one things we need for the development of Canada? Therefore I say, both on the ground of economy,—having regard to the rate of interest and having regard to leaving a reasonable capital at home for the development of our country—from either of these viewpoints it is good policy at times to go abroad.

But I want to tell my right hon. friend that his practice was better than his preaching. He preaches here against borrowing money in the United States, but in practice he and his friends borrowed in the United States and they borrowed a great deal more than we borrowed too. The Canadian government, in a period of a few years, issued in the United States securities, I think, to the amount, including our own, of $490,000,000, and $370,000,000 of that, if my memory serves me, was issued by the Conservative government. I think they were wise in issuing those securities. We have issued $100,000,000 in one general loan, which I have described, and we issued a couple of small loans. I admit there was a little difference in the way the thing was handled. My hon. friends opposite, a few months before they went out of power, issued two guaranteed railway loans and—shocking to say—they sold them in the city of New York. My right hon. friend must remember that. He and his colleagues committed the great crime of selling in New York. That is not all; they sold in New York at a price which gave to the buyer the opportunity to make $4 on the hundred in one case and $3.50 on the hundred in the other. When we had a similar loan we sold on terms which gave the buyer a profit of 59 cents on the $100. There are at this moment about $210,000,000 of securities outstanding in New York, and about one-half of this almost was issued by the late government. So again I say to my right hon. friend that his practice was better than his preaching. He condemned us for borrowing money in New York but he also borrowed money in New York and I am glad he did so because I think it was a wise policy to pursue.

I notice too that my right hon. friend made a statement with regard to the sales tax which I think he ought to regret. He stated:

> They have added to the revenue of the country something, I have not the exact figures, but it must run into tens of millions, by the imposition of a sales tax fifty per cent greater than the sales tax they found when they came into power. That is a tax that is placed upon the backs of everybody in this Dominion. All who use the necessities of life must pay their share of the sales tax.

It would have been inconvenient if I had asked my right hon. friend to mention what are the necessities of life which are paying this sales tax—he might have difficulty in doing so. I am going to weary the House a little by giving a list of the exemptions from the sales tax, and it is fair to say that these exemptions, in the first instance, were given by his own government. All we did was to increase the volume of the tax—as we had to, and I am going to speak of that again—and we increased the exemptions. We are told by my right hon. friend that we have imposed on the people of this country tremendous burdens that bear on the necessaries of life. Will the House bear with me for a few minutes while I read the list of exemptions. I think it is just as well to publish the list. It is one of those things buried in public documents, and not very easily understood by the public generally.

> Provided also that the taxes specified in this section shall not apply to sales or importations of:—
>
> Bread; flour, including self raising flour, oatmeal, rolled oats and cornmeal; rolled wheat, buckwheat meal and pea meal; animals living; live poultry; meats and poultry, fresh; milk including buttermilk, condensed milk, evaporated milk, and powdered milk; cream; butter; cheese; oleomargarine, margarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter; lard, lard compound and similar substances, made from animal or vegetable stearine or oils; eggs; vegetables, fruits, grains and seeds in their natural state; bran, shorts, middlings, alfalfa meal; oil cake, oil cake meal; grains mixed or crushed for cattle or poultry feed; hay, straw; hops; nursery stock—

and so on. I will not read the whole list, it would take me ten minutes to do it. Practically all the necessities of life, including fuel and feed, are exempt from the sales tax. Yet my right hon. friend, in a moment of weakness, said that the taxes on the necessities of life under the sales tax, are breaking the backs of the poor people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With my hon. friend's experience in the House, I do not think he should mis-state what I said. I said that everyone who used the necessaries of life paid

his share of the sales tax. Those words are strictly and literally true. All necessities of life are not taxed. Those who use the necessities must pay their share of the tax. Clothing is a necessary of life and it is taxed, and many other necessaries of life are taxed. My words are strictly true.

Mr. FIELDING: I am going to take what Hansard says on the subject. It is a misfortune for some of us that we have a Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Outside of parliament, when some unhappy public man has said some foolish thing he can afterwards blame it on the reporter. We cannot do that here. We have to be held responsible for our words. Referring to Hansard I see what he said was—

That is a tax which is placed upon the backs of everybody in this Dominion.

The word "everybody" includes himself and myself.

All who use the necessities of life must pay their share of the sales tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear hear. Is not that true?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend seems to enjoy it so much I am going to give him the pleasure of listening to it again. He said:

That is a tax which is placed upon the backs of everybody in this Dominion.

He used the word "all" in one case and "everybody" in the next case. You cannot use any two more comprehensive words in the English language. He said:

That is a tax which is placed on the backs of everybody in this Dominion. All who use the necessities of life must pay their share of the sales tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that not true?

Mr. FIELDING: I have read a long list and my hon. friend will almost tempt me to read the whole of it now, but no, I will not do it. Nearly all the foodstuffs, light, fuel and practically what was broadly speaking called the necessities of life are free from the sales tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated that everybody paid his share of the tax. Will the hon. minister tell me of one individual who does not pay his share of the sales tax?

Mr. FIELDING: All who use the necessities of life must pay this tax. I say that all who use the necessities in the case of the articles I mention pay no tax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the three things that I particularly desired to draw attention to. First, my hon. friend's remarks on the tariff, and secondly—

Mr. MEIGHEN: What remarks?

Mr. FIELDING: On the increase of trade, and the horrible crime we committed when we borrowed money in the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member be good enough to read my statement where I said it was a crime, or where I criticised it at all? I have looked up Hansard and I do not see it.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member said distinctly "They have increased the obligations of the country"—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: "—and they have done it by increasing their obligation in the United States."

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely, that is a compliment if he puts it that way. Was he contemplating moving a vote of confidence in us for doing it? Are we to take all the other statements in his long speech in a Pickwickian sense?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, in the sense I made them. I said they had increased our obligations to the United States. That is absolutely a fact. Why does he read into it a criticism on account of going to the United States instead of going into Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: What was the object of saying it if it were not by way of criticism?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated the object a moment ago.

The SPEAKER: Order, order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not allow the hon. member to read anything into my speech. He can take any sentence from beginning to end and he will fail to prove it incorrect, just as he failed a moment ago.

Mr. FIELDING: I must confess that when I made that remark it never occurred to me that my hon. friend all the time was making these statements as a compliment. I thought he was delivering a criticism of our action.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So I was.

Mr. FIELDING: I see now it is a mistake. He said we were doing all these things, and he meant them all in a Pickwickian

sense, and probably that being the case it is hardly fair that I should take them seriously, but I have been paying him the compliment of believing he was serious.

I want to say a few words regarding the two amendments which have been submitted to the House. The general sentiment contained in these two motions is largely of a sound, sane and sensible character. In its proper place, much that is contained in these amendments—in their general sentiment rather than in their exact words—we might be able to subscribe to. Much that may be said at the proper time, in its proper place, with approval cannot win approval when it is said in the wrong place. The hon. members who have moved these resolutions have, I think, made a mistake as to the time and place of moving them. They are the best judges of that. The resolution of my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Hoey) follows largely a resolution moved in the interests of the Liberal party in the House several years ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two years ago.

Mr. FIELDING: I would like to remind my hon. friend that there was another motion made by the Liberal party at a later date which he would do better to take as a model if he wants to take a model. In the year 1921, which was the last year of opposition, the year preceding that in which the Liberal party came into its inheritance, we moved a resolution in the House, and I am going to read it, because that is the resolution on which we appealed to the country. We went to the country in the period following the adoption of that resolution, and not only did we of the Liberal side vote for it, but my hon. friends of the Progressive party who were then in the House did us the honour of voting for it also. It recites in general terms what we supposed to be the condition of the country. I think perhaps I had better read the whole of it. It reads:

> That, while recognizing that existing financial requirements of the Dominion demand the maintenance of a customs tariff, the House is unable to concur in the declarations by the government that the tariff should be based on the principle of protection; the tariff is a tax, and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit;
>
> That the aim of the fiscal policy of Canada should be the encouragement of industries based on the natural resources of the country, the development of which may reasonably be expected to create healthy enterprises, giving promise of enduring success;
>
> That such changes should be made in the customs duties as may be expected to reduce the cost of living, and to reduce also the cost of implements of production required for the efficient development of the natural resources of the Dominion.

Now comes a paragraph to which I desire to invite attention and which had escaped the attention of my hon. friend from Springfield when he prepared his amendment. If he had had the resolution of 1921 before him he would have noticed this very important last winding up clause, and you know the last clause, like the postcript of a lady's letter, is the most important thing. That clause reads:

> That while keeping this aim clearly in mind, the House recognizes that in any readjustment of the tariff that may take place regard must be had to existing conditions of trade and changes made in such a manner as will cause the least possible disturbance of business.

The policy set forth in that resolution was the policy adopted by this government. It was adopted and carried out in the budget of last year, and it will be the policy we will keep in mind where circumstances will permit. I am sorry to find my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has tried to convey the impression that the reductions that were made were of no importance. I showed you a moment ago that there were stages in the debate when he thought they were important. There were considerable reductions, which, if looked upon in a fair manner, would, I think, entitle this government to a large measure of credit. With the exception of the duties on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes every item in that long list of changes was a revision downwards. It is important to note that. Shall we have further reduction? That is a question upon which I am going to have an open mind, and I am going to advise all others to have one.

With regard to the tariff problem to-day, especially when we consider what is going on in the neighbouring republic, there are conditions which are going to present the tariff question to us as a matter of more than ordinary difficulty. Therefore, I think every man in this House will be wise if he maintains upon this question an open mind. For myself, it is my desire to approach the question with an open mind, ready to hear everything that can be said for or against reduction, and then to come to the House and give the matter the best judgment that I can. I think there never was a time when it was more important that we should realize the truth of that remark attributed, I think, to an American statesman, that I have quoted more than once—"It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us." There are in the life of Canada to-day conditions which are not to be disposed of by any mere reference to theory or to what A, B or C may have said at some time or another. There are difficult conditions, in the handling of the tariff, more difficult, more serious, probably, than we have had in former times. So I ask

hon. members to agree with me that this is not the proper time to consider them, and when the proper time comes, we will give hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity to bring forward these motions if they so desire.

So far the only thing that we have been able to present to the House in the way of tariff proposals is the treaty with France. I am not magnifying its importance; but whatever change it makes, it is a reduction of the tariff, and, therefore, it is a carrying out of a promise. There is set forth in that treaty a long list of articles with regard to which we provide that the intermediate tariff will govern, subject to a discount of ten per cent on the duty that would be collected. In the case of a duty of 30 per cent, supposing $30 were due and you take off 10 per cent, you reduce the duty to $27. On another list, not so long, but very comprehensive, there is provision for a discount of 15 per cent. Therefore, even this session we are acting in line with that resolution by trying to reduce the duties where we find it possible to do so.

My hon. friends who have moved these resolutions have, I think, failed to understand the gravity of the position that is presented. There are times and subjects upon which a government can well afford to accept suggestions from any quarter, because none of us has a monopoly of wisdom. On a thousand questions that may come up in the House any sensible government is aware that it may learn from members who may be opposed to it; and so in cases of a minor character, the government is willing to receive suggestions and amendments, and even on the critical question of a motion for supply there are cases where a government may, without humiliation, accept amendments. Those are cases which are provided for according to our constitution. But I cannot conceive—and I think such a case would be rare—of a self-respecting government which is prepared to accept any amendment on a motion for an Address in reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General. What is the motion before the House? It is a simple resolution, politely acknowledging the Speech which His Excellency has kindly addressed to this House and giving him an assurance that whatever matters are brought before us will receive our respectful consideration. Are there any fireworks in that, any dynamite in that, any alarm in that, anything that any member in the House cannot properly vote for without any amendment? The first duty of the government is to provide that the Address to His Excellency shall pass, and things which would be accepted on their merits at another time cannot be accepted then. I say at once, I do not believe you will find a case, certainly not in our Canadian political history, where any government has accepted amendments of that kind on a motion to pass an Address to His Excellency. I think the hon. gentlemen who moved these resolutions have acted hastily—I am not presuming to judge them—for several reasons. I think they are not taking the best opportunity of discussing these things. There is a time and a place for everything, and the time for discussing the questions which they have raised would be in the budget debate, much better, I think, for them and much better for all concerned. But of that they must themselves judge.

What do these resolutions call for? Economy and tariff reduction. Lower tariff, economy—these are fine sentiments. We all recognize the desirability of economy. Last year I had occasion to point out the different angles from which the question of economy is viewed. I pointed out that sometimes an hon. member is found advocating economy in loud tones, and then coming in and wanting a large expenditure in his particular constituency. My hon. friends of the Progressive party are only human after all; they are not free from that little weakness. They proclaim they want economy, and at the same time they tell us they want large expenditures on terminal elevators at Montreal and Vancouver. These cost money. How are you going to have economy if you are going to build them? Then we had the charge of increasing the public debt. My hon. friends of the Progressive party talk about economy. They are sincere; they want economy; but there is a motion on the order paper for an expenditure at once to finish the Hudson Bay railway. They are only human like the rest of us.

Mr. HOEY: That would be an economy.

Mr. FIELDING: Some years ago when I was campaigning with the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Ontario, I passed through a little country town where they paid us the compliment of putting up a quantity of decorations. On one which was set across the street I read this motto, which I have never forgotten: "Wise expenditure is true economy." That is sound. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) gave us some splendid illustrations this afternoon; but when hon. gentlemen ask for these expenditures, how can they be regarded as consistent if they vote for this resolution condemning an increase of the national debt? How can you reduce your national debt if you are going to carry on all these things?

Mr. MORRISON: Building the Hudson Bay railway is not really an expenditure; it is an investment. We contend that it will pay for itself.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it is an investment, my hon. friend says. My hon. friend reminds me of a chap in our boyhood days who had a pitch and toss arrangement. He would cry: "Come up, boys, it is not your money we want, it's your patronage."

Mr. MORRISON: All we have been getting so far from the government is promises, instead of patronage.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is hard to please. We have given him large and numerous reductions in answer to his demands for them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And notwithstanding his vote against them.

Mr. FIELDING: He did not mean to vote against them in detail. He only voted against them in their totality, which he thought was a different thing. I am not saying that everything has been done that everybody has asked. Few of us get all we want in this wicked world, but I think it would be well for us that we should express appreciation of what we do get. We may well be thankful even for small mercies, coupled with the expectation of better things to come.

Let us not be afraid of the debt. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton treated that this afternoon in a very serious way. Canada is a country requiring a great deal of development; we are not a new country, but we are still a partially developed country, and if we are to meet the demands arising in all parts of the country, I do not hesitate to say that you cannot reduce the public debt at the present time. I take the responsibility of saying that. The late government—and I am not throwing any rocks at them—had to increase the public debt by $92,000,000 one year, the next year by $81,000,000, apart from war matters, and we confess that we shall have to increase the debt this year largely, though not to quite as large an amount. It is folly to pretend, in these pressing times of development and great needs, that you can carry on the business of the country without any increase of the public debt. Such a thing is an ideal to have in mind; we are all the better to have such ideals and to strive for them, even if we cannot reach them, and it is the duty of any Minister of Finance to make an earnest effort to see that the national debt is not increased more than is necessary. The figures which I have given you will, I think, show that we are acting on that principle. If we had to be afraid of somebody coming every year and saying: "Oh, you are increasing the public debt," then we would be at a standstill. This is a new country. This is a live, go-ahead country. New problems are arising.

> New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still, and onward,
> Who would keep abreast of truth.

There are things to be done in Canada, and I hope and trust the government will have courage to do them, in the belief that wise expenditure is true economy.

There is a more serious side to these amendments. I was amazed to find my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) say that this is not a vote of want of confidence. It is an extraordinary idea for my hon. friend to entertain. I want to tell him and all others that, as I said before, while there are many questions upon which a government may properly invite and welcome suggestions, when you come to a matter of passing this simple, respectful Address to His Excellency the Governor General, there can be no compromise, and I say again that no self-respecting government will stand and accept an amendment anything like that. When all these things are considered, I hope that the hon. gentlemen who moved these resolutions under the impression that they do not involve want of confidence will accept my statement when I say frankly and sincerely that they do involve a vote of non-confidence, with all the consequences that may arise therefrom.

This much is clear, Mr. Speaker. If this government does not possess the confidence of this House and of the country, there is no other group in this House that can. That much will be admitted. So if either of these motions should pass, it would impose consequences upon this government of the gravest character. Are we to have political chaos in this country? Are we to have political conditions such as may be found in some of the turbulent states of Europe where governments rise and fall, and come and go, and their supporters fight each other on the floors of their legislative chambers, and do such other things as bring parliamentary institutions into contempt? No. This is:—

> A land of settled government,
> A land of just and old renown,
> Where Freedom slowly broadens down
> From precedent to precedent.

And precedent tells us that we cannot accept these amendments. If my hon. friends on futher reflection think it is their duty to move

them, it is not for me to find fault. I hope they will see their mistake and withdraw them. Again I say, if these amendments are carried, there is one course open to the government. You will produce a condition of political chaos in Canada which is not good for the Conservative party, which is not good for the Progressive party, which is not good for the Liberal party, and which is not good for the state. But, whatever the consequence of this may be, this self-respecting government cannot accept the amendments referred to.

On motion of Mr. Bancroft the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY SITTINGS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Before the House adjourns, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Fielding.

That on Wednesday, the seventh instant, and subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House will meet at three o'clock in the afternoon.

That is instead of two o'clock as the Rules at present prescribe. I have spoken to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) and neither of those hon. gentlemen will take exception to the government moving this motion if it assumes responsibility for so doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under ordinary circumstances, according to the Rules, I would have to ask the right hon. gentleman to give two days' notice, but by unanimous consent the motion may be put.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Wednesday, February 7, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

BY-ELECTIONS IN 1922

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Chief Electoral Officer the statutory report of the by-elections held during the year 1922, printed pursuant to section 72 of the Dominion Elections Act.

REPORT PRESENTED

Detailed statement of all bonds and securities registered in the Department of the Secretary of State for Canada, as provided by section 32, Chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Putnam for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Hoey, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Shaw, resumed from Tuesday, February 6.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate in reply to the Speech of his Excellency, I wish first to deal briefly with the speech delivered yesterday afternoon by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). I want to compliment my hon. friend upon that speech; it was a good one, and I heartily agree with nearly everything that he said. But I cannot quite agree with some of his remarks in connection with matters concerning western Canada, and I wish, if I may, to make some reference to that part of his speech.

Referring to a letter written by someone in Edmonton to a Scottish newspaper, my hon. friend asserted that the statement contained therein was exaggerated. I agree that it was exaggerated, but I contend that my hon. friend's comment in that connection was exaggerated also. He stated, according to yesterday's Hansard:

There are thousands and thousands of farmers in the West who are comfortably situated—as comfortably situated as the capitalist in Montreal or Toronto.

If the farmers of western Canada, of Manitoba particularly, are as well situated as those gentlemen to whom my hon. friend referred, why is it that the Manitoba reports show that there were 4,000 fewer farmers in that province last year than there were the year before? The reports show that there were 55,000 farmers in Manitoba in 1921 and 51,000 in 1922. I submit, therefore, that the figures do not agree with my hon. friend's statement. In designating the location of the farmers who, my hon. friend alleged, were so prosperous, he described a circle with a radius of twenty-five miles around the city of Winnipeg. Now, the constituency which I have the honour to represent adjoins Winnipeg on the north, and I have an intimate knowledge of at least a great part of the district included in that circle; my own farm, in fact, is very close to it. I would invite my hon. friend, when the session is over, to come west and look into this matter for himself. I will show

him around a part of that circle and I will defy him to find a farm there, with the exception, perhaps, of a few dairy farms, that has paid operating expenses in the last three years.

My hon. friend referred also to the number of motor cars in Saskatchewan. Some of my hon. friends to the right say, "hear, hear." It is a common idea on the part of certain people in this country that a farmer should never sit on anything but a wagon box. I do not believe in that, Mr. Speaker. Being a farmer myself I maintain that a serviceable automobile, obtainable at a reasonable price, has become a necessity in modern farming. My hon. friend said that every man in twelve in Saskatchewan had an automobile. I do not think that is enough. In a province where farming is the basic industry—it is practically the only industry there—in a province of great distances—and I know something of those distances, for I homesteaded there thirty-two miles from the nearest town—in respect to a province such as that I would reverse my hon. friend's statement and say that only one out of every twelve had a motor car. I think that would be nearer the mark. Furthermore, in giving those figures, he did not state what proportion of these cars had passed through the hands of the bailiff. He gave us no idea of the number of motor cars owned by men who had moved in there, and purchased perhaps with the money they brought in with them. I maintain again that the motor car has become a necessity on the modern farm.

Another question with which my hon. friend dealt was the United States tariff on farm products; and in dealing with that he asked in effect, what could the Canadian government do to remove the United States tariff against our farm products. I would make this suggestion to my hon. friend and to the government: that the best way to get rid of the American tariff against our products is to reduce the cost of production in this country, and if you do that, there will be a clamour in the United States against the tariff which raises the cost of production in that country.

The condition of agriculture in Canada to-day is not wholly the result of the reconstruction period through which we are passing, nor is it due to post-war conditions generally. If you go back to the years prior to the war, you will find that agriculture at that time was on the down grade. In the years 1912, 1913 and 1914 the farmers of western Canada were selling their grain below the cost of production, and had it not been for the war intervening, the government would have had to deal several years ago with this same situation that confronts us to-day. The net prices received for grain on the farm this fall were similar to those of 1911. Yet in 1911, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Victoria, Alta., (Mr. Lucas) yesterday, we could buy an eight-foot binder for $180 and to-day the same binder costs us $276. I submit that about the same comparison could be made in connection with most of the articles that enter into the cost of production on the farm. Coupled with this was the fact that in those years many immigrants were coming into the country, and many young men who were taking up homesteads were willing to work on the farms at a very reasonable rate in order to acquaint themselves with the local methods and conditions. When we compare the period before the war with the present time, and realize that in those earlier years men were being forced off the farm in no small numbers, it will give us some idea of the deplorable condition that agriculture finds itself in to-day. It is a well-known fact that for years in this country success or failure on the farm has depended largely on the amount of free labour a man could command in his farming operations. When a man's family was small and he had to hire every bit of help required, he invariably had a hard time getting along, but as his family grew up and furnished for a few years free labour on the farm, that was the time the farmer got ahead if he ever did get ahead. I submit that there can be no permanent prosperity in this country while this condition exists, so long as the great basic industry of Canada is dependent for its success on free labour. The fact is, the fiscal policy of this country is not a sound one for the development of our natural industries. That policy was evolved at a time when the Red River valley the most fertile valley in the world, was the principal grain-growing area of western Canada. It was evolved at a time when municipal taxes were negligible, when labour was cheap, when the land was clean; and all these things contributed to a low cost of production. But to-day municipal taxes in Manitoba are in the vicinity of one dollar per acre, due to the extension of roads, and the building of bridges, drainage and schools; and the high cost of transportation and of the necessities of life has raised the cost of production to a point where farmers are quitting the farms in large numbers. There are four thousand less on the farms in Manitoba to-day than a year ago. I submit that that is a serious situation, and one that requires careful analysis, and until we have found out the reason why these men are deserting the farms

in such large numbers, it is useless to talk very much about immigration.

May I deal for a moment, not with immigration, but with emigration, and some of the causes that have contributed thereto? There should be no tax in this country on woollen clothing, which is a necessity in a climate such as ours. Yet we find that clothing and blankets are taxed as high as 35 per cent under the general tariff, and from 20 to 25 per cent under the British preference. That is little short of a crime in a climate such as ours. We find that boots and shoes are taxed from 20 to 30 per cent. Take the case of a farmer with a large family, situated two or three miles from school—the average distance in western Canada being two miles. Consider the difficulty this man has in trying to clothe his family to withstand the rigours of the Canadian winter in the face of these taxes; and the figures I have quoted do not tell of all the taxes that the farmer has to pay, because the tariff tax is added at the factory, and the factory price increases something like 100 per cent by the time the product reaches the consumer through the ordinary channels of distribution. Therefore, the consumer pays about double the amount of the tairff tax quoted in the schedule. Can we conceive of anything that would tend more to drive men out of this country than the hardship this man's family is forced to endure under these conditions? I maintain that the tariff tax on woollen clothing has done more to drive people out of this country than any other single factor. The whole tax on necessary clothing and boots and shoes should be wiped out in the interests of humanity and in the interests of common sense. A tax on woollen goods might be all right in Florida, but it is decidedly poor business in Canada. The Canadian people voted overwhelmingly at the last election for low tariff, and I submit that they are in no mood to be trifled with. The government should start their reductions at once, and start them on the great necessities—cotton and woollen goods, and boots and shoes.

I have followed with interest the statements of those who suggest mixed farming as a remedy for our economic ills. Many of those who advocate such a policy however overlook the fact that the problem of mixed farming is inseparably bound up with the problem of wider markets. Take the live-stock industry for example. In the Winnipeg stockyards last fall cattle sold for as low as 4½ cents a pound for prime steers, and one cent a pound for fairly good cows in an unfinished condition. In the city of Winnipeg also, potatoes sold for as low as 20 cents a bushel. The American tariff practically prohibits the shipment of these products to the United States. Now, in view of these facts, to suggest a wholesale reversal from grain to mixed farming is simply adding insult to injury. Furthermore it is well known that thousands of farmers in this couniry are prevented from keeping hogs and sheep because of the tax on woven wire fencing which, through the medium of tariff and sales tax approximates 25 per cent. I say that the whole problem of mixed farming is inseparably bound up with the problem of wider markets. If you will give us markets and reduce our cost of production, there will practically be no limit to Canada's capacity to produce farm products. Better trading and better international conditions go hand in hand. International commerce tends to bring about a better feeling among all nations. Every satisfied customer that Canada has in foreign countries constitutes a bond of peace between us and those countries; and I think the idea of a bond of peace can be applied also to Canada in a national sense as well as internationally. If the manufacturer in eastern Canada felt that he was getting the farmer's products at their real market value and if, on the other hand, the farmer felt that he was getting the products of the manufacturer at their value in the markets of the world, it would result in creating a bond between them which would make for national solidarity—a bond, Mr. Speaker, which would strengthen the chain forged by the Fathers of Confederation, which is now gradually weakening.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to intervene in this debate, but in the course of the discussion things have transpired which have made me feel that it is my duty, representing as I do an agricultural constituency in the province of Nova Scotia, to say a few words from the standpoint of a member from the Maritime provinces. It is customary, I believe, to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address. I am sure that while I am a young parliamentarian I can do that with a great deal of gratification. Particularly do I feel that I have the right to congratulate my next door neighbour in the political arena in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), in the course of his very excellent disquisition, paid a tribute to the honour that was bestowed upon his constituency by his being selected to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and as a Nova Scotian I sincerely congratulate my col-

league from that province upon his speech. Most worthily did he uphold the honour of the province from which we both come. Unfortunately I am not familiar with the language of old France, and therefore I could not comprehend all that was said by the seconder of the Address. It certainly must seem rather a paradox that I, descended from French Huguenots, cannot understand the language of my forebears; but judging from the fluency and grace displayed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rhéaume), and from the manner in which his remarks were received by his colleagues from Quebec, his address was both eloquent and convincing.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many references to those of our membership who have passed beyond the veil since last we met. When I came into this House last year—although I am the baby, so to speak, of the Maritime representatives—there were some four or five members with us who to-day have passed beyond the veil because "the finger of God touched them and they slept." I was not exceedingly well acquainted with the late hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart), with the late Hon. Mr. Kennedy, and with the late Mr. Lafortune, but of the late Dr. Blackadder, I can speak with authority. We had stumped together in promulgating the principles of Liberalism as followers of the great chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and to-day it is to me a great sorrow that he is with us no longer. In thinking of him, the words of the poet recur to my mind: "Although he is absent in body, he is present in spirit." Perhaps I can best give expression to my regard for Dr. Blackadder in these lines:

How can I cease to pray for thee dear heart!
Where'er in God's great universe thou art to-day
Can He not reach thee with His tender grace;
Can He not hear me when for thee I pray?

Somewhere thou livest and hast need of Him,
Somewhere thy soul seeks higher heights to climb,
And somewhere too there may be valleys dim,
Which thou must cross to reach the heights sublime.

Then all the more, because thou canst not hear
Poor human words of blessing, will I pray,
O true brave heart! God bless thee
Whereso'er in His Great Universe, thou art to-day.

Divers things find mention in the Speech from the Throne. It is true that criticism has been uttered by some hon. gentlemen opposite because certain matters have been omitted; but the Speech from the Throne is not supposed to contain all the legislation that will probably come before parliament. There is, however, one particular matter upon which we are to legislate this session in which I, as a representative of one of the most historic constituencies in the Dominion, am personally interested—that is the question of redistribution. I stand here representing the historic constituency of the county of Hants. With the prosperity that has come to various sections of the Dominion, Hants, through no fault of her own, has lost in population, with the result that the constituency which in days gone by was the scene of Joseph Howe's greatest battles is to be amalgamated with some other constituency in the province of Nova Scotia. In this regard there is one plea I wish to advance: At the time confederation was brought about it was undoubtedly understood that the representation in this parliament should be founded upon the basis of the four original provinces. It was never intended—I do not believe, Sir, it was ever in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation—that any of the four original provinces should lose part of their representation. The other provinces which were subsequently carved out of the western country are going to get a greatly increased representation, and that increase will be at the expense of eastern Canada which has borne the burden and heat of the day. So I believe, Sir, that this is the proper time for us to take into consideration and endeavour to secure for the older provinces an irreducible minimum as regards representation. True, some of us will be told that we are governed in that particular by the British North America Act. I admit that that is the case. But if we have borne the burden and heat of the past, if we at the expense of the East have built up the western country, in return the western country should be prepared to come to our aid and to say: The Fathers of Confederation did not foresee there was a danger of the West overruling the East, and we are prepared to come to your aid and join you in any petition asking for an amendment of the British North America Act which will guarantee to the people of the East an irreducible minimum of representation in the House of Commons.

My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) yesterday in the course of his very excellent address dealt with the problem of immigration. You will permit me, Sir, to be somewhat laudatory of Nova Scotia and to say that I was extremely proud of the fact of being a Nova Scotian after hearing his address, eloquently delivered and replete with sound logic and good common sense. After listening to him, the hon. Minister of Finance, and other speakers of the day it was pleasing for me to recall the words of Tenny-

son so far as the Minister of Finance is concerned:

> At last the Master Bowman, he,
> Did cleave the air;
> Who but bent to hear
> His rapt oration, flowing free.

I was indeed proud of my native province as I listened to one of our youngest members from Nova Scotia and to our grey-headed veteran who is our leader in the Maritimes.

Some hon. members in the course of their speeches referred to our railway problem. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that whether our National Railway system should be under government ownership or not is no longer a debatable question. The government is pledged to a fair trial of government ownership in respect to our National Railways. It is not my purpose to give expression to my own personal views, but if I were to do so I would say, without fear for the consequences, that I am absolutely opposed to government ownership of our railways; but as the government is pledged to give a fair trial to government ownership I, as one elected to support that government, am bound to see, so far as the power within me lies, that the government is supported to that end.

My friends from the West are clamouring for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway; in fact, they want railways built for themselves. You know, Mr. Speaker, that our western friends are in no way sectional: They do not ask anything for the West; they want it for the whole Dominion. If you are going to put a fair interpretation on what they say, that is what they apparently intend to convey, even though some of their advocates may appear sectional. But so far as government ownership of our railways is concerned, so long as we, the tax-payers, have to vote the money to carry on these railways, then it is all very well for Sir Henry Thornton or any other person high or low in the social or political scale to say there shall be no political interference. I am thoroughly in accord with the dictum that no member of parliament or of the government should have the right to interfere in the ordinary management of the system; but so long as you have to come to parliament to obtain the funds to carry on these National Railways, the matter is of urgent public interest, and the people's representatives in parliament have the right to discuss the management of the system. The government some time ago appointed Sir Henry Thornton president of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways. Of Sir Henry I know but little. He undoubtedly is the best man that the government in their wisdom could secure. However, as the humble representative of the people in the county of Hants, I have one piece of advice to offer that gentleman, namely, that instead of going about the country attending banquets and repeating "Politicians, hands off!" he should remember the old biblical injunction: Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off. Sir Henry Thornton is confronted with a great problem. He is endeavouring to make the Canadian National Railways successful. In the course of his administration he will find that he cannot run a railway system here under the same conditions as obtain in England. Our winter climate is altogether different, the railway system is incomparably more extensive, and the conditions generally vary throughout the whole Dominion. So I have one other piece of advice to give Sir Henry Thornton that I trust will help him to make our National Railways successful, namely, that he follow another biblical injunction: Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

Our people are going to be called upon to pay for the upkeep of these railways, and therefore they should be administered in the interests of Canadian ports. I claim, Sir, that it is the bounden duty of Sir Henry Thornton and of the present government to see that freight rates are so regulated that shippers shipping by way of the great ports of Halifax and St. John be given a preference. You may say that I am sectional when I advocate that, but I claim that our public moneys should be expended towards the development of the Dominion—the upbuilding of our ports. If the operation of our government owned railways results in deficit after deficit, then in the name of every thing that is fair, the money which we have to provide to make good these deficits should go towards the improvement of Canadian ports and so give employment to our people.

We have been told by certain hon. members that we should practise economy. My hon. colleague from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) yesterday afternoon referred to what might be termed the difference between true and false economy. True economy is the expenditure of money, as I understood him, whether it adds to the national debt or not, so long as that expenditure provides increased facilities for trade, and so stimulates and makes that trade easier. False economy is the locking up of our money in a miser's bag, so to speak. Now, we in the Maritime provinces need full and adequate facilities in

Halifax and St. John for carrying on all sorts of export trade. True, nature has endowed us with excellent harbours, but to-day there is need in Halifax for better terminal facilities, for grain elevators, for abattoirs, for cold storage plants to take care of fruit and other products of the farm. To-day the farmers of the Annapolis valley have apples which they cannot dispose of except at prices which practically bring them no return whatsoever. Cold storage plants in Halifax would enable these growers to store their fruit and place it on the market at prices that would bring them a fair return for their labour. In that regard I want to tell my hon. friends from western Canada that they are not the only people hit by the present conditions obtaining in this country. We hear a great deal about, not the unproductive farms, but the production of the farms of the West not yielding a great profit to the western farmers. We undoubtedly have the same conditions in eastern Canada; but you do not find the farmers of Annapolis, King's and Hants coming to the government and saying: "It is true that there has been dire distress as regards trade in this country; things are not prosperous, but we want the government to be our fairy god-father and to pay us for all these things." That seems to be the attitude of hon. gentlemen from western Canada.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think so.

Mr. MARTELL: They come here and they want everything. In other words, they say: "We want the cash; let the people of the East pay the piper." I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft) upon his very excellent address, because he comes from my own county of Hants. But in the course of his remarks he took occasion to disagree with my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll). He said that the farmers of western Canada were not prosperous. No person in this House is saying that the farmer of western Canada is prosperous to-day. What the hon. member for Cape Breton South said yesterday was that the farmer of western Canada was as prosperous as any other person in the Dominion of Canada. Will my hon. friend tell me that the farmers of Saskatchewan are all, as the hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. Lucas) said yesterday, willing and anxious to get out of the country, when last year over 2,000 of them were able to pay income taxes? What about the people in Manitoba who were able to pay income taxes? If the farmer of western Canada comes here with a fair demand, asking for increased facilities for trade, and if he meets us in the same spirit as the farmer of eastern Canada is prepared to meet this parliament, he will get what is coming to him from this government in a fair and equitable manner.

It is all very well to talk about the tariff. An hon. member who spoke yesterday quoted from Holland in a very elaborate and eloquent speech, and he almost insinuated that the men of the old parties were political crooks. Undoubtedly, he made the words of Holland his own—"Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy." Can my hon. friend point to any member of this government or any member of the late government who was purchased by the spoils of office? Surely, the time has come in this country when men of all political parties shall be given credit for some measure of political honesty and shall not be called rogues and purloiners because they do not happen to agree with the particular member who is giving utterance to his sentiments.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend calls "order". Go ahead and call the order if you wish. We hear constantly in this House attacks made upon men who have become prominent in the industrial life in this country. Yesterday afternoon, one of the speakers did not hesitate to make a few little insinuations about the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). I am sure that if my hon. friend were sincere, if you could look into the innermost recesses of his heart, you would find he was not so much against the Minister of Justice as he was envious of men who, through their greater ability, secured and occupied greater positions in life than he. I want to tell my hon. friend who made that address yesterday that the present Minister of Justice was for many years leader of the people of the province of Quebec; and if my hon. friend wants to know the opinion of people outside of Quebec, he can come down to the old blue-nose province of Nova Scotia, and he will find there what our opinion is of the Minister of Justice. In the 1921 election, when it was said that the present Minister of Justice was coming back into politics, that statement aided every man in every constituency in Nova Scotia in securing his seat in the present parliament. That is the opinion which the people of Nova Scotia have of the present Minister of Justice.

Again, we were told yesterday that the Liberal party came into power on a platform of lower tariff. That is not the case. On every political platform that I had an opportunity of speaking in the province of

Nova Scotia, wherever I heard a colleague from Nova Scotia speak, and wherever I heard any of our leaders in Nova Scotia speak, no pronouncement whatever was made upon the tariff. What we said was this, that we had it on good authority that if the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government were returned to power, Mr. Fielding would be Minister of Finance, and that was all that the people of Nova Scotia wanted. That was our tariff policy — Mr. Fielding as Minister of Finance. I might go on and elaborate on this. It is true that there is a tariff wall in the Dominion of Canada to-day; but what have we to offer in its place? It is all that the people demand. It is said that Solon, the Athenian law-giver, said that the laws which he gave to the Athenians were not the best laws, but they were the best laws the Athenians at that time could stand. So it is in connection with the present tariff. It is not the best tariff; but it is the best tariff that Canada, under present conditions, can stand.

I am not going to intrude further, to any great extent, upon your valuable time, but I wish to say simply this. As I have already stated, the time has come in this country when public men should get a fair measure of justice meted out to them. My hon. friends opposite stand in their places and say that the two old political parties of this country have gone into desuetude. I want to tell my hon. friends who sit opposite that the grand old Liberal party of this country and the historic Conservative party will exist in the Dominion of Canada when there will be no Progressives occupying seats in this House.

Mr. HOEY: Will the hon. member tell me if they are going to exist together or separately?

Mr. MARTELL: Whether they exist separately or together, they will exist for the making of good government, government in the interest of all the people all the time, and not in the interest of any particular class or group.

I want to be local for one or two minutes and to call the attention of this House to conditions which exist in my constituency. The other day my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Putnam), in speaking had only one fault that I can remember, and that is that he arrogated to his constituency the historic place from which the expulsion of the Acadians took place. I would claim that my constituency is the most historic. There is in my constituency of Hants the town of Windsor and in that constituency also are great lumbering and gypsum industries and farming interests. We are the fourth port in the province of Nova Scotia as regards shipping and to-day we are absolutely devoid of any method of getting our commodities to market. I am, therefore, going to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) to look well to the demands of Windsor for improved trade facilities.

Before I conclude, I want to refer for a moment or so to the subamendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). I do not know whether that is the fruit of the brains of that hon. member or not. But it seems to me if I read the times aright, that there has been a sort of morganatic alliance between him and some other members in the House, not of the Progressive faith. I believe he has taken sweet counsel of some of the friends of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who leads the opposition. The amendment reminds one of the deception practised in the case of Jacob and Esau in the days of old: the hand was the hand of Esau, but the voice was the voice of Jacob. There is no reason to-day why there should be any pessimism in this country. True, there is a cry of unemployment all through the country. But, Sir, this notwithstanding, I do not think we have any reason whatsoever to be pessimistic. Canada is rich in her natural resources; she has diversified industries; and all we have to do is to be cheerful and have faith in our common country, looking forward to the day of prosperity, for already we can see

> The roseate hues of early dawn,
> The brightness of the day—

and Canada rightly taking her place as one of the foremost parts of the British Empire.

I was going to refer to some remarks made concerning Canada and the Near East situation, but I shall not say much on this point. I have only this to observe, that the people of my province are, I believe, absolutely in accord with the attitude taken by the government in the matter. I believe that the issues of war and peace in the Dominion of Canada should be determined entirely by this parliament. We do not want to drift away from the Old Land, but Canada does want to be mistress in her own house. It is for us to say what shall become of the moneys of the Canadian people, and what stand Canada shall take in all matters, national or international. I can do no better, before I close, than to quote the words of Sir Allen Aylesworth, who was appointed a short time ago to the Senate:

We do not ask for independence or closer legislative union, but the right to work out our own destiny, with Canada taking a leading part in that galaxy of nations that will forever surround the British throne.

It is not by lip loyalty that we shall retain our attachment to the Old Land. We must show ourselves capable of shoulder-
4 p.m. ing the responsibility which devolves from that independence which we have. For

Whilst the language, whilst the arts
That mould a nation's soul
Still cling around our hearts,
And between, let oceans roll
Our joint communion, breaking with the sun.
But still from either beach,
The voice of blood shall reach
More audible than speech,
We are one.

Mr. D. F. KELLNER (East Edmonton): As a representative of one of the constituencies which were honoured with a visit from Their Excellencies last summer, I am glad to know that our poor efforts at hospitality were appreciated. Before I say anything further, Mr. Speaker, I would tender a word of commendation to the mover of the Address (Mr. Putnam). Unfortunately, I cannot do the same so far as the seconder is concerned, for I do not understand his language. I was just a little bit surprised at the tenor of the address of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell). That hon. member devoted himself particularly to a criticism of the Progressives for their attitude towards the two old parties. While I listened the other afternoon to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in his very brilliant address, it occurred to me that the right hon. gentleman endeavoured to prove to the House that the present administration are incompetent, unreliable and unfit for office. I think you will agree that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) came right back. He claimed that in any instance where the present government had failed, it was because of some hopeless and impossible policy which had been wished upon them by the past administration; and he emphasized the fact that his government had done all that could reasonably have been hoped for, so far as anything they had personally undertaken was concerned. He also tells us that we are criticising the government.

Well, if the claim is advanced that both governments have been as good as could have been expected, it seems to me that no one will deny the truth of the statement that, in spite of this claim, Canada to-day is in a worse condition than it has ever been before. I believe that the rank and file of the people are finding it harder to get the necessaries of life than they have ever done at any previous stage in the country's history. However, I am not one of those who blame either the present or the past government for this. I think they both largely follow the same policy; their course is to a great extent dictated from the same sources, and the results would be much the same, regardless of what party might be in power. The present state of affairs, in my opinion, is due to the culmination of an impossible, a false, and an unfair fiscal policy; and I sometimes think that we take rather a short-sighted view of the situation when we go back only to the years of the war to get an angle from which to draw our conclusions regarding present conditions.

In order to understand the present situation correctly, we should go back over a period of about forty years to what might be termed the inauguration of the industrial epoch. At that time, practically throughout the English speaking world, a new method of business was being introduced. New machines were invented, expert mechanics were contriving devices for expediting commerce, railroads and transportation companies were extending their activities, agriculture took on a new impetus, with improved machinery to replace the old and worn out systems of production. The result was an increase in production in many ways. At the same time there sprang into being a large number of financial institutions to finance these increased operations. Now, I believe that these financial institutions had a dual purpose to perform. It was necessary for them to organize and build up their own business, and it was necessary for them also at least to look after the credit standing of those to whom they were lending money. The result was that early in the game, if one may so refer to this development, it was realized that if competition went on to its logical conclusion many of these financial institutions would be ruined. They therefore encouraged the system of fixing prices in order to eliminate competition; and to-day, in consequence of this price fixing, we have a spread between the cost of manufactured goods and their selling price which is perhaps greater than it has ever been before in the history of the world.

No doubt this is a topic that has been largely dwelt upon by previous speakers, so I will not do more than cite one instance in this connection. Recently in the city of Edmonton a farmer brought four horses to market, and there was no doubt that they were good horses, the kind which the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) tells us ought to fetch good prices. The auctioneer brought out the first two, and

under the hammer they went for $20. He went back and got the other two and they brought $15; or, in other words, the four horses, good animals, were sold for $35. The next article put up was a second-hand wagon which had been in use for five or six years. When the auctioneer called for bids the first offer was $25, which was increased by bids of $5 until the bidding stopped at $40. Then the auctioneer made a little speech, to this effect. He said: "Gentlemen, what would a wagon cost you if you bought it new to-day? Put a little paint on this wagon and it will be as good as new." The bidding was resumed and the wagon finally brought $90. Now, here were four good horses which were sold for $35, while an old second hand wagon could fetch $90. I do not think it is necessary to dwell on the point further. However, I would ask the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) who stated a few moments ago that there were a large number of unsaleable apples in his constituency, why they do not bring them to Ottawa and sell them, where they are retailing at five cents apiece.

Following out the theory of industrial expansion which this country has experienced, I would point out that by 1912 a certain amount of distress in our business operations had become apparent. In 1913 and the early part of 1914 the conditions were rapidly becoming worse, and by the time the war broke out we had practically the same conditions in Canada that we have to-day. Of course, since that time we have added materially to our public debt, and in that respect the condition has become a little more acute. I notice that if you speak about this matter to a banker in western Canada he will say it is the manufacturer who is to blame—that they have kept their prices so high that the people are unable to buy their goods; and if you speak to a manufacturer he will say that the bankers and loan companies are to blame because they lent money at exorbitant rates of interest which it required all the production of the country to pay. That is another case of "passing the buck," somewhat the same as the ex-government and the present government do in evading responsibility. I believe that government has one function to perform, that is, seeing that there is fair play as between the different classes of the people. If they are going to extend advantages to any it should be to the weak, to those who are unable to look after themselves—these should receive first consideration. That, however, has not been the case in the past. Any patronage that has gone out has invariably gone out to the big concerns, to those who are well able to look after themselves.

Speaking yesterday afternoon, the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), referring to conditions in the West, produced a telegram from the East Edmonton U.F.A. an organization with which I have the honour to be connected, that had inspired a letter which he seemed to question the truth of. I take it that he was trying to argue that the West had had a very big crop last year. I have here a report from the Alberta government covering the crop averages in that province. It states that in respect of spring wheat there was an average crop of 11.40 bushels to the acre; of winter wheat, 11.60 bushels; of oats, 21.50 bushels; of barley, 14.90 bushels; of rye, 10.30 bushels.

With regard to the matter of a suggested immigration policy, I would like to quote what the present provincial government is sending out in regard to the conference recently held in this city respecting immigration. The statement says:

> Hon. R. G. Reid, Minister of Health and Municipal Affairs, returned last week from Ottawa where he attended the conference of Dominion and provincial cabinet ministers on the problem of immigration. Mr. Reid made it plain to the conference that Alberta was not in a position to encourage any wholesale immigration at the present time but was prepared to absorb new settlers with sufficient capital to establish themselves. He also pointed out that the province was seeking irrigation farmers particularly for the new irrigation districts being opened up in the south.

If the reports we get about Canada being in the most favourable position of any country in the world are true, what is the sense of our going to other countries and trying to get farmers to come in here who have money? I do not see that there is any country you can go to with much hope of getting them. Every country has unoccupied farm lands. Most assuredly the United States has them; every country in Europe has them. There is no doubt that any persons in these countries who wanted to farm could find a good opportunity to do so in their own home land, and if we transplant them to Canada there is little prospect of their remaining here very long. Probably seventy-five per cent of the people who live in our urban centres to-day have had experience in farming, and the reason they are not on the farms to-day is because they tried it and found it did not pay, so they moved off.

Canada is a young man's country, a strong man's country. We cannot afford to take any class of people who may wish to come here. The only men who can hope to make good in our country are men who are physically robust and strong.

I was a little amused the other afternoon when the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) suggested that the redistribution which is to take place this session should follow the lines of the redistribution policy of 1912. I think when he made that request he strayed a considerable distance from the paths of intelligence. In 1912 it was unquestionably the policy to make as many safe Conservative seats as possible, and this time I do not doubt, it will be the policy to make as many safe Liberal seats as possible. Whether or not this government is responsive to the needs of the country I do not know, but I do know that the opinion is held that a small group control and largely dominate the business of the country. That is a dangerous tendency. The people are losing heart; they are becoming dissatisfied, and unless confidence can be restored and the spirits of the people brought up to a higher level, the position will become even more dangerous. That was virtualy admitted yesterday when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said that our debt would probably not be paid during the lifetime of the present parliament. That is practically the condition that the individual finds himself in today, except that he is a little worse off, because he has not the taxing power of the country in his own hands. If his business requires new money, he invariably finds that he cannot get it, whereas the government can levy additional taxes to meet the country's requirements. It is the duty of the government, Sir, to see that there is fair play as between the different classes that comprise the people of Canada, a duty which I am afraid in the past has not been faithfully carried out.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and after listening to the number of excellent addresses which have been made on the motion of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam), I feel that it is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House at any considerable length. However, I feel it my duty to refer for a few moments to certain matters contained in His Excellency's Speech, as well as to try and answer some of the criticisms made by certain members who have preceded me.

I presume I am in order with the other members of this House in offering, as is usual, my congratulations to the mover of the Address (Mr. Putnam) and the seconder (Mr. Rhéaume). We in Nova Scotia, as was so ably said by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) are very proud of the honour the government has done us in selecting one of our number to move the Address. We are proud, Sir, of the hon. member for Colchester, and proud also that he comes from one of the old historic counties of the province of Nova Scotia.

Since the opening of this parliament reference has been made to the deaths of certain members which have taken place since last session. Whilst we all lament the four members who have passed away, I wish particularly to refer for a moment to one who for the last four or five years was a very dear personal friend of mine. It is said that if you sleep with a man you come to know him, and I had the honour and the pleasure during an eight weeks' trip to the West in the year 1920 of coming in close contact with one of the hon. members of this House who passed away during the recess. I feel it my duty at this moment to express my deep sorrow that a personal friend of mine in the person of the Hon. Mr. Kennedy, the late Minister of Railways, is with us no more.

His Excellency in his Speech has given us some very valuable information. The second paragraph says:

> It is gratifying to note that in a period of world-wide trade depression following the Great War, Canada has made substantial progress towards recovery.

It is quite true, of course, that conditions in Canada are not as bad as they were a year ago; but still every business man in this country realizes that we are not yet out of the woods by a long way, and it is desirable that there be not only public economy, but private economy by every man, woman and child in Canada if we are ever going to get back on a proper business basis. While conditions are not just exactly what they should be, yet there is hope for this great country. We have great natural resources, and if our people apply themselves and work, not merely six or eight hours a day, but from daylight till dark or as long as there is work to be done, I believe that we shall pull Canada out of the condition in which she finds herself today.

The government seems to be coming in for a great deal of blame for the present conditions. I cannot agree with this statement. It is to be remembered that this government only took office a year ago, and it was faced with certain conditions at that time. I do not blame the conditions altogether upon the late government, but this government was faced with certain conditions, and it is certainly going to take a year or two—in fact, it will take, not decades, but centuries to overcome

certain things which have taken place in the last few years.

The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) has moved an amendment to the amendment, in which he deprecated the fact that the public debt had increased by $45,000,000 this year. Well, Sir, there is good reason why the public debt should have increased that much, and one reason is what took place, not last year, but several years ago. Whilst the war is responsible for a great deal of the increase in the public debt, my opinion is that most of our troubles are due to what was known as "Union government' 'in this country. If instead of having a Union government in 1917, we had had either a Conservative or a Liberal, we should not find ourselves half as badly off as we are at the present time.

I notice that the hon. member for Calgary West, in speaking of the public debt, offered no solution of our difficulties. He talked, of course, about economizing, and how fine a thing it would be to reduce the public debt, but he did not make any concrete suggestions how it could be done. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), who also moved an amendment, talked about the economic conditions in this country and endeavoured to tell us that those conditions should be bettered. It is all very well to get up and criticize, but unless your criticism is constructive it is an absolute waste of time to get up on your feet before an intelligent assembly of this kind and make statements which you are unable to back up.

Let us look into this question of the public debt for a moment, and see what can be done with regard to expenditure in this country. I hold in my hands the Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1923. These Estimates were passed last year by the members of this parliament, and totalled $466,983,000. If we look at the Estimates for a moment we shall see why the hon. member for Calgary West and the hon. member for Springfield did not show us where this government and this parliament could save money for the taxpayers. What do we find? The very first item is "Interest on public debt, $140,000,000." Now it is impossible for us to get around that expenditure. The interest on the public debt has to be paid until such a time as Canada is capable of paying off all or part of it. This charge, of course, was largely brought about through the great expenditure during the war years. It was also brought about by other causes. Some of the amounts which have been spent were not in my opinion absolutely necessary, but, of course, there were certain amounts that had to be expended, and some of them very large amounts.

I spoke a moment ago of the cost of the war. Nobody objects to any legitimate expenditure in that connection, but during the past few years the amounts which have gone to make up our public debt have been expended all over this country. For instance, in the city of Halifax, which is the greatest port in Canada, a large amount of money was spent some few years ago. Some $20,000,000 was expended on the port of Halifax, and I say that that amount of money was wasted. It was an unnecessary expenditure. It should not have been expended where it was, because the eastern terminals where they at present exist are really of no benefit to the port of Halifax or to the shipping which comes there. The whole city was cut in two. I say that instead of spending $20,000,000 upon that work, an expenditure of $2,000,000 in another part of the city would give us far better terminals.

Take the city of St. John, where also a large amount of money was spent in development work. Whether the expenditure was wise or not is a moot question. Some people contend that in order to develop the port of St. John it was necessary that that large amount of money should be spent; but I have heard criticisms, especially with regard to the dry-dock in Courtenay Bay. I have heard it said that the money spent there was absolutely wasted because a ship cannot be hauled out to be cleaned or placed in dry dock unless you have a high tide in the Bay of Fundy, and as those who read the Nautical Almanac know, the tide is some 35 feet.

There were other great expenditures. This government and the late government have voted large sums of money to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, for instance. I think everybody will agree that that expenditure has been for the development of the port. Perhaps more money has been voted than was absolutely necessary, but Montreal is a great port, and it seems to me if we are ever to develop the business of this country large sums of money must be spent where development work is necessary. So, when members of this House or people outside regret the increase in the public debt, they should bear in mind that no criticism should be offered to legitimate expenditure.

Then we have been spending for the last few years large sums of money on harbour works in Quebec. Large amounts have also been expended on harbour improvements in

Toronto, and we are told, in criticism of this expenditure, that no inconsiderable sum voted for that purpose was spent last year in building boulevards and parks in that city. If that statement is correct the money spent for such a purpose was an unwise expenditure. On the other hand, any expenditure for properly building up the port of Toronto I should say was a wise expenditure for which neither the present government nor their predecessors should be criticized.

Turning our attention to the Pacific we find that a large sum of money has been spent in Vancouver during the past few years. I had the pleasure of visiting that city two years ago, and of visiting it again this year, and I want to say that it is one of the principal cities in Canada. It is a city that every Canadian should be proud of, and not simply the people who live in its immediate vicinity. The port of Vancouver in my opinion is, in the near future, going to equal the city of Montreal—no, I should not say that, but it will go a great length in that direction; and I admit that any moneys spent by this government, or any other government, for the development of that port is in the best interests of Canada. I heard my hon. friend from Skeena (Mr. Stork) speak of Prince Rupert and he extolled that port very highly. The port is certainly an excellent one, and I am told is 600 miles nearer the Orient than Vancouver. In the port of Prince Rupert there is one of the best drydocks in the world, and a drydock which is not being used either by the general shipping of Canada, or by the government vessels when they need to be hauled out and repaired.

I find that in the city of Victoria a sum of four or five million dollars is to be spent on a drydock. Now, I have nothing to say against that city, and I congratulate the hon. member who represents it upon getting such a large sum of money voted; but I am doubtful, Sir, of the wisdom of such a vote in view of the splendid dock to be found at Prince Rupert. I doubt whether the late administration, or the present government is justified in expending such a large amount of money for such a purpose in the city of Victoria in view of existing accommodation, the huge burden of public debt and the tremendous amount of money we have to pay in the form of interest and for other purposes.

For example during the war there was expended for what was termed naval expenditure and which was almost entirely unnecessary the sum of $30,000,000. This amount was practically wasted; no benefits whatever were derived from the expenditure. Before I came to Ottawa I went through the dockyard in the city of Halifax. Some of the citizens of Halifax called my attention to the great quantity of stores that was to be found in that dockyard. In order to convince myself of the truthfulness of the statements of these gentlemen I went down and inspected the dockyard and I now make this statement: Whoever are responsible for the great quantity of stores in that dockyard—whether it is the officials of the Naval department under the present government or under the last government—are not fit to continue to hold any office of public trust in this country. Would you believe me, Sir, when I tell you that there is almost enough rope in store in the dockyard of Halifax to reach practically all round the world, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that within half a mile of the dockyard, in the city of Dartmouth, rope works exist where supplies could be purchased whenever needed, and at very short notice. Well, some official, at the instance of some government, deliberately purchased from some friends sufficient rope to fit out the entire British navy, the vessels of the Canadian government merchant marine and all the shipping that will come to Halifax for the next twenty-five years. Worse than that, there is enough wire rope in that dockyard to rig practically every ship in Canada. Furthermore there are 800 suits of oilclothes hanging up in an upper attic. These are practically burnt and will not be fit for use. Permit me to mention that the dockyard stores contain these among other items—7 tons of pepper; 1,300 dozen teaspoons; 1,500 dozen tablespoons; also knives, forks, teapots, and soup tureens—everything you can think of. I went into one branch and inquired "What is in those boxes?" I received the reply "They contain black ink". I inquired "How much is there?" They said "One hundred and forty boxes of ink, twelve quarts each." Now here every day we have to ask a messenger to go and get us a bottle of ink, and yet in the Halifax dockyard there is enough ink to keep the members of parliament supplied for the next five years. This affords some idea of the wasteful expenditure which has gone on. It is about time the present government set to work and sold at auction or otherwise the great quantity of stores in the Halifax dockyard.

There is another item, and a very big one which goes to make up our public debt on which such a large sum of interest is payable at the present time, and that is the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, which cost the tax payers of this country some $80,000,000. This money should never

have been spent, and the taxpayers of Canada should never have been called upon to bear such a heavy burden. If the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries had taken the advice of certain members of this House he would have been able to sell these vessels at a fair price, or practically at cost. But instead of doing that he has kept the vessels in operation for several years with the result that year after year they involve a loss of large sums of money. Last year the loss was about $9,000,000; this year I am told the loss will amount to $10,000,000, and that is where the money is going, to increase the public debt. In the Speech from the Throne it was announced that these ships had been passed over to Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors. I say that it is a mistake for the government to put these ships under the control of the Railway department or under the control of the board of directors of the Canadian National railways. In my opinion they should have remained under the manage- of the Minister of Marine, and I would advise the government at the earliest possible moment to cause them to revert to his control. The minister should then sell them as quickly as possible so that the people of the country will not have to pay any further deficits on the service.

There are other expenditures, and to some I would like to direct the attention of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) and see if he objects to them. For example we passed an appropriation of $8,000,000 last year for agriculture. I am sure my hon. friend will not object to that one, he will not say that that appropriation was not necessary. For my part I certainly think it was necessary and very likely was expended to good advantage.

Mr. GOULD: It was too small.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member for Assiniboia, says it was too small. That is the selfish westerner speaking.

We have a vote of $2,000,000 for immigration and colonization, and in the Speech from the Throne there is a reference to the desirability of getting immigrants for Canada. With that I agree, but I also want to sound a note of warning to the government. While it is desirable to secure immigrants, and while it is true that, in view of the burden of our public debt and the existing taxation, we must increase the population of this country, yet it seemes to me that we ought to endeavour as far as possible, to retain our present population as well as attract new arrivals. During the last year, and it is not the fault of the present government, a great many people have left this country. It may surprise you to know that some of the very best blood in the province from which I come have gone to the United States—this exodus consisting not of old men and women, but of young men and young girls from 18 to 25 years of age. These are the people we should try and keep in Canada; and yet because of certain conditions which now exist, and for which I say the present government is not responsible these young men and women are forced to go to the United States. As far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned I do not believe we have had a square deal since confederation. One reason why we cannot get the same measure of justice meted out to us as the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, in particular, enjoy is this—on account of our distance from these great provinces we are practically compelled to buy from Ontario and Quebec but we are unable to sell our products to them. Certain people talk about home markets, but so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, we have no home markets except within our three Maritime provinces. Our destiny is on the sea and to the south, and unless we get fair terms from the great republic so we can sell our products there, and unless we can also sell our products in the West Indies and abroad, there is not very much hope for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

Some of my hon. friends on the other side were talking about our railway problems and high freight rates. Well, if anybody in this country has reason to complain about our freight rates it seems to me it is the people of the Maritime provinces. In view of what happened last year—I refer to the generous treatment meted out to the western provinces by the Maritime provinces—I think our western friends should endeavour to help us in the Maritimes as much as possible. I happened, Sir, to be a member of the special committee on the Crowsnest pass agreement, and I had the honour, as the representative of the Maritime provinces on that committee, to move the adoption of a report in committee which was to bring some relief to the western provinces. This report was filed in parliament on the 24th June, 1922. I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) said that by that agreement the people of the West saved $30,000,000. Well, if that be so, we in the East who got no redress in the matter of freight rates had to pay our proportion of that saving, because if no reduction had been made in freight rates, and if the Canadian Government Railways had

received, say, half of that $30,000,000, there would have been $15,000,000 less increase of the national debt. Therefore I say the people of the Maritime provinces had to pay their proportion of that amount.

I want to read to the House one of the clauses of that report. It will be found on page 496 of the Journals of the House of Commons for 1922. Here it is:

> Representatives of the Maritime provinces urged that their situation was one of special character, because of the conditions under which the Intercolonial Railway has been constructed as a result of the Confederation agreement. They contended that there was an implied obligation necessarily attaching to these terms which guaranteed to them special consideration in regard to railway freight rates, on account of their distance from the central and Western provinces. It was claimed that the increases in rates of the Intercolonial Railway since 1916 were in excess of rates allowed by the Board of Railway Commissioners on many of their products, which excessive rates greatly interfered with inter-provincial trade, and are contrary to the obligation accepted by the Government of Canada at Confederation. The Government was, therefore, asked to take cognizance of the situation and endeavour to arrange such reductions of rates as will, having regard to the actual cost of operation of these railways, remove as far as possible the difficulties complained of, and that the Board of Railway Commissioners should, for the same reasons, and in so far as their jurisdiction extends, restore the differential rate formerly applicable to traffic to and from the Maritime provinces, and we recommend that the Minister of Railways and Board of Management take steps to meet the situation in these provinces by a substantial reduction in rates.

Now, while this part of the report was adopted by the House, practically nothing was done by the Railway Commission to give redress to the Maritime provinces, with the result that we in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick are at the present time suffering by reason of the high freight rates which we have to pay, and as long as these high freight rates exist it is impossible for the people there to do very much business with the central and western provinces. It is true that a new board of directors of our National Railways has been appointed and are at work, and I sincerely hope that before they get very far in their deliberations they will take into consideration the fact that the Maritime provinces have certain rights under confederation, and if they expect the people there to be prosperous and to be able to pay either their share of the interest on the national debt or of the public expenditure, they will have to put them in a position where they can do more business with the central and western provinces.

But, as I said a moment ago, in my opinion our destiny is not with these provinces. If we are going to get increased business we have to get it either in the United States or in other foreign countries. While the western farmer has been suffering on account of low prices for his products, the same thing applies to the farmer and every other producer in practically all the other provinces, and applies perhaps to a far larger extent to those in the Maritime provinces. Last year United States congress passed what was known as the Fordney tariff bill, increasing the tariff on goods which we sell to that great country, and that increase has been a great handicap to the farmers, the lumbermen and the fishermen of the three provinces of the Maritimes. Candidly, I do not know what is going to happen. Some people talk of retaliation, of putting up a tariff wall against goods from the United States. I am opposed to that course because I cannot see the wisdom of it. My hon. friends on the other side want lower tariffs. I am in hearty sympathy with them. I think that if it were practical I would go a great deal further than they are prepared to go, because from a business standpoint, if conditions in these countries were normal, I cannot see why there should be any tariff between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick any more than there is between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. But unfortunately there are certain conditions which we have to face. This government has been left a legacy, if I may so term it, by other governments, and they have to carry on and raise sufficient moneys to meet our national expenditure, and therefore it is impossible at the present time to adopt free trade or substantially reduce the tariff. Consequently I do not think my friends from the West should be in such a hurry. They should give the government a chance, and I feel confident that if they have patience everything will work out all right. As I said before, if it were possible I would have no tariff barriers at all. But I think it is useless for any hon. member to rise in his place and endeavour to convince us that at the present time we can either very much lower our tariff or abolish it altogether. The Fordney bill, as I said, was very injurious to the people of Nova Scotia. For instance, the business in which I am mostly interested, fish, is hard hit, a duty of $1.60 per hundred pounds having been imposed on salt dry fish, and on salt fish, herring, mackerel, and so on, a prohibitive duty of two cents a pound. The result is that anybody who ships these goods to the United States receives that much less for them, because the price governing fish is not fixed in the same way as the price on grain or on manufactured products, that is, the price of fish is fixed in the foreign market,

and consequently the shipper has to pay the duty.

Unless this government does something to make an agreement with the United States whereby the tariff on fish is reduced or abolished, I regret to say that the great fisheries of Nova Scotia will soon be a thing of the past. In my own county to-day we have something like 150,000 quintals of fish unsold, representing under normal conditions about a million and a half dollars. It is no wonder that all over Nova Scotia and the other two Maritime provinces the fishermen are leaving for the United States, because they find that under the Fordney tariff they cannot make a living from the avocation they have followed in the past. Therefore, while I congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) on concluding commercial treaties with France and Italy, it seems to me that after the session is over one of the first things to engage the attention of the government should be the making of an agreement with the United States whereby the tariff on some of the commodities we export to that country will be reduced to the point that will enable us to recover our trade with that country.

I was speaking to the House, and particularly to the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) with regard to our national expenditures, and was asking him if he objected to any items which were contained in this great list totalling $466,000,000. One large item is $33,000,000 for pensions. I am sure that neither the hon. member for Springfield nor any other hon. member is going to object to that expenditure so long as the money is properly spent, and therefore when he or any other hon. member urges the necessity of economizing I am confident they do not want to economize on this item. There is an item, however, which I am now going to express myself freely upon. The next item I notice which we voted last year was for Militia and Defence, $10,000,000. Personally, I am with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) with regard to a great reduction in that item. I believe there is no necessity to spend $10,000,000 in this country on Militia and Defence. As long as we have a skeleton organization which might cost anywhere from $2,000,000 to $5,000,000, I think Canada is doing her share. I noticed in the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen) the other day—and I should really congratulate him upon that speech, because it was a very mild and good one—he mentioned the fact that Canada had certain duties in connection with the defence of the country. That is quite true, and Canada, I think, is willing at any time to do what is necessary; but in view of the large public debt, in view of the interest and other expenditures that we have, we should, for the next few years at least, economize as regards expenditure in connection with Militia and Defence.

Last year, we voted some $90,000,000 for Railways and Canals; and as I said a moment ago, if this House had given relief to the agriculturists of the West, we would not have to raise so much money in other ways to pay the expenses of Railways and Canals. The next item is Dominion Lands and Parks, $4,936,000. This is an item where, in my opinion, this government could economize. In view of present business conditions in this country, I cannot see why almost $5,000,000 should be spent on Dominion Lands and Parks. Another item is Soldier Land Settlement, $12,000,000. I am sure neither the hon. member for Springfield nor anybody else will object to that amount of money being spent, if it is spent properly in the interest of the returned soldier. Then there is Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Nobody, I am sure, will object to that item. Then, under the heading of Miscellaneous, we have the large sum of $14,000,000. I am going to be frank with the government, frank with myself and frank with the House. In my opinion, under that heading, this country can save some money.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear." I hope he will not ask for several million dollars to be expended in the western provinces for something which we cannot afford. Before I pass from the amount which was voted last year for Railways and Canals, I notice an item of $4,360,000 lent to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited. I do not think the present government was responsible, because we were compelled to vote that money last year, and I do not wish to criticize very much the former government. But we have arrived at a time and a condition when, in my opinion, no more money should be voted by this House for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Instead of voting more money to be wasted and lost, this government should sell those ships at the earliest possible moment, pay any debts that have been contracted in connection with them, and place

the balance of the money towards the payment of the public debt.

Mr. NEILL: Is the hon. member aware, or will he tell the House, that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine on the Pacific coast is a public benefit and a profitable one? It is only in the effete East that it has proved unprofitable.

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend has stated that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships on the Pacific coast are beneficial and profitable. I do not know if they are profitable or not, but I doubt that very much. I cannot understand why they should be beneficial, when millions of tons of shipping are lying idle in almost every principal port in the world, ships that would be very glad to carry the cargoes which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are carrying from Vancouver and other Canadian ports.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): They would not be Canadian ships.

Mr. DUFF: They would be British.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): American.

Mr. DUFF: This government has no right to vote the people's money to pay the deficit of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships when there is tonnage to carry every dollar's worth of goods on either the Pacific or the Atlantic coast.

I want to refer for a moment to some of the items under Miscellaneous which amount to $14,000,000. This is a very large amount, and of course some of it is necessary. I am sure nobody will object to the item of $2,200,000 which it voted and spent to provide for the administration of the business profits war tax. Everybody realizes that a large amount of money is collected through this source, and it is necessary to have a large staff of officials to collect this amount. The only regret I have is that there are not more farmers in this country, especially in the West, who can pay a business profits tax and an income tax.

There are, however, several amounts on which I think we could save this year. First, there is a grant of $15,000 to the Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts' Association. I believe under present conditions that money should not be voted and should be saved to the ratepayers of this country. There is a grant of $3,000 in aid of the Dominion Council of the Girl Guides. Of course, it is very nice for certain religious bodies in this country to get together the young ladies in their congregations and to put them through certain physical training; but under present financial conditions in this country, these churches should arrange to pay the expenses of these organizations themselves and not come to this government for any grant.

Another item is Purchasing Commission, $72,000. I believe there is no necessity for paying $72,000 for a Purchasing Commission, when in the Public Works department, Marine and Fisheries department and every other department there is a purchasing agent. It seems to me that these purchasing agents should be able to purchase the goods that are required, and that this $72,000 could be saved to the taxpayers of this country. I feel sure the hon. member for Springfield will realize, on consideration, that when the government has to raise practically $500,000,000 and most of it can be spent economically in the best interests of this country, it is pretty hard for the government to retrench very much in the matter of expenditures.

Mr. LEADER: Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question—and I am asking it in a friendly spirit—does he not think that the grant of $5,000 to the boat race off the coast of Nova Scotia might be done away with this year?

Mr. DUFF: I agree absolutely with the hon. gentleman, and since he has brought up this point, I might say that I consider the $5,000 voted last year for that purpose was the best expenditure that this government or any other government could make.

Mr. LEADER: You beat the other fellow.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, we beat the other fellow. But let me tell my hon. friend that this is not an ordinary yacht race; it is a fishermen's race. This race is run by fishing vessels; the boats are manned by actual fishermen, and it is a good thing for the country because it develops a spirit of rivalry. Last year no less than fifteen new fishing schooners were built because the owners and captains wanted to compete with the vessels which won the race in 1921. In spite of the depression in Nova Scotia to-day, in my constituency sixteen new fishing schooners are being built practically as a result of that fishermen's race.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are they needed?

Mr. DUFF: I do not quite understand the hon. member's question.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): My question is in reference to my hon. friend's last remark. Are these fishing schooners being built for the purpose of racing only, or for fishing purposes?

Mr. DUFF: I am sorry my hon. friend does not read the newspapers. I have explained the matter in this House, and the newspapers contained many columns about it last year. These vessels are not racing vessels; they are fishing vessels. They, with their crews, leave the ports of Lunenburg, LaHave and Mahone in the month of March when my hon. friend and I are comfortably seated in the House of Commons. They go out and anchor off the Sable island banks where they fish for about a month.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): My hon. friend referred to the fact that the holding of this race caused an additional shipbuilding effort to the number of fifteen ships. Presumably it was because it was felt that the grant would stimulate interest in fishing. All I am asking is whether these ships were built purely because of the stimulus and the advertising which would result from the race, or whether they were built because they were actually needed.

Mr. DUFF: They are built for both purposes. The race gave a stimulus to young men to go and secure owners to put up money to build the new schooners. The result is that the fleet has been increased by fifteen or sixteen ships in the last year, and the same number this year. These vessels are not racing yachts; they are ships that are on the ocean from the 15th March until the middle of October or later. They fish on the Sable island banks, the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and elsewhere, where fishermen, to the number of about twenty on each vessel, spend the whole summer, returning with fish to the value of some $30,000 in each ship. Every vessel added to the fleet brings into the country yearly product valued at some $30,000, and I certainly think that a grant of $5,000 voted for the purpose of promoting this industry does just as much good as a similar grant voted for agriculture.

Mr. BROWN: I want the hon. member to understand that the matter is one that has my sympathy. But he apparently does not see any inconsistency between his advocating this grant and the statement that fishermen are going to the United States. Does it not seem that we are building up at one end and allowing the industry to go down at the other? Does the hon. member not see any inconsistency there?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think there is. The people who are going to the United States are young men and women. The men who are going are not fishermen.

Mr. BROWN: You mentioned fishermen as well, I believe.

Mr. DUFF: There are a few from Cape Breton and the counties along the shore, but most of the men who have been fishing in these vessels of which I speak will remain at home. Now, because of the depression in the fishing industry, a number of fishing schooners of the type of that which won the race last year have been sold, as my hon. friend says, to gentlemen who are in a more profitable business and who hail from the United States. And the joke is that these vesels hail from Lunenburg, although they are owned and operated from the United States, because Americans cannot go into that particular business with ships of their own.

My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) raised some question with regard to this grant of $5,000. Of course I am quite willing to take this criticism in the right spirit. But I would call his attention to some of the amounts that have been spent in agriculture. In my opinion the $5,000 voted for the schooner race was just as beneficial in the interests of this country as some of the moneys voted for agriculture. We vote some $8,000,000 all told for agriculture.

5 p.m.

For instance, for seed and fertilizer we grant $260,000, and for live stock $1,000,000. We on this side of the House do not complain about the votes to agriculture which the western provinces receive. I noticed somewhere the other day in looking over the estimates that a large amount was voted for seed grain as well. It seems to me that if this government and past governments can have voted large sums of money for seed grain and for other agricultural purposes, my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie should not complain if a certain amount is granted to the fisheries of the country; because, in my opinion, neither this government nor any other has done what it should have done to encourage our fisheries. I see that while in the Speech from the Throne His Excellency speaks about agricultural depression he makes no mention of the depression in either the fisheries or the lumber industry. I think that the sooner His Excellency is made aware of the conditions in the Maritime provinces and is shown the opportunity we have for development there, he will see the wisdom of including in the next Speech from the Throne some practical reference to fisheries and lumber.

One hon. member yesterday spoke about the Hudson Bay railway. Now, this is something on which we have spent a large amount

of money, and I understand that our western friends are asking that still greater sums be expended to construct this railway. In my opinion, and I have some knowledge of the matter, this undertaking should never have been started in the first place, and it would be a mistake for this government to spend one dollar on the Hudson Bay railway. It is regrettable, but still true, that every dollar spent by either this government or any previous government in endeavouring to build a harbour at either Port Nelson or Fort Churchill has been absolutely wasted. By reason of currents and the condition of the bottom of that large bay; the millions of dollars that have been spent in dredging since operations were first started have been practically wasted. I have some knowledge of this locality because I have been at the mouth of Hudson bay as far as Mugford and Nain, and it is impossible to get ships into the bay for any lengthy period. They may get in for four weeks out of the whole twelve months of the year, and no shipping man will send a vessel there unless he gets a higher freight rate, because he has to pay higher insurance. But what is the use of spending millions of dollars in building a railway to Hudson bay when it is impossible to keep the ports open on account of ice and the conditions that prevail at these places? I think it is about time that the people of the West, while we are all in sympathy with them, realized the futility of asking the government to spend money for the purpose of building the Hudson Bay railway when it can never be a success. Even if the railway were built, very little shipping would come to these ports.

I think I have said about as much as is necessary in regard to this matter. I feel that if this government is given a chance to prove its worth it will satisfy the taxpayers of the country that it is endeavouring to do its best under very trying circumstances. The government has been in power only a year, and it is impossible for any government to do very much in that time. We should bear in mind that when the Liberal party was in power from 1896 to 1911 this country was very prosperous. And I would remind my friends from the western provinces that any relief in the matter of taxation that has been given by the governments of this country has been given by the Liberal party when in office. That party went down to defeat in 1911 in an effort to provide some relief not only to western agriculturists but to all the people of Canada, when the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the late Mr. Paterson tried to get through a reciprocity agreement.

I think that we should at the earliest moment try to negotiate with the United States another treaty of that kind. I am not scared of the bogey of one hundred millions swallowing nine millions. Now, the people of the Maritime provinces are all good Canadians who believe in confederation, but unless some relief is given them, I fear to contemplate the future. Thousands of people have left those provinces during the last year, and if something is not done to retain the present population the Maritime provinces will lose thousands this year and next year as well. I do think that our western friends should unite with the members from the East in an endeavour to find some solution for the problem of the Maritime provinces. If that solution lies in a lower tariff and it can be provided without any injury to any of the rest of the people I am with the western members. But I do not think that this is the right time to move an amendment such as has been submitted by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in his speech the other day said that this tariff was 2½ per cent higher than it was when the government of which he was leader went out of power. I always take with a grain of salt anything the right hon. gentleman says, and I shall not dispute his words now; I could not, perhaps, hold my end of it in a controversy with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: I beg pardon? I would try it, of course, if necessary. I want to read an extract from an editorial published in a Tory newspaper. The right hon. leader of the Opposition has said that the present tariff is higher than it was when the Union government, or the National Liberal and Conservative government, was in power. Nobody has any doubt about the politics of the Mail and Empire, a journal which is published in Toronto, the great home of Toryism, and is regarded generally as a loyal Tory newspaper. In an editorial which devotes a good deal of attention to the hon. leader of the Progressive party, the Mail and Empire says, referring to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke):

> Does he regard the present tariff of Canada as a highly protective one, considering the fact that it is the lowest tariff Canada has had in a generation?

These are the words of the Toronto Mail and Empire, yet the right hon. leader of the Opposition said a few days ago, and I think he repeated it yesterday, that the present tariff was higher by 2½ per cent than it was when his government went out of power. I leave the matter to the right hon. leader of the

Opposition and the editor of the Mail and Empire, but everybody knows—it was stated yesterday by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding)—that the tariff is lower than it was before; that reductions were made on a great many articles. I feel that if this government is given a fair chance it will reduce the tariff, even at this session, wherever possible.

Mr. IRVINE: If this is not a proper time to move the amendment, when would the proper time be?

Mr. DUFF: Well, I am only a backbencher; I am not a parliamentarian of many years' standing, any more than my hon. friend is. But my idea is that the proper time to bring down the resolution moved by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) is when the budget is brought down —that is, if he is not satisfied with the budget.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask further whether the hon. member would guarantee to us the right to move an amendment to the amendment on the budget?

Mr. DUFF: I do not have to guarantee the hon. member any rights at all; he has certain rights in this House just the same as any other hon. member. I do not think he need worry. The Speaker will be delighted to allow him or anybody else to move any amendment that is in order.

Mr. IRVINE: We had to worry about it last year, and did not get it.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member did not worry very much; his hair has not turned grey. Now, while I have a good deal of sympathy with the sentiments expressed by this amendment, I feel that this is not the proper time to bring it forward. Every hon. member agrees that the burden of taxation is high; that many people are suffering from that burden, and that there is a good deal of unrest and dissatisfaction. But what can we do? We have to face a certain condition. We have a very large debt, the expenditures of the country are great, and the only thing for us to do is to bear our burdens cheerfully. But I repeat that this government, wherever possible, should endeavour to economize and save money for the people. I have faith in this government. I believe that if they are given an opportunity they will pare down the expenses so that not only my hon. friends sitting opposite, but every ratepayer in the country will realize that under a Liberal administration Canada's affairs are conducted in an economic manner. I submit that in all the circumstances it would have been far better if my hon. friend had not moved the amendment which he has introduced.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): Mr Speaker, it has been a pleasure to me to listen to such a moderate speech from the hon. gentleman for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I remember that last session he was far more fiery and had far stronger statements to make respecting the party to the right of me and also this party. But to-day his tone is a moderate one, and we cannot therefore extend to him the criticism that we can extend to the other two hon. members who have spoken and who also come from his province. However, some of the things he said certainly demand an explanation.

In the first place, speaking of economy, he says that $6,000,000 was spent on the agricultural interests of this country—and he was continually looking at us as if all the agricultural interests were centred in western Canada. Only a few moments previously one of the members from Nova Scotia had said that his constituency also was an agricultural one. I think my hon. friend will find that some of that money was spent in the Maritime provinces.

Mr. DUFF: If my hon. friend will allow me, I did not object to any expenditure for agriculture. I did not say it was all for the West, either.

Mr. LEWIS: I understood the hon. member to say that $6,000,000 was spent in connection with agriculture, that we were demanding economy, and that we would not want any smaller expenditure in that regard.

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend should remember that he and his friends are not the only agriculturists in this country. There are better farmers in Nova Scotia than there are in any of the western provinces.

Mr. LEWIS: I am quite willing that the hon. member for Lunenburg should blow his own horn; that has nothing to do with me. I am not saying there are not better farmers in the East, nor am I saying that all the farmers who have left Saskatchewan are failures. But if $6,000,000 is spent upon the agricultural interests of the whole of Canada, representing practically half the whole population, it is a very negligible sum to spend when we consider that $481,000,000 are spent for the rest of the Dominion. Let us remember also that we, the common people, are paying into the public treasury over $80,000,000 in connection with the manufactured goods which we buy, and are putting a further like sum

into the pockets of the manufacturers. So that $6,000,000 is a very small sum compared with other expenditures that are made.

Another thing I could hardly understand as being consistent was the assertion of the hon. member for Lunenburg that as a result of the duties on fish many of his people were going out of business, coupled with the later statement that sixteen new schooners were being built, not for the races but to engage in the fishing industry. Wise and intelligent men will not make the necessary expenditure to the building of sixteen schooners for the purpose of engaging in a trade that is declining. My hon. friend, therefore, is hardly consistent in his remarks respecting the fishing industry.

I am reminded that the three previous speakers from Nova Scotia who have addressed the House have spoken about the "tale of woe" of hon. members on this side. I ask, has any hon. member in this House ever heard a greater tale of woe from any province than we have heard from Nova Scotia? If he has, I have yet to hear it. In that connection I am reminded of the formula of Dr. Coué, which I might paraphrase thus: "Day by day and in every way we are putting more things before you," and if there is an effort to effect a remedy analogous to that which is supposed to be effected in the human body by the application of that formula, it may be that in the body politic we shall get a feeling of health and strength so far as the Canadian West is concerned.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask a question? Last year you got certain reductions in railway rates. What did we get in the Maritimes? How much have you in the West paid for the building up of Canada?

Mr. LEWIS: I am quite well aware of those reductions and we are thankful to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) who brought in that report. We do not say a word against that; we consider it our due; and the very fact that the Crowsnest pass agreement was suspended for a number of years was due to our patriotic effort to help Canada in the past. But now, when the same conditions no longer prevail, there is no reason why we should not go back to the agreement we had before the war.

There are a few criticisms I wish to answer. So far as redistribution is concerned, my sympathy goes out to the hon. member for Hants who mentioned it, because possibly his own constituency will be amalgamated. That seems to be inevitable as a result of the numbers of people leaving the province of Nova Scotia. It does seem rather hard that a province that entered into confederation should find its population decreasing day by day, and that it should have its representation in parliament reduced. I for one would be glad to see Nova Scotia placed on the same plane as the province of Quebec in that regard, because it does seem to me that the Maritime provinces, so far separated from us, should not be denied a voice and proper representation in this Dominion parliament. So I will be willing to support the hon. member in that respect.

He mentioneed another matter on which I cannot altogether agree with him. He said that the West should remember the Maritime provinces, because the people from those provinces had borne the burden and heat of the day. It seems to me that we also are to-day bearing the burden and heat of the day, and in some cases it has been too much for the frail body of humanity, with the result that large numbers of them are getting out.

The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) in his speech yesterday referred to a letter that was written to the Scotsman, of Edinburgh, and he took it in absolute sense. I fail to find that it speaks of "all the farmers" or "every farmer", but only "the farmers," and so for that reason I think he was speaking generally, and not in an absolute sense. He was speaking of conditions generally as he knew them, and although my hon. friend contradicted the information in that letter, he will find on referring to Hansard that the previous speaker gave it correctly. It was to this effect, that he knew farmers in western Canada who were just as comfortably situated as the capitalists in Montreal or Toronto. I have had the pleasure of visiting some of these western homes. I have lived in the West for twenty years. I was a missionary out there eighty miles from the railways, and I visited hundreds and thousands of homes, and I want to say that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it would take the average farmer ten years to furnish even one of the rooms that you find in the palatial homes of eastern Canada, and as for the Canadian farmer living in the same comfortable circumstances as the capitalist in Montreal or Toronto—why, it is simply absurd. It seems to me that the man who made that statement knows absolutely nothing about western conditions.

The hon. member for Lunenburg also spoke of the Hudson Bay railway. He may have spent a day or two up around the bay, but I would point out that the two commissions that were appointed by this Dominion parliament have reported that the route is navigable for at least three or four or five months

in the year, and not four weeks, as has been quoted. I shall deal with this in a few moments.

In regard to what has been said of western Canada, we will not play second fiddle to any man in regard to our eulogy of the Canadian West. We believe that the land is all right; we believe it is one of the finest countries in the world; we believe it is one of the most fertile soils that can be found; we believe that we can grow the finest wheat in the world. But in spite of having the finest soil in the world, in spite of it being one of the finest countries in the world, in spite of our growing the finest wheat in the world, we are not in a prosperous condition and men are leaving the country in large numbers. What we say is that there must be something seriously wrong when in a country that has been endowed with the finest possibilities, and where production has been granted to us by Providence above, and through the hard work of the individual, circumstances are such that a man almost fails to subsist. It is not a matter of a year or so: it is a matter of a number of years. I have heard the statement made outside by a member of this House that possibly it is the failures who are leaving the country, and if so, we are better off without them. So far as my district is concerned, if that were true, you would have to say that the men who have spent their lives farming, men who know all about the conditions, are all failures. That is impossible. They have farmed in the East, and they have farmed in the West, but owing to the economic conditions under which they have to farm they find it impossible to keep home and body and soul together, and it is for that reason we raise our voice; not that we are pessimistic, but because we feel if we do not raise our voice and warn these eastern men and present the real facts so that you may understand and sympathize with us and help us in every conceivable way, the confederation that was brought about in this great Dominion for the advancement of the North American continent will one day go on the rocks, and great will be the fall of it. That is how it seems to us at the present time.

The hon. member for Lunenburg said that no man had the right to get up in this House and tell a tale of woe or complain of conditions unless he had some remedy to suggest. He said that the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) and many other members who have spoken had not offered any solution of the problems they presented. We believe that we have tried to solve the problem; we believe we are trying to solve it day by day, and we are showing you the means whereby it could be solved if you would listen to us. But that seems impossible, because we are speaking to a large extent to deaf ears. The hon. member for Springfield has clearly shown, so far as we are concerned, how prosperity and peace and harmony and unity can once more be brought to this Dominion. I may speak of that in a few moments.

The immigration policy of this country has been dealt with to a large extent, and I want to say this: Travelling on the train one day I met a man who said, "I have watched the proceedings down in parliament a great deal, and it does seem to me that the Dominion immigration agents are something like this. In a certain insane asylum, if they want to test a man's sanity, they have a great trough filled with water and then, with the tap still running, they give the man a bucket and tell him to empty the trough. If he starts bailing out the trough before turning off the tap, they say he is fit for the insane asylum and he is detained. But if he first of all turns off the tap, and then gets his bucket and bails out the trough, they say he is fit to enter into the commercial life of the land. Now if we could reverse that process and apply it to the immigration policy it might be of practical utility. In 1911 we had 7,206,643 people. The natural increase over deaths —in spite of the losses of the war, the losses caused by the epidemic of influenza, and the great mortality which took place during that period—was approximately 1,500,000. In the same time we received 2,000,000 immigrants from different parts of the world, making a total of 10,706,643. So that we actually lost two million people, just as many as came in. In other words we are not making any progress. What is the use of men trying to raise families in this country, what is the use of our trying to keep pace with the natural development of the country when, despite all the people that are coming into the country we are getting no further ahead? There must be some reason for it, there is a leak somewhere. I believe it is up to the Dominion authorities to stop that leak and to so remedy the conditions that people in Canada will be rendered happy and contented. Either they should do that, or else they should give way to others who will take their place and solve the problem.

There are some things I want to say in regard to the farmer. I happened to attend a sale the very morning I left my home town

to come to Ottawa. This sale took place at ten o'clock, and was similar in character to a great many other sales that are taking place in that community—it was a sheriff's sale. That sale was forced by the bank upon a certain farmer, and nine of his horses had been seized. The sheriff came along and inquired "What am I bid for these horses?" I said "Two hundred dollars". He said "We are not taking them as a whole. What bid is made for them individually?" Well, the horses eventually realized the sum of $187. Then we turned to that farmer's sheet of expenses, to the expenses of the sheriff, the expense of keeping those horses in the livery barn, and the expense entailed by the judgment, and what did we find? So far as the judgment was concerned the farmer's liability was not reduced in the least—he had lost nine horses and his liability under the judgment remained the same. I am told that is the condition generally throughout the West with respect to sheriff sales.

I am not reciting this tale of woe merely for effect, but I want to state what I think will be the remedy. First of all I have no objection whatever to bringing in all the men that can be found to settle on the vacant land in order, as we are told, to help to bear the burden which is crushing us. But we must bear this in mind: In western Canada we are located at least 1,500 miles inland and we have to produce wheat in competition with the rest of the world. Unfortunately, owing to the long railway haul, and other expenses involved in getting our wheat to Europe, it is impossible for us to, at present, compete with others in those distant markets. And if you have an immigration policy whereby thousands of persons are entering upon and cultivating those western lands, can you not understand that it will have the effect of increasing the supply of wheat on the world's market? What does that mean? The greater the supply of wheat the less will be the price paid for it; and instead of the thousands and thousands of new arrivals proving a help to us, their labours will have the effect of detracting from the price we receive for our produce. We are told that our western wheat is demanded by millers generally throughout the world, that it is a product that cannot be equalled or duplicated anywhere, that it is a hard wheat different from any other wheat grown elsewhere. If that is true the fact of our being located 1,500 miles inland is not of so much importance, provided the identity of our wheat is preserved and specified in such a way that the buyers in the world's markets will know they are getting a Canadian hard wheat. I think this provision is one of the things which is essential to the prosperity of western Canada. Another condition, has reference to possible outlets for our produce. We have been told that the Hudson bay route is not feasible, and a damper has likewise been placed on the Vancouver route; but we believe that if the identity of Canadian wheat is preserved on the markets of the world, and if these two outlets are made available for export, the existing problem will have been, to a very large extent, solved. I do not believe that we are in reality selfish in seeking our own preservation.

There are other matters to which I would like to refer. The practice of economy in the administration of government has been urged, and it is very desirable that we should observe economy. But let me point this out: If the proceedings of last session are carefully studied it will be found that during the first part of the session non-contentious items were brought forward and much time was occupied in discussing them, so much so that two, three and four days were devoted to the consideration of a matter of $500,000. But when the session was drawing to a close and members were growing tired, the government brought down late at night, or in the early morning, estimates involving the expenditure of millions of money, and many members were too tired to care much what went or "slipped" through. It seems to me that when they are dealing with a body of sensible and intelligent business men, the government should be actuated in its policy by sound business principles, and should bring down these large amounts of estimates early in the session when the proposed expenditures can receive thorough and adequate discussion.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the Near East question. I notice that almost every member who has spoken has eulogized the government on their position to that question. Now, I am one of those who are not afraid to declare that they are not prepared to eulogize the government for the action they took at that particular time. I will state my reasons why. We were told that this parliament is the proper authority to decide any big question of foreign policy, and whether we shall send forces to the Near East or any other foreign point, or engage in any large expenditure for such a purpose. I agree with that contention, but the point I wish to make is that we were denied the privilege in this case—we never had an opportunity of saying whether we should support Great Britain should they go to war or not. I think that is a question for parliament to decide; it is not one which should

be left for decision to Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, or the Hon. T. A. Crerar. I make this further point: The Canadian parliament did not decide that question, or the government of Canada either. A message was sent to the British government, and they replied that they thought there was no necessity to call parliament together. Now then, in the ultimate analysis it was neither the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) nor his government, nor the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), but the British government that decided whether the Canadian people should have the right to say whether we would back up Great Britain in her foreign policy. I am not supporting any party in reference to this matter, but I assert that the people of Canada, through their representatives assembled in parliament, have the sole right to decide a question of such magnitude and of so much importance to the peace of the world.

In regard to the conditions now prevailing in this country, I notice that one hon. member speaking yesterday said:

> I hope that when legislation is brought forward the legislators will see to it that it does not enhance the price of the commodities representing the necessities of the common people.

That is a very good statement, I think it is well worth commendation from this side of the House, and I would commend it most heartily to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he brings in his budget. He is the person to whom we should commend that statement—not to hon. members, but to the master hand, to the minister who brings down the annual budget. In that connection, when he is speaking of the necessities of life, I would ask him to remember that he increased the burden upon the common people last year by fifty per cent through the sales tax. We would commend to his consideration the necessity of seeing that not only monopolists, not only combines and other predatory organizations, but this government itself do not enhance the price of the commodities which we all have to buy to feed and clothe ourselves. Why, it is becoming almost impossible for a family man to supply all the needs of his family. We know that no matter how you try to tax those higher up, as one member said in the Imperial parliament the other day, in the last analysis the tax is passed on from one person to another until it rests on the ultimate consumer. I believe it is the same in Canada. You may say that the capitalists, the manufacturers and the upper classes are paying the bulk of our taxes, but in the final analysis it is always the common people who are bearing the heaviest burden of taxation,—a burden which is driving them out of the country.

In regard to the stamp tax, although some men think it is an excellent thing, I have nothing to say about the tax itself; I shall confine my remarks to the manner in which it is collected. This year we find there has been an increase in the sale of stamps. When you buy a war tax or an excise tax stamp you know that you are paying a specific tax the aggregate return from which will be earmarked; when you buy a stamp and place it on a cheque you know it is going to help reduce the war debt, but in the great majority of instances you may affix an ordinary postage stamp. A banker told me some time ago that at least eight cheques out of every ten that passed through his hands did not bear the proper revenue stamp at all but merely a postage stamp. No wonder the hon. Minister of the Post Office Department can show a surplus this year in place of the deficits of former years. I believe that if a stamp is to be placed on cheques and other documents a special stamp should be provided, so that the returns from that particular tax can be ascertained.

Now, as to economy. We have been told that it is almost impossible to have economy in our public expenditures. The Minister of Finance spoke yesterday to that effect, and other hon. members from the Maritime provinces adopted the same tone. But their arguments were fallacious. They said that it does not make any difference how much we expend as along as we have assets—as long as our natural resources enable us to show a balance on the right side of the ledger. But is that true economy? In the final analysis this heavy burden of a great national debt is placed upon the people and must be met by taxation, not by our natural resources. Although Great Britain has a far greater war debt per capita than we have, she is living within her income, and not only is she meeting current expenditure, but she is reducing that expenditure day by day and setting aside substantial sums in reduction of the national debt. We find that the great nation to the south of us is following a similar course. Therefore I am not the least bit surprised that the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) should move an amendment to the amendment that economy is necessary in the administration of our national affairs. It does seem to me that if the Liberal party is going to live up to the tradition that it stands not for the welfare of one particular class but of all the people, the government will see to

it that when it has ascertained the approximate national revenue for the coming fiscal year—its cloth—it will cut its coat accordingly. In other words, the government should strive to keep the national expenditure within the national income, and also reduce the national debt. I would be only too willing to support any proposals to this end. But it must be remembered that last year, although there was a decrease in our expenditure on the navy and militia, and $30,000,000 extra was produced by the sales tax, we were not living within our income; and whether an individual, a community, or a nation endeavours to proceed on this false premise, that our assets are greater than our expenditure, bankruptcy must follow. And besides, we have no right to consider that our undeveloped mines and other natural resources belong to this generation, not at all. They are the inheritance of the Canadian race in the years to come, and if we are going to exploit them now what are our children going to do in ten, fifteen or twenty years' time when they take our places? I see no reason why we, as a people, should expect to develop the whole of this country in a few years when that development normally should take at least a hundred years. This is the last Great West in the world, the only place where people from other nations can settle. If we are going to take the surplus millions of European nations and populate this country in a very short period of time when normally, through natural increase, it should take a century, what are our children going to do, what is their outlook? Let us examine the situation carefully. Do not let us be afraid of it. Let us realize that we have Canadian-born children growing up at the present time with not one foot of free land that they can settle on, it having been nearly all alienated in carrying out the policy that we evolved some years ago. If there is no room for these people, then they will have to flock to the cities; then they will flock to other parts of the world, and not only bankruptcy stares us in the face, but as far as I can see we are going to depopulate the prairies, instead of on the other hand having prairies that are filled with beautiful homes where is heard the tramp of the children's feet as they come with their laughter and song. That is the vision that we western men have. It is true we are putting this condition before you day by day in the hope that men with vision, men with intelligence, will realize that if there is one thing in the world to-day that will stop fanaticism. that will stop Bolshevism, that will stop any of those isms that disrupt governments and cause men to fight across parliaments, and one parliament after another to go out of existence, as we were told yesterday, it is unity among the people of Canada and a square deal for every man.

[Mr. Lewis.]

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

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

Thursday, February 8, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Certain amendments to Radiotelegraph Regulations approved by the Governor in Council.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

REVISED HANSARD

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to call the attention of the government to the delay in printing the bound volumes of Hansard. One cannot get the bound volume of Hansard of last session. I am informed that not for many, many years has parliament met without the advantage of the bound and indexed volume of Hansard.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am obliged to my right hon. friend for bringing this matter to the attention of the government and I shall have it looked into at once.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): On Monday last I sent to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition a bound copy of Hansard, and sent copies also to the Prime Minister and the leader of the Progressive party. The other volumes will be ready for general distribution on Monday next, I am informed. There was some delay in getting the index proof down to the Printing Bureau. It did not reach there, as I told my right hon. friend on Monday last, till the 5th of January, hence the delay.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Putnam for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the

opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Hoey, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Shaw, resumed from Wednesday, February 7.

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne which was read by His Excellency contains an outline of the legislation which the government intend to introduce and pass during the present session, and the debate on the Address in reply gives hon. members an opportunity of presenting their views on this proposed legislation and on any other matters which they think should be brought to the attention of the government. The debate should therefore serve a useful purpose. The members, being fresh from their constituencies, should have first-hand knowledge of the needs and requirements of the nation as a whole, but should have as well the latest views of their constituents upon the public questions of the day.

One paragraph in the Speech from the Throne reads as follows:

> During the course of the session your attention will be invited to other agreements of an international character and significance, and to other matters requiring legislation.

This is pretty broad, and may contain many things. But it is more in connection with the specific legislation promised that I intend to speak. Several important subjects are engaging the attention of the people of Canada at the present time, but I shall refer to only three. The first of these, as I group them, is the financial question, or the question of ways and means, which since the war has been brought home to every taxpayer and to every householder in Canada in the most direct and impressive manner possible. But, as another and perhaps a better opportunity for discussing this important subject will occur later, when the budget will be delivered, I will reserve any further remarks until then.

The next question to which I will allude is our social and industrial unrest, and in which, of course, is included the labour problem; and the third, is the question of transportation in which is involved the great railway problem with all its far reaching consequences and influence on every phase of our national life. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to present my views on the second subject to which I have alluded. While there is comparative industrial rest in Canada at the present time we have had our labour troubles and we may have them in the future; and it may well be that even during this session some legislation on this subject will be introduced, so that the remarks which I now make may perhaps be in order.

In the early days of society all or nearly all things were held in common. Then, as the race increased and multiplied and spread out over the earth new conditions arose. The old patriarchal order of society gave way to a new form of autocratic government. It was no longer the father but the king who ruled. Still further and further went the divisions and sub-divisions of society, until the last vestiges of the feudal system, with all its vices and virtues, disappeared until now in all communities called enlightened democracy in some form holds the balance of power. With the passing of the feudal system came greater freedom of opportunity, and fuller reward for labour to the mass of workers; but no one was now responsible for the welfare of the employed or the unskilful. Even the skilled labourer found himself unable to cope with the power of the successful commercial or industrial leader, who was often assisted by some direct or indirect privilege denied to the mass of his fellows, so that the last state of labour became worse than the first. From out of this oppressed and almost hopeless condition grew the organizations which have since spread over all the world, known as labour unions. Animated at first by a desire to secure justice, and reasonable opportunities and rewards for manual workers, the movement spread, and by force of circumstances, became militant in nature. The status of labour was tremendously improved in consequence, and its organization was perfected. But over-organization often defeats its own well-meant purposes by destroying individual freedom of thought and action. As soon as unionism approached this stage of its existence, it became less concerned with the welfare of the unemployed and more concerned with the maintenance of its own place and power. The age of the professional labour agitator and the professional labour boss had arrived, and a new tyranny was born, more relentless and more destructive than anything that preceded it, as witness the horrible butchery at Herrin, Ill., some months ago, and the terrible upheaval in Russia.

Few, indeed, could be more sympathetic than I with every honourable and lawful effort that labour could make to improve its own condition, and conditions generally, but at the same time few would be more resolute than I in opposing its unlawful aims and aspirations, or in preventing it from imposing the decrees of its sometimes badly-informed

leaders upon the rest of the community. And I take this stand in the best interest of labour itself, because if labour, or any other group of men, should succeed in establishing a tyranny, destroying organized and regulated society, the first and the last and the greatest sufferers would be the poor and the lowly.

It is often said, and I think generally admitted—often admitted in this House—that organized labour has the right to order strikes, tie-ups even in the production of those things that are necessary, or almost necessary to the life of the state. This proposition I deny, and having denied the proposition I, of course, deny still more emphatically the right of any man, or group of men, to prevent another man from working when, where, and for whomsoever he pleases. The family is the unit and corner stone of the state—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask my hon. friend to make that rule apply to all groups, whether of employers or of labourers?

Mr. HUGHES: Before I sit down I will answer my hon. friend on that point and give my opinion without any equivocation or reservation whatever. I have said that the family is the unit and corner stone of the state, and the father or head of every family has the right and duty of supporting his wife and children by the work of his hands or brain; and no other man, or no other group of men combined, have the right to take that right away from him, or hinder him, in the discharge of that obligation because it is inherent, it is fundamental, it is God-given. Whenever and wherever that right is taken away, and that duty interfered with the foundations of society are either injured or destroyed.

I have said that I absolutely deny the right of any labour union to order a strike, because I cannot give to labour unions greater rights and privileges than are accorded to other men and groups of men. If any man, or group of men, in the state get more than justice, some other man, or group of men, necessarily get less than justice. I think it has long been the law that a strike or mutiny on board ship is punished by the most severe penalties, because of the tremendous risks involved and the terrible suffering inflicted upon the innocent. For somewhat similar reasons a strike or mutiny in the army is punishable with instant death. No community can or should allow its firemen or policemen to go on strike—they must arbitrate. What would be thought of the doctors of a city, or the nurses of a hospital, who went on strike even against hard conditions? And it would be still worse if they went out on a sympathetic strike. If such a thing happened public opinion would be so outraged that these men and women would be driven from the country of their birth or adoption, and no other country would allow them to enter. And what if the farmers and fishermen struck, or loafed on the job, and produced only enough food for their own sustenance? Of course such a thing is unthinkable; as well might the feet and hands strike against the head and refuse to work, or the head strike against the feet and hands and refuse to direct their operations. The fact of the matter is that modern society is so complex, and so complicated, we are all so dependent upon one another, that no nation can properly exist to-day without the hearty, sympathetic, honest co-operation of all its citizens; and no group of nations can prosper without the hearty, sympathetic and honest co-operation of each and all of them.

From what I have said it may be readily inferred that my condemnation of strikes though severe is mild compared to what my condemnation of lockouts would be, or even the bringing about of such a condition of things that strikes would be inevitable or probable. No punishment would be too severe for men who would or could be guilty of such crimes, because the head that would deliberately plan mischief against the feet and hands should be cut off from the body.

In this connection labour, and the community generally, have a grievance which I am prepared to voice. Labour says, with much truth I fear, that the over-capitalization and stock-watering of industrial corporations, and on which such excess capital or watered stock, dividends are often paid, gives money or value to men who are not entitled to it, raises the price of the things produced beyond their fair market value, and thus reduces the rewards of labour below the fair wage level. If this argument be sound, —and I feel there is much truth in it,—the policy or the manipulation which gives such results presses unfairly upon all classes in the community and helps no one except those who are its special beneficiaries. Legislation that permits such things is defective, legislation that encourages such things is bad, and will end in destruction, because, I repeat, if any man or group of men in the community get more than justice, some other man or group of men must necessarily get less than justice.

Mr. IRVINE: Which group does the hon. member think has got less than justice in the past few years?

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. member will follow my remarks I will endeavour to explain that.

When we see men, who by manipulation of the stock market, by the cornering of the necessary things of life, by the promotion of mergers with a capital far greater than the combined capital of all the companies merged—when we see such men become millionaires and multi-millionaires in a few years we may be quite sure that the community as a whole has been wronged. I recognize the fact that rich men sometimes usefully employ part of their wealth. They establish libraries, they build hospitals, they endow universities and other seats of learning, they contribute to scientific research work, they even give alms to the poor, and such things are highly commendable. But the good done in these ways never compensates for the wrongs done the community as a whole. Better by far to raise the standard of living generally than to make a few millionaires and a multitude of paupers. Better by far to have justice and charity in the proper meaning of these words than almsgiving. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you".

Strikes and lockouts are civil war which must be prevented by the organized power of all the people. Because, the first and greatest duty of the state is to protect the lives and the property of its citizens, and particularly to protect those who are honestly endeavouring to make a living. Organizations or groups of men, labourers or millionaires, to extort more than justice must at the very least be controlled or the state will eventually perish. It is hard to draw the dividing line, but when we see labour unions demanding for their members far higher wages and shorter hours, than unorganized men doing somewhat similar work in other callings can receive, we may be sure that injustice is being done. And on the other hand, when we see other men seizing the natural resources of the country, calling these resources their own, exploiting them for their own personal advantage and by means of this exploitation become millionaires, then we can be equally sure that injustice is being done. There can be no doubt but the earth and all it contains was made by God for the use of the human beings he placed upon it. If some men can seize greater portions of the earth's surface than they can by any possibility ever make use of, and will only let other men live upon it by paying them rent for it, then manifestly there is injustice. And what applies to the earth's surface applies, as well to the minerals, the water powers, the forests and every other natural resource. If some men could seize the air and the sunshine, and only let other men use them by paying for them they would certainly be seized and sold, but as they cannot be readily fenced around they are comparatively free.

And yet the results and rewards of industry and economy must belong to him who exercises these great virtues, or you destroy energy, initiative and ambition, and produce stagnation and decay. The true division should be the giving to man the full ownership of everything he produces by his hand and brain, and the giving to the community everything God created for the benefit of all. It might be hard to draw the dividing line in all cases, but when correct principles are once recognized details become easier. And many difficulties would disappear if men and Christian nations would only remember the Sermon on the Mount; would only remember and practise the Golden Rule—to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them.

But in all probability it will be a long time before men and nations come to practise this rule. Then, why would it not be proper for the state to make laws to regulate the conduct of groups of men in the same way that it makes laws to regulate the conduct of individuals? If my neighbour and I have a dispute we will not be allowed to settle it with clubs or guns, we must take our dispute to a properly constituted tribunal, when, in all probability justice will be rendered—at all events we must be satisfied with the decision, because it is the best that can be done. As I have stated we must not be allowed to settle our dispute with clubs or guns, neither must we be allowed to settle it in a way to suit ourselves, and to bring injury to other people and to innocent people, the way in which strikes are often settled. All disputants no matter how few or how many, should be bound by the same laws, and if the state be unable to establish tribunals that will render justice, and if the state be unable to enforce the decrees of such tribunals, our civilization, as I see it is near an end. In short, I favour, with all my heart, compulsory arbitration. I know some of the arguments that are advanced against it,—that you cannot force men to work and should not try. I agree with that, but in my judgment the man who will not work, who refuses to work under reasonable conditions at all events, should not eat bread at the expense of the community and I have the highest authority in the world in fact the highest Authority in the universe

who said in addressing men: "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread." And work is not a penalty but idleness is. There are only two classes of men in the world; the working man—and nearly everybody is a working man, —and the parasite or the beggar.

And now Mr. Speaker, I will take up the third question to which I alluded in my opening remarks, namely transportation and the railway problem with which the best and most highly trained experts in the country are hardly able to cope, and which is pregnant with the possibilities of great success or colossal failure. The ordinary layman should, I suppose, hesitate before entering upon a discussion of this question, still we must discuss these things. I know Sir Henry Thornton has warned the politicians away from this subject, but an older man than Sir Henry, Euripides I think, has said "That is true liberty when free born men having the right to advise the public may speak free." Now I happen to have the right to advise the public, and whether I do it badly or otherwise I cannot shirk the duty.

Some few years ago a working arrangement was entered into between the railway executives of North America and the railway brotherhoods, which arrangement is known as the McAdoo award, and I venture to say that nothing like this arrangement was ever before known in the heavens above, on the earth below, or underneath the earth. I shall not attempt to describe this arrangement, but I have my own opinion of the sanity or the business ability of the railway executives who entered into it. Suffice it to say that it provides for promotion by seniority and by seniority only, and it pays a premium for loafing on the job, it holds out inducements to men to loaf. I shall try to give a few examples of how the thing works out in practice before I conclude. There is no business under the canopy of heaven that could be a success handicapped by such conditions. Railwaymen are not angels any more than the rest of us, and they would be more than men if they failed to take advantage of some of the inducements held out to them to get overtime and other rewards from the extraordinary schedules under which they work. But, to their credit be it said, many of them do not take full advantage of all their privileges, and hence conditions are not as bad as they might be. Sometimes there are strikes by the railway brotherhoods in the United States, and sometimes the newspapers convey the information that there is talk of strikes by some of the brotherhoods in Canada. But I have more faith in the common sense and common patriotism of the railway men of Canada than to think they would be guilty of any such folly or crime. And against whom would the railway men strike? Why, against their own government, against their own brothers and fellow-countrymen, who are carrying a railway burden that is well-nigh crushing them to the earth.

Since more than half the railways in the Dominion have become the property of the people, what need is there in Canada for railway brotherhoods except for benevolent purposes? If a portion of the people of Canada must organize themselves into a brotherhood to get justice from their own government, that is from the rest of the people, what kind of a country have we? And if the railway brotherhoods want more than justice for their own members, they are a menace to the rest of the community and should be disbanded.

When Sir Henry Thornton was in Charlottetown some weeks ago, I heard him speak and I heard him emphasize the necessity of willing co-operation in all branches of the service and among all the officials and employees. I heard him say there must be esprit de corps among all officials and men from the president down to the last office boy. I also heard him say that capable men should be selected for divisional superintendents and upon their shoulders should be placed large responsibility. With all of this I heartily agree, and I will go further and say that to these things should be added a desire and a willingness on the part of officials and employees to serve the public; otherwise there can be no proper efficiency. I do not think the Canadian National system has these things at the present time, and I do think the Canadian Pacific railway system has them, to a measurable degree, at all events.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give you my reasons for the belief which I hold. A little more than a year ago, travelling from Montreal to Prince Edward Island, we changed engines at Moncton. The engine attached to our train broke down before we got clear of the Moncton yard. The next engine we got, broke down as we entered the yard at Sackville, a few miles further on. A month or two before that, while travelling from Sackville to Tormentine, the train stopped a few miles out of Sackville—cause, a hot box. Upon examination it was found that there was no waste in the box to hold the oil, and no waste on the train. After some delay we got started again; but soon another box became warm for the same reason and another stop ensued. Finally, a third box showed signs of undue caloric pressure, and this necessitated further delay. By stopping at every

brook and pouring water on the boxes, we controlled the heat somewhat and got to Tormentine several hours late. What kind of efficiency did that indicate? Was that an isolated occurrence? I do not know. It apparently was not. While travelling from Halifax on the 30th day of October last by the Ocean Limited, I had a seat in one of the first class coaches. The day was cold and the car in which I sat was very cold and draughty. The officials, of whom there appeared to be a great number on the train that day, frequently passed through the car, and invariably they left both doors open. I shut the doors two or three times and some of the other passengers also shut them. I spoke to one of the officials as he went through the car and stated that, in my opinion, there was no use trying to warm the province of Nova Scotia with the little heat we had in that car. He scowled at me and shut the door; but in a moment another official came along and opened it; then a fellow-passenger told me that it was better to leave them alone, because a few days before he had drawn their attention to the coolness of the car, and they made it so warm that the cure was worse than the disease. I know that the temperature in the chair cars and the Pullmans is kept comfortable; but should not the comfort of the men and women who have to ride in the first and second-class coaches be considered and should not everything possible be done to make them comfortable?

The editor of one of the Charlottetown papers told me that he was in Halifax last summer and travelled to Sackville by the Ocean Limited. He had two fairly heavy grips and wishing to get them checked he went to the checking room in the Halifax station and made known his wants. There were two men working there and they were moving more slowly than the mourners at a funeral. They paid no attention to him. After a little while he repeated his request, adding that he would miss the train if they did not attend to him soon. Still no attention, so he had to pick up his grips and run, and as he was going out the door they jeered at him.

I was in the rotunda of the Brunswick hotel at Moncton last fall, and ten or twelve men were sitting there, most of them commercial travellers, I think. One of the men was talking over the telephone, and when he had finished his conversation he turned to the others and explained that he wanted to go to Montreal and wished to travel via St. John if it did not cost him any more than going direct by the Canadian National railway. He stated that an official of the Canadian Pacific railway had arranged the matter for him in less than ten minutes, and that it would take a day or two to make a similar arrangement with an official of the Canadian National railway, because it would be hard to find one who had the authority to act. And all the men in the hotel agreed with him. Last summer three clergymen residing in the eastern part of Prince Edward Island wished to spend a few weeks in western Canada. They desired to travel by the National railways because they were national. They wrote to the then District Passenger Agent at Charlottetown for information. A week passed before they got an answer, and then a telegram came with thirty-three cents to collect. The money was paid under protest, not because of the amount, but because of the principle involved. The station master at Souris reported that the money had been paid under protest, and later a telegram came back stating that a mistake had been made and telling him to refund the money. In the meantime the agent of the Canadian Pacific railway had been communicated with. A reply with all information came back at once followed by letters soliciting the patronage. These men travelled by the Canadian Pacific railway and they state that they received every kind of attention and civility. In nearly every city they were met by an official of the railway who inquired if he could do anything for them, and who informed them that they could stay off at any point as long as they wished, and could change their route if they so desired without any additional cost except the added mileage. In short, every official of the Canadian Pacific Railway seemed anxious to please. Moreover, the information they got in the West in regard to trains was to the effect that while the Canadian National trains would likely leave on time, there was no certainty when they would arrive at their destination. On the other hand, the Canadian Pacific trains not only left on time, but in nearly every instance, arrived on time. These men in common gratitude feel it to be their duty to recommend the Canadian Pacific railway to any friends who may contemplate a trip.

I have heard it mentioned during this debate that there were sufficient cars in Canada to take care of the traffic and that the government need not have given an order for more cars. Well, I know there was a shortage of cars in eastern Canada last fall. I know there were not enough cars to carry the coal from the mines to the people who needed it. I know that the mines were held

up for cars and the dealers in coal could not supply their customers. And I further know that at that season of the year it took from four to seven weeks for a car of coal to come from Sydney to Charlottetown, a distance, I suppose, of about three hundred miles. Now, I do not think that it was efficient management for a car to have been six or seven weeks on the road, coming a distance of some three hundred miles. Cars, I believe, are worth four, five or six dollars a day to the railways, and the car that is twelve or fifteen days out of commission means a loss to the railways of sixty, seventy or eighty dollars, not to mention the loss which is entailed to the people.

So much as regards general conditions on the Canadian National railway system. And now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask you to bear with me while I relate some of the conditions on the Prince Edward Island division, with which I am personally familiar. During the last few years the management of that division has greatly reduced the train service and the train accommodation and has at the same time, I am convinced, increased the cost of the service. I refer more particularly to the eastern part of the division. Owing to the complicated schedules governing the wages of railway men, it is difficult for a layman to accurately estimate the comparative cost of operating trains, but I shall try, in a general way. For instance: Eight hours or one hundred miles constitute a day's work on a freight or a mixed freight and passenger train, whereas, ten hours, or one hundred and fifty miles constitute a day's work on a passenger or express train, the employees, in all cases, having the right to calculate the day's work by the mile or by the hour whichever method of calculation would give them the higher pay. Moreover, the men on the freight, or the mixed freight and passenger trains have not only shorter hours and fewer miles, but they have higher pay per hour or per mile, as the case may be. And further, when the hours which constitute a day's work are exhausted, every hour after that is called an hour and a half.

From the time the Prince Edward Island railway was opened some fifty years ago till a few years ago we had a daily freight train in summer between Charlottetown and Souris, and a daily passenger train as well. A few years ago the freight service was reduced to a tri-weekly train. This tri-weekly train is unable to carry all the freight offering, the overplus, or some of it, has to be sent by the passenger train which thus automatically comes under the shorter hours, the fewer miles, the higher pay, the overtime, and what should be a day's pay for the train crew is changed into a day and a half or a day and three-quarters. But, there is more than this. The passenger train that carries freight is always late, and when this happens day after day, passengers who can travel by auto or in any other way will not travel by train, and the passenger service is greatly injured.

But this is not all. The daily freight train between Souris and Charlottetown some years ago took care of the freight originating on the Georgetown-Montague branch. This the tri-weekly freight cannot do. The consequence is that the Georgetown-Montague train, which according to the schedule, has its terminus at Mount Stewart, has to be ordered into Charlottetown, some eighteen miles farther, as a special freight. Now, according to the schedules, when a special train is sent out, no matter how short the distance, or the time, it is a full day's pay for the train crew. There is therefore a day's pay from Mount Stewart to Charlottetown, another day's pay from Charlottetown back to Mount Stewart and of course a day's pay between Mount Stewart and Georgetown, or three days' pay in one, for that train crew. But even this is not all. The tri-weekly freight train between Charlottetown and Souris, trying to take all the freight, is often overloaded and therefore makes very slow time. It is sometimes out on the road sixteen hours. The first eight hours constitute a day, the second eight hours a day and a half, or two days and a half in one. And this kind of thing is called management by railway experts. To be just to the men I don't think they want this kind of management, they would prefer to have regular working hours and regular pay.

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet told all the story of the peculiar railway management we have in Prince Edward Island. There is a branch line of railway, extending from Souris to Elmira, some ten or twelve miles long and known as the Elmira branch. Before last summer Elmira was the terminus of the eastern line. Last summer, Souris was made the eastern terminus and a motor bus, or a little gasoline car locally known as a "jitney", with one man in charge, was put on the Elmira branch to carry light freight, baggage and passengers, and a regular freight train once a week. The motor bus, or jitney, was a complete failure. The car was too small to carry the cream the farmers wished to send to the butter factory and any baggage or other light freight at the same time. The

engine was constantly getting out of order, so that no one could be sure the little thing would ever get to its destination. It frequently broke down when about half way between Elmira and Harmony Junction, where it was supposed to meet the regular train, leaving the cream it had aboard at a side station for a day or so, and compelling the passengers who started by it to walk back to their homes and miss their train connections that day. The repair parts were kept at Moncton, N.B. and when the thing would break down a commnunication would be sent to Moncton to send new parts. Sometimes these parts would fit when they came, but sometimes they would not. This necessitated further communication with Moncton and further delay. The consequence was the jitney was out of commission about half the time. When it was out of commission the train had to be ordered out from Souris as a special. I have already stated that every time a special train was ordered out, no matter how short the run, it is a full day's pay for the crew, so when the train was ordered out from Souris in the evening it was a day's pay to Elmira, another day's pay from Elmira to Souris the next morning, and, of course, a day's pay between Souris and Charlottetown or three days' pay in one. But this is not all; when the train crew would be ordered out from Souris to Elmira on Saturday evening there would be a day's pay for that evening, another day's pay for Monday morning and a day's pay for Sunday, because the men were away from the terminus mentioned in the schedule; and in addition to all this the man in charge of the jitney was on full pay all the time. And this is the kind of management we have on the Canadian National railways and this describes what the country has been paying for a domoralized service. If this is any indication of the kind of management we have over the system or over any large part of it, all I can say is; God help the country. And Mr. Speaker, I have some fears that it is an indication of the kind of management that may be found outside of Prince Edward Island.

When the jitney of which I spoke broke down for the last time, and when it had been thirty or more days out of commission, and when there was no hope of it being able to do any more work last fall, I spoke to the divisional superintendent, Mr. Grady, and suggested that he put Elmira back on the train schedule and let the people know they would have a train every day, thus improving the service and decreasing the cost. He informed me he had tried to do this, that he had put the whole matter before Mr. Kingsland, the general manager at Montreal, and the reply he got was to mind his own business, and that he would make no more suggestions. My statement to Mr. Grady was that if I were in his place I would not take such a reply from Mr. Kingsland, I would say to him that I was minding my own business and the public business as well, and that I would go beyond Mr. Kingsland with my suggestion. Later in the year, in the month of December, the Elmira branch was put back on the schedule and a daily train service re-established, but this was made a mixed freight and passenger service, the most expensive train service that could be established. During the summer and during the months of October and November, when a considerable quantity of freight would be moving, the people served by the Elmira branch had to be satisfied with a weekly freight train, while during the month of December, when there would be much less freight moving, a daily freight was put on. The only possible explanation of such conduct is that the local management wished to so increase the cost of operating the Elmira branch that the general management would allow him to close it altogether; and this has been done. Apart altogether from this incident, which should be sufficient to condemn any management, I know that the Prince Edward Island division of the Canadian National Railways is not run on either railway or business principles, but on sectional and personal prejudices; and if Sir Henry Thornton or any member of the board should wish to get further information on this point I shall be glad to supply it.

When Mr. Grady told me that Mr. Kingsland had given him the answer previously mentioned, I was surprised, because I knew it was not the way the officials of any large business concern act towards one another. I spoke to some of the other officials of the Prince Edward Island division in regard to the matter and they informed me such an answer was possible because "that is the very answer Mr. Grady would give to any of his junior officials who would dare to make a suggestion to him." Not only would they be told to mind their own business, but one or two strong adjectives would be placed before the word "business".

I ask you Mr. Speaker, and hon. members to picture to yourselves the kind of co-operation, the kind of esprit de corps there must be in the Canadian National railway service when language of this kind passes between the officials. No business on the face of the Foot-

stool could be a success managed under such conditions. I am afraid a general housecleaning is required.

Perhaps it will be a good place here for me to say that I think Sir Henry Thornton will make the Canadian National Railway system a success, if any man can. I think he is a big man in every sense of the word. He has had railway experience on two continents; he has met railway men in the United States, in England and on the Continent. He is personally and favourably acquainted with wealthy men in the United States who may be willing to invest some of their wealth in Canada and so help forward the development of our natural resources and our industries. Because of the peculiar position he occupies, and because of having been born in the United States and now being a British citizen by adoption, he may have much to do in bringing about a condition of things which will mean much to our country; in fact, he may be a contributor in establishing better trade relations between Canada and the United States.

There are a few other things I wish to mention in connection with the Prince Edward Island section of the Canadian National railway system and I will then conclude my remarks. When Prince Edward Island entered confederation in 1873 it was on the distinct understanding that efficient steam service would be established and maintained between the Island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial railway and the railway system of the Dominion. In fact "it was so nominated in the bond." This promise has never been fully implemented, either in the letter or the spirit. The establishing of the car ferry was a step in the right direction, but the benefits of that step will be almost nil till the Prince Edward Island railway is standardized, and I was therefore glad to hear Sir Henry Thornton say in Charlottetown a few weeks ago that this work would be taken up without delay.

Confederation has undoubtedly benefited the two central provinces, Ontario and Quebec. It has been injurious to the provinces on the Atlantic sea-board, and very injurious to Prince Edward Island. In proof of this statement many facts could be given, but a few will suffice. When Prince Edward Island entered the confederation fifty years ago, we had several small flourishing industries, now we have none, except a few small lobster canning establishments, which could not be moved away because the fish have to be canned where they are caught.

Mr. JACOBS: What about fox farming?

[Mr. Hughes.]

Mr. HUGHES: Fox farming is another industry. All our industries save those I have mentioned have gone to Ontario and Quebec. Then our population was increasing every year, now it is decreasing and to-day we have some six thousand souls less than we had in 1871 and some twenty thousand less than we had two decades ago, which is equal to one-fourth or one-fifth of our total population. This is surely a startling and challenging fact. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not increasing in population as they should, but they are not actually decreasing. Our people are engaged entirely in farming and fishing, and I sometimes ask myself whether a burden has been put upon these industries which they cannot carry. Our climate is healthful, our soil is fertile, our fisheries are productive, and we think our people are mentally and physically equal to others, in fact many of them do well when they go abroad. Then what in the world is wrong with us? I ask the members of the railway board, I ask the members of this honourable House, I ask the people of Canada generally if they can be indifferent while one province, small though it be, slowly bleeds to death. We think our transportation difficulties have much to do with our dwindling population, we think the railway freight rates are unjust to Prince Edward Island—I shall give examples. We also think that no railway board composed entirely of men from the other provinces can fully understand or sympathise with our local difficulties. We therefore think we should have a man on the railway board. I put this matter as strongly as I could before the government, and I now put it before the parliament and the people of Canada, and hope for good results.

If it be thought that representation on the railway board would give Prince Edward Island too many men in public or semi-public life, so far as I am concerned, I would gladly give up part of our representation in this House and in the Senate for representation on the railway board. We have the Railway Commission and the Civil Service Commission, and if Canada is to be governed by boards and commissions we of Prince Edward Island want representation on some of these bodies, where power and responsibility rest, and where there is work to be done.

I said I would give examples of unjust freight rates so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, and I shall now try to carry out that promise. I find that the rate on grain from Montreal to Halifax, local, is 32 cents per 100 pounds; while on the same article from Charlottetown to Halifax, much less

than half the distance, it is 31 cents. Charlottetown to Sydney, still less than half the distance, it is 35 cents, while from other points on Prince Edward Island the rate to Halifax and Sydney is 37 cents and 38 cents respectively. If we take potatoes, the discrimination is still worse. We have seen that grain is carried from Montreal to Halifax for 32 cents. The rate on potatoes from Charlottetown to Montreal is 38 cents, and from other points on Prince Edward Island to Montreal the rate is 40 cents, and from Prince Edward Island to Sydney, 38 cents. It does not cost the railway any more to carry 100 pounds of potatoes than it does to carry 100 pounds of grain. Moreover, I always understood that railway freight rates were based, to some extent, on the value of the commodity carried; in which case potatoes should be carried cheaper than grain, but so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, it is just the other way round.

The soil and climate of Prince Edward Island are admirably adapted for growing potatoes, and the farmers of that province are therefore much interested in their production; but it would seem as if the National Railways management wished to discourage such farming, because for every two bushels of potatoes grown, the railway gets five pecks for carrying them three hundred miles to market, and the farmer gets three pecks for preparing the soil, providing the seed, providing the fertilizer, planting, spraying, digging and marketing. Of course, the farmer who grows potatoes gets nothing at all for his labour. I am quite safe in saying that the farmers of Prince Edward Island do not get more than a dollar for a day's work of twelve to fourteen hours, while the coal miners and the railway men get from one to two dollars an hour for their work—and yet these men, or some of them, listen to labour agitators who tell them they are slaves, and that they should strike for higher wages and shorter hours.

Modern civilization has turned our economic system upside down. The basic industry of agriculture has a load that it cannot carry, and some of the young men on Prince Edward Island who understand farming will not take farms from their fathers as a gift, if they are obliged to live on them, and the young women will not marry young men who intend to follow farming as an occupation.

Lord Shaughnessy, the president of the Bank of Montreal, the president of the Bank of Commerce, and other men of large affairs in this Dominion, have said that a large immigration of agricultural workers would cure or at least help to solve many of our difficulties. Perhaps they are right. But we are producing more food products now than we can readily market, and if we produce two or three times as much, would it help the situation? It appears to me that conditions are such that men of British descent and perhaps men of French descent in this country, if not the world over—it may not be peculiar to Canada—are leaving the land and flocking to the cities to take up industrial occupations and professional work. It might be that men from some of the countries in Europe who are accustomed to a lower standard of living would be satisfied if they came to Canada and went on the land. That might be a better arrangement. These are the men who, if they were satisfied with a lower standard of living than we are accustomed to, might make a success of farming. I do not know whether that was the idea of Lord Shaughnessy and the others who spoke of immigration as being a cure for our troubles. It is the trend, at all events, of the British people to flock to the cities. Whether other people will come on the land and take possession of it, I do not know; but in the long run the men who possess the land will own the country, for the cities cannot renew their own lives. In three generations they die if they are not renewed from the country, and if that is the tendency of people of British and of French descent in this country, then other people will come in and take our place.

There is another thing in connection with the railway service on Prince Edward Island which tends to make young men discontented with farm work, and so far as I can learn, it is not found in any other province of the Dominion. Eight hours constitute a day's work for a stationmaster. This regulation, or something like it, may perhaps be all right in large cities where there is heavy traffic and the men are kept on the jump, and where enough men are employed to make a shift; but in small villages and country places where only one man is employed, it is simply ridiculous. When the stationmaster goes on duty at seven o'clock in the morning, his day ends at three o'clock in the afternoon, after which the station and the freight shed are locked and no more business is transacted that day. Just imagine a man driving in some miles from the country to deliver or receive some freight and arriving ten or fifteen minutes late and finding all railway business suspended for the day. Again, imagine a trader or business man in the town or village who is loading or unloading cars having to quit work at three o'clock

in the afternoon, if he can't get a special permit to continue the work at his own risk. These things are of daily occurrence on Prince Edward Island, and this is the method pursued by the railway to get business.

There is another aspect to this kind of thing which has a most injurious effect. When three or four o'clock arrives the station master runs out his car—he can afford one—and takes his wife or his sweetheart as the case may be for a drive through the country. The young men working on the farms see what is being done, they contrast their toil and work of twelve or more hours per day, with that of the station master, and they decide to get into the railway service or leave the country, and they are leaving it by the score and by the hundred.

There are stations on the Prince Edward Island railway where the train leaves or passes early in the morning, say six o'clock, and returns about seven or eight in the evening, and the station master is not there, either when the train leaves or when it returns, to sell tickets, to look after the freight, or do anything else. He comes for a few hours in the middle of the day—when there is nothing or very little to do—after which he locks up and leaves. I know one station, Elmira, where the train left at six o'clock in the morning. The station master was not obliged to open the station at that hour, and did not open it. The station master at that place was the agent for the Dominion Express Company. Before these regulations came into force the fishermen in that locality shipped a good many smelts to the United States by express. This business gave the fishermen employment and gave them some money to enable them to support their families during the winter months. After the regulations came into force there was no station master or express agent there in the morning to take charge of the goods and give a receipt for them, and in any event the little jitney of which I spoke was unable to carry heavy goods such as fish. The consequence was the Dominion Express Company closed the office, the fresh fish industry was killed, the fishermen lost this means of making a living, and the railway lost the business.

A man sitting in his office in Chicago, or in some other American city, who is the head of this branch of the railway brotherhood, has the power to enforce these regulations, and the power to protect the brotherhoods in this kind of thing. In my opinion the time has come when Canadians will have to be master in their own house, and will have to manage their own business and their own industrial activities.

I have not, however, despaired of my country or of my fellow-countrymen. I think if the matter were put before the railway brotherhoods and the labour unions as it really is, if it were shown to them that unless we all pull together we shall all be destroyed together, they would act the honest patriotic part and we would all acquit ourselves like men.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the debate on the Address, I would like to pause to say just a word with reference to those who were with us during the last session and are with us no more. Individual references to our deceased colleagues have been made by the leaders of the three parties in the House, and I could add nothing to what has been said. But, I would like to express the feeling that our late colleagues, no matter which party they represented came here as Canadians believing that it is part of a man's duty to do his share of the work in the public service of the country. And in these days it is all too necessary to impress upon the people who have time to give, who have ability to give, who have force of character to lend, that they should come, even through the dusty ways of politics, to this Chamber to help in the solution of the very real and very grave questions from which we shall not be free, perhaps, during the span of a generation. The men who have passed, saw their duty. No matter what feeling of personal ambition may have influenced them, they came here and did their duty according to their lights, and I trust that we may take some inspiration from their example, for there were among them men of strong character, men of real energy, and men, above all, of absolute sincerity. It was said by a great Imperialist in the last moments of his life: "So little done, so much to do!" That is true here and now as it was when uttered by Cecil Rhodes the Empire Builder; and it ought to be with some feeling of the gravity of that statement that we should approach the work of this session. And may I suggest, Sir, that in approaching the work of this session we get at it manfashion and not consume merely three hours a day, or less, as we have been doing for the last five days? Real work needs real energy and real attention from real men; we cannot handle the problems of this country by merely playing with them, or dawdling from day to day and occupying our time in other

pursuits, letting the business of the country wait until we can rush it through some months later on when we are all anxious to get home and are a bit tired of—shall I say?—passing our time rather helplessly here. There is much to do, and I would ask of those who have the programme in hand that they should let us get at the doing of it. We are going to differ, we are going to disagree, about the doing of it; the people of Canada are going to differ and disagree about the way we are going to do it; but let us get at it for we come here for the purpose of settling or solving problems, and we can only do that by being in action.

I would like to be able to refer to the Speech from the Throne in happier terms than it was referred to by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), who once again donned sacerdotal vestments and inveighed against the barren figtree with traditional severity. He found it barren, and I do not think that the group which sits to his right will be able to gather any more figs from it than they could even from the thistles which adorn the wayside. He gave it a good cursing; and I hope that my hon. friends opposite will realize that, after all, there comes an end sometimes to the hopes—the dazzling, sparkling, scintillating hopes—which may be held out before the eyes of even the most trustful of mortals. My hon. friend from Springfield, after one session's experience of the scintillating hopes, comes back this year, gets on mount Ebal and gives the cursing which always came from that celebrated spot. Of course, he gives a little flicker towards us, but I did not think the group of which I am a member had been doing anything in particular, I did not think we had been irritating him, I thought that we had left him alone pretty well this session. We had not, as yet, reminded him of those most unfortunate results which I predicted last year would flow from that morganatic alliance into which he had plunged. However he has perhaps discovered something about the Conservatives—he may think he has found something such as has been found in the tomb of King Tutankhamen. I may tell him that we are not yet quite buried, and that he will find that, even with us, we endure for a good many years, and that, like the celebrated Pharaoh, we have remained in the same place. He may look around about, and he may find another party which has not stayed in the same place with regard to its policy. I think he has already discovered that fact. Or, if he would like something a little lighter, something in the poetic vein, he might be induced to look up the quotation given by our dear friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he was not occupying his present position, but when he was a critic of the then government, and quoted, I have no doubt with admirable zest and fervour, some lines that, although not appropriate then, are at least very much in place to-day. We can quote them back. They were as follows:—

> They promise, prepare, propose, postpone,
> And end by letting things alone.

I trust that my hon. friends to my left can fully appreciate the vagaries of government policy which in two sessions have gone through the whole course indicated so pathetically by the hon. Minister of Finance. One hon. member says he does not appreciate it. In last year's Speech from the Throne I find the following paragraph—

> It is intended at an early date to co-ordinate the Government-owned systems in the manner best calculated to increase efficiency, and to effect economies in administration, maintenance and operation.

And I have just had the pleasure of listening to a very interesting speech from the other side of the House in which the effect of economies in administration, maintenance and operation has been set forth in a most salutary manner for the government to hear. I learned, however, with surprise the other day from the hon. Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that this co-ordination had not been effected. I judged from what he said that there was some serious legal obstacle. What legal obstacle there could have been that was not in existence when the Speech from the Throne was delivered last year I utterly fail to conceive, but apparently things are put in the Speech from the Throne without very much reflection, and possibly in the hope that the ambition of the late P. T. Barnum may be comfortably realized, in fooling all the people at least part of the time until the next session. My hon. friend apparently did not know there was an obstacle, but they had a whole session in which to find out and introduce any legislation which was necessary and we come here and find, I think it was after the opening of this session —I am not sure of the exact date, but very close to it—that they did get through the order in council co-ordinating these systems. Why the delay? I do not want to be misunderstood. I never speak as an enthusiastic advocate of government ownership. I look upon government ownership as an unfortunate necessity, as something that cannot be avoided, as something that we have got to make the best of. It is no use to go back into the reasons that led up to it. There is no use travelling through the years when my hon. friends were in power, and when their

unwise acts with regard to railway building rendered ultimately necessary the steps that had to be taken with regard to these railways. But we are facing, as some one said the other day, a condition and not a theory—we have the railways. I would like to hear something—and I speak in all seriousness; if we are going to face this problem from a national standpoint, I would like to hear something more hopeful, something more helpful and more trustful than I have heard from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance the other day. He did not speak of this, and I had assumed, perhaps wrongly, that he was an ardent public ownership man. He certainly did not speak as such. I would think however that it would be better, for the education of the people of this country as to the necessity of vital co-operation of all interests in this country, to make the best of the amalgamated roads. I would think it would be well for a man of the high standing of the Minister of Finance to give us some hope and some light in dealing with this problem, instead of rather reprobating it and treating it as if it were something nobody could ever hope to accomplish. If that is the real view of the government, if they have made up their minds on this important subject, if they feel we can never make a success of these railways, then I would invite them to put an end to the farce at once and let us proceed to get rid of these railways before the burden on the country becomes more and more intolerable. There are just the two courses to pursue, one is to go ahead and make good with the railways, and the other is to get rid of them. Whatever course the administration sees fit to pursue, let us have energy and force back of it, and do not have any cold water thrown on the proposition by any member of the administration. The order in council has been passed, and we have co-ordination to some extent. Whether we have within the system the real desire to make it effective I do not know.

I am not going to criticise the choice made by the government of the administrator of the railways. I believe every man has a right to a chance to make good, and I propose to reserve any remarks or any criticism of that appointment until we get a full, fair opportunity for a demonstration and see what the gentleman can do. Let him be judged by his works. In the meantime I might enter a little plea for somewhat more action and somewhat less speech. This country is probably unknown to Sir Henry Thornton, and I trust he will be able to grapple with the tremendous problems that he has to face. But I would rather hear him tell afterwards, if that will be necessary, what he has done, than hear quite so much about what may be done. While touching on this subject, I do not think that the attitude, perhaps, of some public men is altogether wise, when they tell us, both in this House and out of it, that you cannot keep the railway system out of politics, or rather, that you must have politics in the railway system. I am going to be extremely candid and say that I am afraid they are right. But I would rather have them say to the public the thing that they do not mean than say the thing that they believe. They do so on other occasions, why should they not do it on this? They are telling you, or they are telling us, that there is this higher class of politics, this general direction of the affairs of the railways, that is necessarily political, and that this House which, after all, means the government, must control. I cannot quarrel with that. The administration for the time being, must settle things. I think, perhaps, our criticism is that they do not quite settle things enough. What I do object to are the suggestions that come in this very chamber, and that I have heard in Sir Henry Thornton's presence at public meetings from prominent members of the Liberal party, that you cannot keep the road out of politics; that the country is paying for the services of the men who are on the road, and that they are going to have some control. That means just this to my mind: perhaps not all the leaders, but certainly those who control the political activities of the party, have made up their minds that, under the guise of public declarations that there shall be no politics, there shall be a very effective and very operative political programme permeating the whole course of the National railways. We have some evidence of this in the province of New Brunswick. I do not care how far they go; all I want is that the thing shall come out in the daylight. If they are right in what they say, that you cannot keep the railroad out of politics, then we ought to get together in this House and get the railroad out of the hands of the people as quickly as possible. If you can run the railway without politics, then we ought to use the whole force of all political parties in this House to keep politics out of the railway administration.

When, a little over a year ago, the party of which I am a member was making efforts to obtain or to retain the confidence of the people, in which effort we were not as sucessful as we would like to have been, in the Maritime provinces we told the people frankly what our programme was, not that we had the direction of the railway system, but that as

far as we could exercise influence, we thought there ought to be large regional divisions of the government railways for the purpose of effective administration. That was approved by the then general manager, the president of the road, and a statement was made publicly; but our statement, I will be frank enough to say, was absolutely beclouded and derided, and the people apparently did not believe it. It was, however, like all our other public pronouncements upon the platform, or of the platform of the party, absolutely true and sincere. The other side were prepared to go to any length, and a railway millennium would dawn if they got back into power. Well, they got power as regards the province of Nova Scotia, got it abundantly; they got it as regards the province of Prince Edward Island to the full extent that that province was capable of giving it. And you have heard the result to-day. They did not get it quite so largely in New Brunswick; but they did get many of the counties in which the old Intercolonial operates, and I will say that, in the city of Moncton and through the counties of Nova Scotia where that railway runs, the people had absolute faith and belief that a Liberal administration would give them a regional administration that would extend at least as far as the city of Montreal; that that portion of the railway would be managed from the common centre of the city of Moncton. Hon. members will recollect that originally the Intercolonial railway ran only to the city of Quebec; but that under the administration of the late Hon. Andrew G. Blair, when he was Minister of Railways, the Drummond County line was bought and the road was extended to the city of Montreal. Now, I am told to-day—my hon. friends will correct me if I am wrong—that this eastern region is to end at Riviere du Loup. I am sorry the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) is not in his place, but I would like to know whether that statement is or is not correct. On the assumption that it is correct, I want to point out something which is of a good deal of importance to us in the Maritime provinces. If the bookkeeping of that railway system is to charge up against that particular region the overhead expenses of the general staff, that will be just one nail more in the coffin of the Maritime provincial railway administration. If you take a line from Halifax to Montreal, you can administer, as regards the supervisory portion of the management, with exactly the same number of men as if it were merely from Riviere du Loup to Halifax. But, if you are going to pay as many men for a smaller portion of the road, why necessarily the overhead is distributed over a smaller amount of receipts and a smaller mileage of the railway. We do not, after all, want something for nothing in the Maritime provinces, but we do want the most efficient use of that railway which was built for us as part of the compact of confederation. We do not want to put an unnecessary dollar of burden upon the country to do that, we want it to be as self-sustaining as it may be, having regard to the absolute necessities of the people in the Maritime provinces, and having regard to conditions of Canadian business as well. But we do not want to have any part of the system loaded up with more unnecessary expense than any other. I think that is a fair business proposition, and I trust that before the session ends, I shall hear from the Minister of Railways whether this statement is a correct one and if so, what reasons have prompted the Government to allow that limited distance to become a regional system.

Last year my hon. friend, whose absence from the House this year we all very much regret, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), wanted the Intercolonial railway to be restored to its former status. I do not know that I agree with that. I want to see the Intercolonial railway of the best possible benefit to the Maritime provinces, and I believe, whether in public hands or in private hands, it would be better that the whole 22,000 miles of railways should be under one and the same management. I believe that in that way we can get better results, and I believe the people of the Maritime provinces will have faith that under one system or the other we shall get better results by having unified management and control, provided that the local necessities of the railway situation are given fair and sympathetic consideration by that management, whatever it may be. My hon. friend from Cumberland, however was probably relying on the Speech from the Throne for that year, which said:

> Conferences have been arranged between the railway authorities with respect to the reduction of rates upon basic commodities.

Last year the government had a programme until the Speech from the Throne was delivered. Then that programme, whatever it may have been, was put under the table and the whole matter was referred to a committee. On the 22nd of June that committee adopted a report which never saw the light in this chamber, and a portion of which was as follows:

> Your committee therefore recommend a suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement for one year, from sixth July, 1922, with power to the Governor in Council to

suspend for a further period of one year, if in its judgment the then existing conditions justify the same. And your committee recommend that suitable legislation be enacted to make effective this recommendation.

That was, in clear terms, a recommendation for a general suspension. It carried out the provisions of the Railway Act, which otherwise would have expired on the sixth of July, 1922. The recommendation of that committee was made, as the report stated, in view of the great necessity for a general reduction in freight rates on basic commodities as a whole, and in what was considered to be the general public interest, and not in consequence of the proposals for rate reduction made by the railways. We had that point of view, then, from the committee, that there was a great necessity for a general reduction in the freight rates on basic commodities. Our friends in the West were, quite naturally, striving to hold an advantage that they had, an advantage which had been purchased not by them alone but by all the people of Canada, and purchased under conditions very materially differing from the post-war conditions in connection with the railways. Now, the very fact that we meet here in a parliament duly convened emphasizes this other fact, that there always is, always will be and of necessity must be, sectionalism. I do not mean sectionalism in the improper sense by which one section tries to get something to which it is not entitled. I mean sectionalism in the fair sense in which it ought to be used in parliamentary institutions,—that sectionalism which presents its local difficulties, and its means or want of means of meeting these difficulties, and comes to parliament in a general conference to decide what can best be done in the common interests of the whole country, from east to west and from north to south. We do not always accomplish that, but I trust that, even though there are misunderstandings, we always have that point of view in mind. And it is with that point of view in mind that I address some remarks to this Chamber this afternoon. As I say, the West came here feeling that they had a right to something, to wit, certain rates lower than anybody else in the country could enjoy for the movement of commodities. They felt it was not fair to deprive them of that advantage. They felt that it was a difficult matter for the people of the West to market their wheat crop, and that, transportation being so vital an element, they ought not to be asked to give up the privilege they had been enjoying. Now, I am not saying that their point of view was correct. Indeed, I do not think it was wholly correct, but I say it was a point of view that had a right to be presented and to be taken into consideration in framing any policy. But it had a right to be taken into consideration only along with the requirements, the difficulties and the needs of all other portions of Canada served by the railways. And in considering this matter it was for the government to formulate a policy which should do as equal justice to all sections as it is possible for any policy to secure. The government shrank from taking up that burden. They felt they were not strong in the House, and they proceeded to make a bargain with my friends to my left, by means of which they got all the political support they could obtain and gave in return—I will not say lavishly, but nevertheless they gave—rights or privileges in utter disregard of the Maritime provinces, of the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia. That may sound harsh, and I do not want to put anything bitterly; but it seems to me that it is just a fact. I am going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to follow me, while I discuss the case of my own province of New Brunswick although I can only do it in the most imperfect manner. Without trying to get anything for New Brunswick that it should not have, I think it is my duty to put before this House the difficulties under which that province labours because of that very bargain which the government entered into for the purpose of obtaining political support. If that agreement did not hurt the province of New Brunswick, I suppose I would not say anything about the matter; and I presume that some hon. members may say that New Brunswick was not hurt. Now, I think that, from the very evidence taken by the committee that considered this matter and which was then shut off, I can demonstrate to the House that New Brunswick in some particulars was rather cruelly hurt. We do not pretend down there to be grain growers. On the other hand, we do not allege that grain growers have no rights; we think they have a right to fair treatment; But we think we have a right to fair treatment ourselves, and we cannot see why a large section of New Brunswick—I will refer particularly to the counties of Carleton and Victoria, where potato growing is largely carried on—should be injured by reason of any agreement with any other part of the country. We cannot see why any man in this House possessed of a fair mind should vote to destroy, to hamper or to impede the potato growers of these counties in order that some portion of the middle West might derive a tremendous advantage. One hon. member from the province of New Brunswick belonging to the group to my left did vote so, carried away, again, by the party spirit. The party meant more to him than his constit-

uents, and he voted to sacrifice the potato growers of his own constituency in order to help out the, no doubt unfortunate, grain growers who were, in the higher circles, pocketing the spoils in the way of overages, shortages and these other things.

Mr. EVANS: Does the hon. member infer that the West is getting a service for which it does not pay?

Mr. BAXTER: I am not inferring anything of the kind, and I am not even going to discuss that point elaborately. What I want to get at is, that if the West wants, as the West has said it wants, all sorts of commodities to come in free of customs duties, and if it wants all commodities hauled as cheaply as can be on the railways, then, if there is an agricultural industry down in New Brunswick that is vital to us, we do not want to have our rates raised above the cost of haulage in order to make these other things possible for the West or the East, the North or the South.

Now at the time this parliamentary bargain was made last year the railways had already lowered their freight charges, taking about three million dollars off the general cost of railway haulage of grain; another fourteen million dollars was taken off by the retention of the Crowsnest pass agreement; making about seventeen million dollars of a reduction on one commodity alone, and paying no regard whatever to any other class of freight.

Mr. FORKE: There was more money made by the railways out of that one commodity than out of any other class of freight they carried.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps a greater quantity of that commodity was handled than of any other freight. Perhaps my hon. friend will also recollect the suggestion that of this seventeen million dollars saved to the grain growers by the action of this parliament, a very considerable portion was taken by the lake transportation companies.

Some hon. MEMBERS: All of it.

Mr. BAXTER: Was it? Then perhaps my hon. friends to my left will contrast the action of the autocratic government of my right hon. friend here (Mr. Meighen), as it has been termed, when its leader took the bit between his teeth and suspended the navigation laws in order to afford relief to the West, with the want of action on the part of a government so friendly to them, but which refrained from granting my hon. friends similar relief. I am not fighting my hon. friends to my left and I am not working with them, I am simply putting forward the case of the potato growers of New Brunswick, and I am going to ask my hon. friends to my left to examine their consciences and say if the New Brunswick potato growers have received a fair, square deal.

In the parliamentary agreement of last year potatoes were not mentioned. Now, can you tell me anything that distinguishes the man who grows grain from the man who grows potatoes? Is there any reason why a burden should be even partially lifted from the one and yet allowed to remain upon the other? I know my hon. friends will not say there is any reason. Well, then, what happened? The government's action paralyzed the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the potato growers of New Brunswick could not seek relief in that quarter. Railway rates were so much reduced that the railway companies, which have to pay their bills like every other company, had to get money from some source and the only source of course, of their revenue is the passengers and freight they handle. Therefore the Railway Commission could afford no relief by lowering the freight rates on potatoes or lumber, except upon one commodity only coming under the classification of building materials, namely, bricks, and in this instance the reduction was very small.

Now then, the action of the government, in combination with my hon. friends to my left, shut out the potato growers of
5 p.m. New Brunswick from any redress at the hands of the Railway Commission, a tribunal whose purpose is to see that there is no unjust discrimination in railway rates. That is the tribunal to which we go for justice in transportation matters. The Railway Commission said: We cannot give you any relief by reducing the freight rates on potatoes or other commodities without reducing the revenues of the railways to such a point that they will not be able to meet their operating expenses, and such an unsound financial position would only bring ruin upon the railways of Canada a little sooner. Remember, the government interfered with the Railway Commissioners, otherwise they would have taken up the case of the potato grower, of the lumberman, and of the shipper of all other classes of freight. No one class would have got all they wanted, but the most expert railway brains in the country would have been put to work upon the freight rates problem, and we would have got the best attempt possible to do equal justice to all classes of freight shippers—a far better attempt than can ever be made by any government or any parliamentary committee, no matter how able it may be.

Denied that recourse, the New Brunswick potato growers put their case before the parliamentary committee. I do not say that that committee was unsympathetic, for even in its first report—the report that was suppressed—a chance was afforded for equal justice. But the action of the government deprived us of that chance. The rates on potatoes from June 7th, 1917, to December 1st, 1921, were laid before that committee, and I have no doubt it will astonish some hon. members to hear how these rates were increased in that period. These rates which I am about to quote are in cents per hundred pounds of potatoes, and are calculated on the same basis as grain rates. In 1917 the rate from the potato shipping points in New Brunswick of Debec, Hartland, Andover and Florenceville to Montreal was 19 cents; in 1921, 34½ cents. In other words, it had been increased 81 per cent.

Mr. SHAW: Can my hon. friend give the House any idea of the distance involved?

Mr. BAXTER: It does not matter as to the distances. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the exact figures, but I could make a rough calculation.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to have it just roughly for comparative purposes.

Mr. BAXTER: I think from those points generally to Montreal the routing followed would give about 500 or 600 miles. To Brockville it was 21 cents in the earlier period, 37½ cents later—an increase of 78 per cent; to Ottawa, 21 cents as against 37½ cents—78 per cent increase again; to Kingston, 22 cents as against 40 cents—an increase of 81 per cent; to Peterborough, 24 cents as against 43 cents—an increase of 79 per cent; to Toronto, 25 cents as against 45½ cents—an increase of 82 per cent; to North Bay, 27 cents as against 49 cents—an increase of 81 per cent; to Hamilton, 26 cents as against 47 cents—an increase of 80 per cent; to London, 29 cents as against 52½ cents—an increase of 81 per cent; to Goderich, 30 cents as against 54 cents—an increase of 80 per cent; to Windsor, 31 cents as against 55½ cents—an increase of 79 per cent. Now, the 19 cent potato rate from the New Brunswick points mentioned to Montreal may be compared with the 18 cent rate on grain from Weyburn to Montreal. The Montreal rate, at the time parliament considered the question, had gone up to 34½ cents; the Weyburn rate had gone up to 29 cents. In other words, the Montreal rate was increased by 15½ cents, while the Weyburn rate was increased 11 cents. Now, parliament by that action took off 9 cents from the 11 cent increase of the Weyburn rate. That left the Weyburn rate only 2 cents higher than the lowest rates they had ever enjoyed from that place on grain; but the Montreal rate on potatoes, which I say is fairly comparable, was left increased by 81 per cent. The Board of Railway Commissioners, tied as their hands were, did the best they could. They made a reduction of from two to three cents per one hundred pounds in the potato rates; that was all they could do. I will ask hon. members, when the rate on grain is cut so low as to be almost restoring it to the very minimum rate, while the rate on potatoes is cut by such an almost infinitesimal amount, does it strike them by and large, without regard to personal considerations, without regard to local considerations, as having even the semblance of being quite fair treatment towards the potato growers in an important potato section of the province from which I come? I do not think they will feel that it is.

Well, what did my friends the potato growers in New Brunswick get? Oh, they got the sop thrown to them of a few thousand dollars which was expended in connection with their potato warehouse in St. John. Not a bad thing; it is all right to help them export potatoes, but it was to send potatoes out of the country. They were not helped to send potatoes within the country; and yet we want our railways to get a sustaining trade between one part of the Dominion and the other. We want the people of all parts of this Dominion to trade reciprocally. We have nine provinces, between which there is interposed no customs barrier, nine provinces populated by a people who, after all, approximate being one in thought and action upon the ordinary concerns of life. We want to trade together. It is vital to our interests that we should. Why then merely help us—I am not going to reprobate it, for it is not in itself a bad thing—why merely help us build up an external trade, why make a fuss about a few thousand dollars to help external trade when you have left on an embargo and a penalty on the internal trade within the bounds of this Dominion? I wonder if my friends to my left or my friends in front of me, because I am really addressing the whole House on this subject, appreciate the fact that to-day in those very counties I mention, the splendid counties of Victoria and Carleton, there has been a practical failure of the potato crop, so far as prices are concerned. They grow no better potatoes in the world

than are grown in those two counties, but they cannot get their price, and the potatoes have rotted there. The fertilizer companies have sold them large quantities of fertilizer, and they have the notes of the farmers, and, in some cases, even mortgages. The mortgages are being foreclosed, and the notes are being sued. The farmers cannot meet them, and what sort of spirit can they have towards a government that bargained away for the chance of temporary political support, their opportunity to sell their products in the markets of Canada?

I have no doubt there is distress in the West, and I would be a poor Canadian if I did not sympathize with the tales I have heard, but do not forget, hon. members of this House, that there is distress in the East and difficult conditions there. We are not all in the class of the financial magnates who have been referred to by some hon. members in this debate. We are not the moneyed power in the East; we are not the people that were meant to be assailed by my hon. friends. I am trying to represent, not as from that constituency, but trying to represent as from New Brunswick the pitiable plight of some other human beings who have been striving just as hard as my friends from the West to make a decent, honest living and to stay in the land where they were born.

Is it any better with lumber? I will summarize this. The low point of rates was on May 1, 1908, and the high point on December 1, 1921. The increases ran, according to mileage—I shall not weary the House with a long tabulation; I think they will take my word for it; it was all before the committee—the increases ran from 63 per cent up to 116 per cent. You are getting a pretty good increase even at 63 per cent. You can average it fairly, I fancy, at 100 per cent. Absolutely no relief either from this parliament or from the Board of Railway Commissioners. The board could not, and this parliament would not. This group to my left protests when we say that protection is a vital and an important thing for the industries of this country. I would suppose that my hon. friends would not take protection for themselves, surely, unless they were prepared to give it to other people; but so far as I have heard their attitude in this House, and I am saying this in all charity, they say to us as Conservatives: You are wrong; your protective policy is a fallacy, and we invite the whole House to join with us and to submerge the government by adopting an amendment which will go as far as it possibly can go towards destroying customs barriers. Somebody applauds. I did not expect very much, but I know that is the attitude of mind of my hon. friends. We say: We stand for protection, and it is right. They cannot expect us to join with them and assist in giving them, or admire the giving to them, of protection that would mean actual dollars and cents taken directly out of the exchequer of this country. And yet that is the proposition that was made last year, as I understand it. Now, let us look at these things from both sides, let us try to be fair. All that we ask is that a consideration of our local difficulties should be had when those of the other parts of the country are considered as well, and we would ask that business ideas and the principles of fair play, rather than the exigencies of politics, should determine the solution.

I think I may revert for a moment or two to the general question of the railways, and as to how the interests of the Maritime provinces are affected. My attitude in this regard may seem intensely sectional, but I am under the obsession that it is fair. I trust that my remarks will commend themselves to hon. members of the House as being perfectly fair to this extent—that if we have in the Maritime provinces a port, or ports, capable of utility in the development of Canada and the handling of Canada's business, those are the ports towards whose development all the energies of our government-owned railway system should be directed rather than towards building up ports in foreign countries. I think that is a doctrine which can be readily subscribed to by any Canadian who is not merely seeking for some selfish opportunity for an outlet for his particular business, regardless of the welfare of his fellow men within the Dominion. During the last election, quite unfairly I thought, the party of which I am a member was bitterly attacked by the Liberal press in St. John on the ground that we had, by taking in the Grand Trunk, made Portland, Maine, the gateway of Canada, and the logical result of our action would be the diversion of all possible traffic to that port, and that it would mean irreparable injury to the port of St. John. If that had been true the same thing would be equally true of the port of Halifax; and my own view is that there ought to be no government policy with regard to the railways that would not treat one of those ports just as well as the other. Now what do I find this year? In a newspaper article published very recently I see that one Henry F. Merrill, the chairman of the state commission which built a large pier at Portland, Maine, says that in his opinion the simple matter of dollars and cents will defeat the efforts made

to divert traffic from Portland to St. John and Halifax. Mr. Merrill also says that Boston is after some of Portland's traffic. Mr. Merrill states that the Maine Central—this is a very important thing if true; I am not able to guarantee the truth of it, but I want to know, and I want to know as early as possible, and as nearly as possible, whether the statement by Mr. Merrill, which I am going to read, is true or is not true—his statement is that the Maine Central, the Boston and Maine, and the Grand Trunk railroads have come together and given a preferential rate over their lines for freight going to the state pier at Portland, Maine. Already, he declares, this has meant a saving to the people of Maine of $75,000. He says further that the railroads have promised that as business develops they will make a further differential. This pier cost the state of Maine $1,150,000, and the cities of Portland and South Portland gave the site, which is valued at $350,000. I am not in a position to say that the statement in question is true, but hon. members will understand that I am vitally interested, as is every other resident in the port of St. John or in the port of Halifax, in knowing whether there is any, or the slightest, foundation for such a statement as has been made by Mr. Merrill. Last winter I ventured the suggestion that the differentials should be imposed the other way, and that there should be practically a prohibitive differential imposed by this country upon the haulage of goods from Montreal to Portland, Maine. In other words, just say to the people who want their goods carried out by a foreign port: "We will take them if you route them that way, we have got to do it for you, but it is going to cost you more, and definitely more, than it will to take them through the port of Halifax, or the port of St. John, over our own railways, all the way in our own territory." That is what I say would be one of the fair things to do in order to help to build up the ports of the Maritime provinces.

Another suggestion I ventured to make was that we should limit the British preference—not in amount, let us have the best arrangement with the Mother Country we possibly can, but limit the customs preference we give to the Mother Country to importations in British—and in that I naturally include Canadian—bottoms, sailing directly from the United Kingdom ports to Vancouver, Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, Sydney, St. John, or any other port in our own territory. This puts no burden on any one. It does not lessen the quantity of goods that will come into Canada or it does not enhance their price, but it does say to the steamship owners: "There will be more cargo for you. If you are taking a cargo of grain and mixed supplies out of St. John you will get more package freight put into your holds when you come back because the importer will get the benefit of the lowest scale of duty by doing that, and we are not going to let him send it in by New York, Boston, or Portland and let these ports derive the same advantage as the ports of this country." That is what I suggested last year. I see that it is the very principle that the government, and I give them credit for it, introduced into the commercial treaty with France. I think they have taken a long step in advance in doing that. I think they are entitled to credit for it. I think that whatever we may condemn them for, whatever fault we may find with them in other matters, we will say they are right in that. But let them make it general, and thus help to build up all our ports and use our railways to the very fullest extent of their capacity.

A little more reference to the Speech or the omissions from the Speech and I shall have done. We are being told—not in the Speech itself, you would not expect to find it there—that we have a wonderful government. I have heard some hon. members opposite tell us that, and I am sure they were convinced of the truth of the assertion. There were not so many members in the House then on the government side as there are to-day; but we are all aware that a little fire broke out in a place not very many hundreds of miles from the city of Ottawa, and some of the fire department—I think even a gentleman of very eminent judicial talents, and perhaps gentlemen associated with the custom house and the naval service—went down to squirt water on that political fire in Montreal; and they did not put it out. We have a wonderful government here, but some of the gentlemen who engage in this laudation may perhaps see, by the flickering of the light of that fire some traces of the handwriting on the wall.

I am very glad of the results that we witnessed in the provincial field the other day, because they demonstrate that the assertions that have been made are not well founded and that the old Conservative party of Canada is still potent, active, and influential in all parts of Canada in the same sense that it always has been. It is broad enough, strong enough, and representative enough for all. The old party is absolutely alive in the province of Quebec and I am proud of it. I am glad to see that the verdict given the other day, though it did not turn a government out of power, yet demonstrated to the

rest of Canada that there was unity in the Conservative party, and that we are only traduced when our opponents say that in that province we have no sympathy and no following. There have been hundreds of thousands of splendid Conservatives who have gone, election after election, to the polls in that province, and those who have gone down have taken their defeat like men, but to-day they begin to see the dawning of a better time, and clearly within their vision is the day when the Conservative party, by the aid of that grand old province, will once more take its rightful place as the exponent of all the people in the country.

This wonderful government that has been acclaimed, has been acclaimed for what? Not for last year's Speech, because that had gone into discard; not for this year's Speech, because it has twelve headings and no substance, and has been destroyed by a malediction from the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). But the great thing in the Speech was the thing that was not in it—the splendid government that had not got us into war. I did not want to go into war. I do not know who was consulted about going into war or staying out of it, and I do not know what were the reasons that were determinative in the government staying out or going into war, or any other way they may phrase it, because it is all contained in confidential documents that have not been exhibited to us, cannot be exhibited to us and would not have been exhibited to us if parliament had been called together. If parliament had been assembled, all we would have had would have been a despatch-case set up on a desk in the House, and we would have been told "The reason for doing what we are doing or not doing or not attempting to do is contained in that case. If we could show you what is in that case, we could show you the reasons for what we are doing, but we cannot unlock that case and cannot show you what is in it." We would have had to trust the government.

How far does the government trust us? I notice that the right hon. leader of the government took into his counsels my hon. friend who was formerly the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar). I did not notice that he called upon my right hon. friend the leader of the party to which I belong (Mr. Meighen). Was it only a portion of Canada that would be interested in going into war or staying out of war? or is the thing really that which its appearance would indicate, namely that the most solemn, the most tragic, the most terrible thing that could come before this country, the danger of another awful conflict, was to be made a matter of party negotiation and party politics? Was it in this way that they were to decide whether there should be war? Would a telegram have gone forth that we would go into war if the Progressive leader had said he wanted it? It is too solemn, I think, to be dealt with in that way. We do not know yet what the government's policy was. It looks to us as if Lloyd George, seeing he was not getting any definite answer, recalled his proposal, and I am very glad that he did, because as I see it, if the Empire is really in peril once more, if it is not the political swash-buckling of Downing street, if it is real peril, there will be no question about the answer of real Canada. But I would like to suggest to the hon. leader of the government to get away from any party politics in connection with this. Do not merely talk about calling parliament together, when practically all the issues are determined, and there will be only one thing for us to do if parliament is called together, but let us as a nation try to strike at the very root of this accursed European diplomacy and insist upon sitting in and taking part in the very inmost councils of the Empire and having our share in the determination, not at the moment when war is about to burst upon us, but long, long before, and let us have our say about the path that the Empire shall tread, and the direction in which it shall lead the feet of the people. Did the hon. member for Brandon wish to ask me a question?

Mr. FORKE: No, I was listening for some applause after that statement.

Mr. BAXTER: I was not expecting any, and I do not desire any. I was not making my address for the sake of applause, nor did I think that I was at the moment travelling on a plane that would invite any bucolic sarcasm. I wanted to go a step further—and there may be some in this audience who will be willing to listen to me—and say that after one hundred years of showing the people of the world how peace can be kept over a great water area and over a great land area, I think there are men in Canada of sufficient brain power and sufficient vision to teach something, even to the best of the statesmen of Great Britain, and I think that the homely common sense that has characterized our men on the frontier, and the rugged common sense that has characterized our men in the cabinet, might be of some utility, if brought into some of the European chancelleries and might have its effect upon the

course to be pursued by some of the nations. I would think that the Mother Country herself might be none the worse of a bit of good, sturdy Canadian and colonial advice, but you have got to give that advice soon enough, it must be early enough, so that the successive steps taken shall be along the line of common sense, of arbitrament, of good feeling, and away from war, for this part of the world wants no more war. My proposition is simply that the government should endeavour to have direct representation, not merely of a high trade commissioner, but direct representation by someone of cabinet rank and authority, who would sit in the inner counsels of the Empire, would give his views, and report to Canada what was being done, so that long before war would even be in prospect, we would know whether or not all had been done to avoid a possible conflagration. It may be my hon. friend who interrupted me derides that point of view. It may be that he prefers to see Canada sailing on, fatuously content with her lot, until the moment when the red fire spreads above the horizon, and then he will call parliament together to sit down and talk about putting out the conflagration.

Mr. HOEY: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question and I do so in all seriousness. Does he not think that the League of Nations, properly functioning, will accomplish all that he has in mind, without the idea of Imperial centralization in the sense in which he has expounded it? I am putting the question candidly for information.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not able to answer my hon. friend as to that. To my mind, the League of Nations will have no power unless it is backed by the fighting power of a number of states, matchless in their strength. But before you get the League of Nations doing what it ought to be able to do, you will have to have the bigger nations inspired with a proper view towards the rest of the world. The League of Nations, to my mind, will be a valuable power for keping in awe and restraining the minor nations. I fail to see how the League of Nations can ever restrain a major nation. At the same time, like my hon. friend, I have given such little adhesion to it in Canada as I have been able to give. I wish its purposes God-speed, and I will do anything I can to further its aims.

We shall have to consider the amendment and the subamendment because we shall have to vote upon them. This may not interest any one else, but it did interest me a little; I have before me a comparison of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), who certainly does not expect me to vote for it:

That in view of the increased burden of taxation and of the hardship which many of the people suffer from this burden, and the unrest and dissatisfaction arising therefrom, and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to reduce the cost of production, and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, the House is of the opinion that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance:

(1) Diminishing the very high cost of production, which presses so severely on the primary producers of the country at this time;

(2) Reducing the cost of living to the great masses of the common people, many of whom are being forced out of the country by the prevailing economic conditions.

Then I turn to the Debates of 1920, where, at page 2510, I see the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) moved, amongst other things, seconded by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King):

That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, The House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff,—

That has been left out of this amendment. Apparently my hon. friend for Springfield has no hope for any wider revision of the tariff.

—substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

I never thought my hon. friend for Springfield was such a plagiarist, for this is really the grossest instance of plagiarism that I have yet seen in this House.

Mr. HOEY: All the great poets have been plagiarists.

Mr. BAXTER: As I said, I hope the hon. gentleman will not expect this group to vote for his amendment, because we stand where he does not like to have anybody stand. We stand where we have always stood, whether we are right or wrong—and we believe we are right—on the ground that a fair, reasonable, proper measure of protection should be given to the industries of the country in order to build up an urban population which will draw its sustenance from the rural population, both being interdependent. We do not

believe in building up one side of the country at the expense of or ignoring the other side. We have to have a symmetrical country, just as we have a lake region, a river region, a coastal region and a mountain region. So I believe we have to have industrial occupations as well as agricultural occupations, and our vision—and we think it is a grand vision—is that of a country made great by the development of all its parts geographically, and of all the opportunities industrially which it possesses. We do not believe we can attain that result by adopting this amendment, however excellent a copy it may be of that which the Minister of Finance produced a few years ago. We have, perhaps, the misfortune, judged by the standard of politics of the present day, to have been sincere and to remain sincere still. My hon. friends to my left have never had any difficulty in knowing where we stand on this subject, and that is why, though personally friendly enough with us, politically they have been at more than arm's length. The fact was not that they did not trust us; they trusted us. They more than trusted us; they knew exactly where we stood and where we were going to stand; they did not like our stand, and they were not going to stand alongside of us. But they knew we had convictions and the courage of them and that that courage was not abated, even though we came back to this House the smallest group after the last election. But what have they found on the other side? Gentlemen with convictions? They were expressed in 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All varieties.

Mr. BAXTER: They had an opportunity last session to put those convictions into realization, and now they need the spur and the goad of my hon. friend for Springfield, cursing the barren fig tree to try to make it bring forth some fruit.

We have the amendment to the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), who wishes to add to the amendment:

> That this House views with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt and urges Your Excellency's advisers to exert every possible effort to economize in the expenditure and administration of government and to lessen the burden of federal taxation which bears so heavily on the people of Canada.

To my mind,—and I think I speak for the group with which I am associated—that amendment expresses, not merely our view of what the government of the day should do, but very much more. It expresses something that should be heard and heeded by every administration within Canada, federal, provincial, civic and municipal. Before the war, in the luxurious ease which Canada enjoyed, she was becoming prodigal; and you can travel through the West from which my hon. friend comes, and you will find marble palaces, which,—though I have no business to criticize, may I express the opinion?—were scarcely needed. All over the country there was a riot of display and of expenditure. But it was easy. We could stand it in those days. We had not the railway problem, we had not the war loan; and either of these, perhaps, we could have stood without the other. But during war time, when everything was moving under pressure, it was a question for this country and for every other country engaged in the struggle, not of what things cost but to get things done. If a shipload of supplies went to the bottom the obvious and the instant thing was to start another ship off. Men could not wait; money did not count. And part of a generation of Canadian people has grown up under that urge and that impetus. Necessarily money was distributed in order to look after the families of men who were suffering for Canada, and the standard of living was perhaps somewhat augmented. So that the country to-day is still expecting to live in the riot, the waste and the luxury, or at least the extreme comfort that we enjoyed when the world was in course of a tremendous upheaval.

Sir, we cannot do it; and if the supreme government in Canada does not set the example of absolute retrenchment in the cutting off of all except the things that are vitally necessary for the development of the country, how shall we expect the ordinary man in the street, the man working for his day's wage, to be content when someone says to him that he must take less? He will say, your government is spending money all the time. He will ask, and I will stand with the rest of hon. members in this House in this regard, because there is no distinction between us: how much work have you people done in the last five days? Some of you make a great fuss about limiting the hours of labour to eight per day. But what is that when you spend only three hours a day or less at work?" Let us stop a bit of the waste here. We can sit at night and on Saturdays, and we can put the business of the House through, instead of in four or five months, within the space of two. I say this in the light of experience. I have had some experience in other places, and I know that I have helped, in a leading position in opposition, by collaboration with the leader of the government, to reduce an eight-week session to one of four weeks, with some spare

time out of that. And no one was hurt, either, while a better example was set for the transaction of public business. The same can be done here. There is a man in Italy, Mussolini is his name, who is tackling the problems of his country man-fashion. He says that, beginning with himself and his government, all those working for the government shall have to work some more hours. Now, I do not want to turn anyone into a galley slave, but at the same time I think that the plain people of this country who are bearing the burdens—for after all it comes down to them, no matter through how many degrees you finally reach them—expect something else at the capital than an exhibition of a waste of time and of funds.

I am in hearty sympathy with every word of the resolution of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), not because it is an attack on the government, but because I believe it contains a great deal of common sense that needs to be taught and emphasized in this country at the present time. I am sorry it is mixed up as an addition to the amendment of the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey). Personally, I am in favour of and shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary, with the distinct understanding that I do not thereby commit myself, if it should carry, to vote for the amendment of the member for Springfield, with the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary incorporated in it. This part of the House does not stultify itself: we do not vote for free trade when we are standing under the flag of protection. But we will vote to emphasize the necessity for economy in the public administration, and we believe that the hon. member for Calgary is doing the country a good service, apart from all politics, when he brings his amendment to the attention of this House. It seems strange, however, that it should be necessary to have either the amendment or the sub-amendment. It seems strange in view of the declaration of policy of the Liberal party. It seems strange in view of the fact that men in public life are supposed to have some regard for the spoken as well as for the written word, and that a pledge is supposed to be binding. Honour is not supposed to depart from a man merely because of his entering into the political arena; and if faith had been kept, if honour, instead of the love and the lust for power, had been the dominating factor in the mind of the government, there should have been no need, there should have been no opportunity, for my hon. friend for Springfield to have cursed the barren fig tree, nor for my hon. friend from Calgary to have pleaded for a government which, without being parsimonious, would be decently economical.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to several very interesting speeches during the course of this debate, none more so perhaps than the carefully prepared address of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) delivered this afternoon, with the main parts of which I agree, especially those passages relating to agriculture.

The Speech from the Throne strikes an optimistic note, but the improvement in our economic condition there noted is due entirely to the increased production and export of agricultural products, and if this year does not bless us with good crops—for which the Speech from the Throne has a prayer—we may find ourselves in a worse position than last year. It is surely plain to all concerned that agriculture is the basis of our national prosperity, and were it not for the many handicaps and unjust burdens placed upon that one basic industry, it would not be long before all classes would again experience increased prosperity. But despite the fact, acknowledged in the Speech from the Throne, that agriculture is in a depressed condition, no government has tightened the screws to such an extent as has the present administration during the past year. Nothing has been done to dispel the doubt and uncertainty in the minds of our agriculturists except in one single instance, the lowering of the freight rates in the West, which has been more than offset by the machinations of a combine among the lake shipping companies. In fact, Sir, I think nothing has been left undone in the way of unjust laws to more completely than ever before deliver our workers over to those who enjoy the privilege of filching the earnings from their pockets.

As to the tariff system, I say it is a system of legalized robbery, more true to-day perhaps than ever before, and is responsible for the stagnation of agriculture and the driving out of the country of thousands of our best farmers. And the shortsighted policy of those privileged people for whose benefit the tariff was instituted has finally shut off their own home market. In last year's Speech from the Throne a promise was made to

deal with this system of trade restriction, and the hopes of every Progressive member were raised in the belief that the Liberal party intended to be true to its own platform and principles, which every one of my colleagues was prepared to help the government put into effect. But the subject is not mentioned in the present Speech, which I take to mean that in the opinion of the government and their supporters the tariff, as it now stands, is as perfect as it can be made.

We are promised this session a bill to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers from the undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade by combines, mergers, trusts and monopolies. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that somehow I have failed to become enthusiastic over the foreshadowing of such legislation, seeing that the government by one amendment to the tariff act last session completely delivered every consumer and producer over to the tender mercies of a skilfully organized minority, composed of these very combines, trusts, mergers and monopolies which are now threatened to be controlled. In fact, I do not think there is a member in this House so gullible—not even a Progressive—as to believe that the present government can by any further legislation control the machinations of these trusts, mergers, combines and monopolies. Since the session of 1909-10, when the right hon. Prime Minister, then Minister of Labour in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cabinet, introduced a bill for this purpose, which was duly enacted, we have seen that legislation fail in its object; indeed, that very same year the Grocers' Guild and other combines openly laughed at and defied the law, and from that time forward such organizations have, according to their interpretation of the statute, evaded its provisions in a perfectly legal way. What this country suffers from at the present time is the iniquitous system of the distribution of goods which is a product of protection which makes the cost of everything we need out of line with the prices of what we produce.

In defiance of any anti-combine bill there was then forged the last link in a perfect chain of combines which, so far as the consumers of this country are concerned, encircles the whole Dominion, and still remains unbroken. It is not new legislation that we need to control combinations that are restricting trade and preventing competition and legitimate enterprise, but the elimination of the legislation now on our statute books that is responsible for these very combines and mergers formed to restrain trade and unduly enhance the price of everything that we need to eat or wear. It is not possible to enact any new legislation to achieve that end that would not be simply a joke on our statute books. It would be a travesty on the intelligence of the electors of this country to tell them that we were, by a new act of legislation, going to control the profiteers and at the same time leave untouched the very legislation which has given them that power, and under which they are so completely organized for their vicious work of exploitation. They have been aided rather than repressed, in this, I know, by a succession of governments for many years.

I think the intentions of the present Liberal government in this respect are plainly seen in an amendment to the Customs Act artfully put through parliament in the closing days of last session—an amendment of which even the Minister of Customs himself declared he did not know how far-reaching the effects would be. It was an amendment that entirely destroyed the right of the purchaser to have the goods valued at the actual cost plus a reasonable profit, and substituted a valuation dictated by the minister or by the producer of such goods in Canada—goods which are already enhanced in price by a protective tariff, and which pass through the hands of several combines, mergers, and trusts, operating defiantly in restraint of trade. Surely that is a fine basis for valuation, from the profiteer's point of view. It is an amendment that destroys entirely the whole tariff schedule as it stands as to rates of duties to be levied, and places the power of valuation entirely in the hands of the Minister of Customs or others who may be interested in the very line of goods he is called upon to value. In my opinion it is an amendment that is aimed directly at the trade activities of the co-operative companies, of agricultural and city workers, in their endeavours to keep down the cost of production on the farms and the cost of living in the cities, to a figure commensurate with world prices and the lower trend of wages. It is an amendement that at one stroke forms into one great combine every manufacturing and distributing concern in the country. The anti-dumping clause as it stands, puts the trade of the whole Dominion on the basis of the company-store system, and divorces the worker entirely from any interest he should have in the country. I think it certainly establishes a man's right to rebel. And all this by the Liberal party with a free trade plank in their platform!

Only a short time ago I heard one of the most prominent Liberals in our province de-

clare that Liberalism stood for liberty, and even the Premier himself declared that the platform of the Liberal party was exactly the same as the platform of the Progressive party, that Liberalism, in fact, stood for progress. Yet this party of liberty and progress has closed up the last gap of liberty that the consumers of this country had left open to them. What pressure was brought to bear between the date of the budget speech, May 23, when the Finance Minister declared that this clause was to be left out as it was an unnecessary interference with trade, and June 22nd, when it was revived by the Minister of Customs? I do not know; but it must have been something worth while that could turn practically the whole Liberal party at one stroke into a body more Tory in its actions than even the Conservative party itself, and quite as amenable to the same influences that dictated that measure in the first place. Outside of the explanation given by the Minister of Customs at that time, no argument was made in behalf of that clause, except a statement by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who reminded the right hon. leader of the Opposition that they had slaughtered him anyway.

The Tariff Act as it stands is perhaps the most vicious piece of legislation that has ever stood on the statute books of any country in modern times. I question if there is anything quite so complete of its kind anywhere else in the world. As it stands it has closed up the trade activities of one of our largest co-operative companies, and an attempt was made this year to bring the United Farmers of Ontario under its deadly ban. Is this the kind of Liberalism that the Progressive party is invited to join? It is true that two who were with us last year are with us no more, but are now sitting on the other side. I have no word of reproach for these men, but rather pity, and it is indeed pitiful to think that they have failed to grasp the ideal underlying the formation of the Progressive movement. It is pitiful that after being elected to support Progressive principles, and after sitting for one whole session with us here and in our caucus, they should have failed to realize their obligations to their constituents. They must present a pitiful spectacle to those who elected them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. EVANS: Since they have failed to realize their obligations to their electors, and failed to realize the principles on which they were elected, it is well that they have changed sides. They will be more at home over there. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, a political party apart from a group of men who have gathered themselves around a set of principles so that, acting together, they might propagate and put those principles into practice. Whatever party is in power there are certain attributes of government that ought not to be overlooked. These are four in number—justice, legality, publicity, liberty. Justice denotes that no citizen or class shall usurp power prejudicial to the interests of any other citizen or class. Legality implies that every enactment shall have the sanction of law. It is hard to think that in these enlightened times in this country, any measure should be made legal without any regard for justice or liberty. Liberty implies that every citizen should have the privilege of asserting his individuality, for his own or his fellows' welfare, in any way which is not prejudicial to the rights of others. Yet the Tariff Act, with the amendment before mentioned, actually deprives one class of its right as citizens, and gives another class the right by law to exploit them. Under legislation of this kind we cannot wonder that the cost of living does not fall with the cost of farm produce or natural products. To-day there is actually no relation between the price of raw material and that of the finished article in the case of anything produced in Canada. Take for instance hides with harness, wool with clothing and blankets, wheat with flour and bread. They have actually no relation in price one to the other. I was in England last summer and stayed a few days at Ealing, one of the suburbs of London. I saw there a four pound loaf actually distributed at the homes of the people for eight pence half penny. That is sixty-four ounces of bread for seventeen cents. To-day in cities in western Canada we are paying seventeen cents for forty ounces of bread, or twenty-four ounces less for the same price. And speaking of flour, Sir, a gentleman who was asked last year to head the wheat board refused to do so for the reason that the control of flour was not given in the legislation creating the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say who that was? I do not wish to press him for the information if he would rather not give it.

Mr. EVANS: I would rather not say. However, he gave the reason I have mentioned, I can vouch for that. Now, we grant our millers an advantage of 60 cents per barrel protection on flour. Under this protection they enjoy a monopoly of the home market, while their large export trade is carried on in com-

petition with millers in all other countries in Europe; and they can cut prices whenever they choose in foreign countries, depending on the profits they filch from the home consumer to recoup them. Not only this, but we producers in Canada who find our market in foreign countries, where our prices are made, have to meet this competition at the other end as well. Any time they choose our millers can lower the price of flour in competition with our wheat on the British market, and so set the basis for procuring their supplies of wheat at home. It is not fair, it is unjust. But the whole tariff system is a one-sided, vicious piece of legislation, with everything free for one class, while the other class is by law exploited. Even were it the ideal state of affairs to make Canada a manufacturing country, one would think that this could best be attained by reducing the cost of living and thereby lessening the cost of production. It is this class privilege, which stands on our statute books to-day, which is fast depopulating the farms of Canada. And in saying that I am not speaking for the West in particular. Colonel Dennis, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is responsible for the statement that last spring 5,000 farms in old Ontario which ought to be producing were vacant. Another fact. Nearly half a million dollars worth of mortgages were thrown back on the hands of one company operating from Saskatoon last fall, and the superintendent told me himself that over 90 per cent of these farms are abandoned.

Perhaps that is not the worst feature of it after all. There is a bitterness caused by these conditions. The bitterness which exists amongst the agriculturists of Canada to-day is not born of hard times caused by world conditions and bad crops, but to the fact that anything the farmer has to sell is out of line with world prices, and that owing to artificially made conditions at home due to class privilege the price of everything he has to buy is enhanced. Now the farmer is willing to take his hard luck as well as any man, but he will not forever make fortunes for others, for skilfully organized minorities who are able to get legislation through this House to suit themselves and are placed in a position to exploit the masses to pay for it. Our cabinet ministers can traverse the whole world making treaties of trade with foreign countries, and by one amendment take away the inalienable rights of the people to buy and sell where they can to the best advantage.

The dissatisfaction with our economic system is not peculiar to the West. I will now come to that wonderful province by the sea of which the member for Hants (Mr. Martell) spoke the other day as being so prosperous. The Solicitor General for Nova Scotia on the 18th January last year, when speaking before the Halifax Board of Trade, declared that the relations between the Maritime provinces and the rest of Canada would become so weakened that dissatisfaction with confederation would become general, and would lead to serious results. I think it will be admitted that the Solicitor General for Nova Scotia knows as much about that province as the hon. member for Hants.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman is referring to me I would say that I would have liked to have had the honour of addressing the Halifax Board of Trade but I never did.

Mr. MARTELL: Like all the hon. member's complaints.

Mr. EVANS: My mistake, I should have said Attorney General. I got this from one of the most reliable newspapers.

Mr. McKENZIE: I doubt its reliability.

Mr. EVANS: I did not know the hon. member was Solicitor General for Nova Scotia. In parts of the Maritime provinces to-day there is tremendous unrest, and in the West many are asking the question: "What good is Confederation to us?" I want to warn the government now that this feeling will not down until we have the complete elimination of class legislation and class privilege.

Mr. McBRIDE: Will the hon. member explain, when he says there is a combine in the fruit industry of British Columbia, how it is, when we are selling fruit for 75 cents a box, the Grain Growers at Battleford are charging 60 cents a box for handling the apples?

Mr. EVANS: That statement has occasioned considerable laughter, but he laughs best who laughs last. I have for many years been connected with the particular concern he has accused of profiteering. I have been connected for years with an association which has handled British Columbia apples. We have handled all the way from three to seven hundred cars of apples in one season, and never once did we charge 60 cents a box, or the half of it, for handling apples.

Mr. McBRIDE: I have a letter here in my hand from that company which states that that is the profit made.

Mr. EVANS: No grain growers' association in any province has ever charged 60 cents a box for handling apples.

Mr. McBRIDE: Have I the privilege of reading this letter?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes, yes, read it.

Mr. EVANS: I have said that this feeling of bitterness will not down until the complete elimination of class legislation and class privilege is accomplished. How far the advocates of trade penalties in this House will deem it safe to obey the dictates of skilfully organized self-seeking minorities is for them to determine. I can only hope that the present class legislation will not be carried on to such an extent that it will further endanger the unity of this country, separating, as it does, different classes and different geographical areas and vocations. Certain parts of the Dominion are better adapted than others for particular products. These different areas are actually separated, one from the other, by a system of class privilege, which has prevented the people from thinking along national lines. They say Canada is a hard country to govern. It is only hard in proportion as class legislation has made a cleavage between the different areas. Perhaps one of the finest acts of statesmanship in Europe in the nineteenth century was the unity of Italy. This was brought about by placing all parts, north and south, and all classes, on an equal basis. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be an act worthy of the greatest statesman to so place this country on an equitable basis for all. We are inevitably driven to a decision of this kind. We must arrange some sort of an agreement for the different classes in the different geographical areas, if we are going to live together in this Dominion. An economic system must be found on which freedom can be built.

The Speech from the Throne mentions the lifting of the British embargo on our cattle. This is one place surely where our government will take a broad view of things, and, with the Government Merchant Marine, create some competition for our steamship lines operating on the Atlantic; so that the lifting of the embargo may be of some use to us. It still costs over $51 to land an animal from Saskatoon in Liverpool. I think it must be plain to all that as things stand the removal of the embargo to-day is of very little use to us. It is surely reasonable to expect that, with the greatest railroad system in the world, and a Merchant Marine in connection with it, freight and transportation rates will be such as will allow the commerce of the country to move freely over these lines, whether it be the potatoes of New Brunswick or the grain of the West. The needs of the producer surely should be considered first. If agriculture is choked to death—and it is already gasping—what will our railroads and steamships do for an income? In fact it will take many years to again reach the point we had once attained in agriculture and in the production of all things, particularly live stock. However much our highly protected industrial magnates may emphasize the surpassing importance of the home market, and be able to embody their will in the statutes of this Dominion, they must surely realize how vitally essential it is that a prosperous foreign trade in agricultural products must be carried on, and to this end I say that agriculture must be encouraged and every incubus that prevents its growth, and, since the produce of our farms is sold in competition with the produce of all other countries, every undue charge that puts the cost of production out of line with the world's prices must be removed. The handicap of freight rates, of which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) complained so bitterly this afternoon, is also a product of class legislation in our trade penalty system, and it is unfair to expect the wage earner to accept the remuneration for his services altogether out of relation to the price of what he has to buy.

I desire to reply to a few of the statements made by different members of this House before I close. The hon. member from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) said that one in every twelve persons in Saskatchewan owned an automobile, and he made this statement as evidence of great accumulation of wealth on the farms there, and that the farmer was living in ease and luxury. If the hon. member knew anything of western conditions he would know that a car is a necessity on the farm. He also spoke as though all the people in Saskatchewan were farmers, and forgets that we have fairly good sized towns and cities in that province. Quite two-thirds of all the cars are owned by urban dwellers, and after all, it is only the small cars of the most inexpensive kind that are owned by the farmers. My hon. friend does not know either, and he did not tell us how many of these cars are not paid for. An automobile firm that I knew, not operating in my constituency, but which I was friendly with, after having $80,000 out, was able this fall to collect only $300. My hon. friend says that we have spent $16,000,000 on road improvements in one year. Most of the work is done in our province by the farmers themselves, working their own taxes out, and when you divide $16,000,000 amongst 125,000 farmers, that amounts to only $128 apiece. To make such glaring statements without any qualification is not an honest argument, to say the least. My hon. friend says

that the farmers around Winnipeg are prosperous. He does not know that, and he can bring no proof to show it. It would be a wonder if a few dairy farmers around a big city would not be fairly well off; but I know Saskatchewan better.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) stated that because we had the Crowsnest pass agreement again in force, the East lost $15,000,000, or one-half of what the West would have gained by the saving in freight rates. Does he mean to say that the price now charged for that service does not cover the cost, or what? Does he mean to say that the rates as fixed by the commission, after the suspension of that agreement, should still be in force? Why? I can tell this House that the hauling of grain is yet the most remunerative work of any that the railways are engaged in, and a glance at their net earnings during the months that the grain is chiefly moving will convince anyone of that fact. Do we in the West not bear our share of the national debt? One would think, since coming here to this session, that some of our eastern members, such as the hon. member for Lunenburg and the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) in particular, seems to think that Canada owns a strip of territory somewhere between the Great Lakes and the mountains. I want to tell these gentlemen that we are in Canada when we are up there, and we are bearing our share of the national debt as much as they are. The East, as the East, has not sacrificed anything for the building up of western Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EVANS: That makes some of our hon. members groan, but it is true, nevertheless. It is rather a big argument which I will not enter into now.

We heard a very excellent speech from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the other day, and I certainly congratulate him on the strength and vigour that he showed in delivering that address. He appealed, at this time, not to create political chaos in this country. Even he does not realize the chaos that class privilege, with all its great penalties, is creating amongst the homes of this country. He was here in 1910 when we came 800 strong down to this city and filled this House in an endeavour to secure relief from these burdens. He is pleading for the party. We are pleading for the people. It is time at last that the rights of the people were respected, and the party must take care of itself. I will repeat, Sir, that I cannot understand a political party, apart from a group of men who have gathered themselves around a set of principles for propagating and putting into effect those principles. He says that no self-respecting government can accept such an amendment. That amendment was not made to embarrass the government; it was made in all good faith to show what we are after, what we believe in and what we want. But I ask, can a self-respecting people stand to be bandied about by false promises made by a succession of governments for many years, and say nothing? It is time that Canada was governed, not by one class with their eyes on their bank accounts, but in equity and righteousness for all classes, when sectionalism will disappear and confederation will yet become a true confederation and not merely a name, as it is at present.

Mr. FRED STORK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speeches that have been made in this debate, and in the main, we have heard a great deal of complaint as regards conditions which obtain in various constituencies. Coming as I do from the far-off constituency of Skeena, which is bordered by the northern Pacific ocean on the west and by the Yukon Territory on the north, I would say, Sir, that the same disabilities and disadvantages which obtain throughout the Dominion of Canada and, in fact, throughout the entire world, are just as much in effect in Skeena as they are elsewhere. But I bring to you, Sir, I think, some little ray of hope, and some degree of sunshine in the brief report which I beg to convey to you from the constituency of Skeena. We are carrying on there, and I believe it is a tribute to any section to be able to maintain its industries and to carry on its progress and development in the face of such difficulties as are receiving such tremendous advertisement in this House. The constituency of Skeena is and has been a pioneer constituency ever since the day when the great pioneer, Alexander Mackenzie, within 300 miles of the city of Prince Rupert, painted on a rock at the mouth of the Bella Coola river where it falls into Burke channel "Alexander Mackenzie overland from Canada, July 22, 1793." Pioneer countries require some attention, and I have every sympathy with the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black) when he requests certain telegraphic communication in the Yukon Territory. Without prospectors there can be no mining industry. There can be no mining prosperity unless the

prospector takes his pack on his back and hikes it into the hills. Without the rugged pioneer there can be no development and no building up of trade centres, and the pioneer, therefore, is entitled to some consideration. In that connection I would review very briefly some of the utilities which are of great importance in a pioneer country. In the first place, the pioneer expects that he shall have access to the centres of business. He must have methods of communication with the outside world. A great many years ago the Western Union Telegraph Company, in their endeavour to reach Europe by telegraph, prior to the laying of the Atlantic cable, tried to establish communication by way of Siberia. They started the construction of an overland line and got the work completed as far as the fourth cabin north of Hazelton. Repeated attempts had been made to lay the Atlantic cable, and at last, after the construction of that wonderful ship the Great Eastern, another attempt was made to lay the cable, and the transatlantic cable became an accomplished fact. The company therefore abandoned that overland line, and many years afterwards the right of way of that line as far as the fourth cabin north of Hazelton was utilized for telegraphic communication with the Yukon Territory when it was opened up. That line was completed some twenty-five years ago. Wireless was not even dreamed of as a possibility at that time. Had wireless been a commercial fact then, I am thoroughly satisfied that the overland line would not have been built. It was built, however, and to-day the upkeep of that line is a tremendous drain on the resources of this country. From Hazelton north to the Yukon there is one thousand miles of territory. This wilderness of a thousand miles is divided into stations twenty miles apart, each of which is manned by two men. The supplies that are needed for that telegraph line are largely carried on the backs of pack horses. Now, when you consider that the specifications in calling for tenders for those supplies stipulate that each package must not exceed a certain dimension and must be of a certain width so that it may be properly handled and be easily carried on the backs of these horses; that each parcel must be sewn in burlap and properly stencilled for the particular cabin for which it is destined; when you consider that the sugar and flour intended for these cabins must be packed in sacks each separately sewn in strong canvas, and when you take into consideration the value of canvas to-day—when you consider all these things you can easily appreciate the tremendous cost entailed in the upkeep of that overland service from Hazelton to Dawson city. I am told that in the interests of true economy this line cannot be kept up under something like three-quarters of a million dollars per year. I am fully satisfied that this line could be abandoned and a better service instituted if there were placed along the coast of British Columbia, at Stewart, at Alice Arm and at White Horse, wireless stations, the initial cost of which would not be greater than the cost of one year's upkeep of the present line. Such a system as I suggest would give the Yukon an uninterupted telegraphic service that could be kept in operation at all times and under all conditions of weather.

Among other things which a pioneer country requires are lights, buoys and aids to navigation. It was my privilege during the recess to visit Queen Charlotte Islands, and I was struck by the wonders of that country. I found in Queen Charlotte Islands a vast inland sea known as Masset Inlet, which to-day is just as dark as when Columbus discovered America. A great deal of development is in process there. The country around Queen Charlotte Islands is wonderfully rich in timber. A company is operating at Buckley bay and is doing a big business exporting lumber. It is highly essential that there should be placed in Masset Inlet some aids to navigation, for they are badly needed. But all pioneers are not clamouring to the government to have something done for them. I notice with a great deal of pleasure that some of the railroad employees along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific have organized a company of their own under the direction of Mr. Len Bell and Mr. George Biernes. They are true pioneers in every sense of the word. Believing that up-to-date methods are the order of the day, they have filled a tremendous want in that country by inaugurating a hydroplane service between Hazelton Head and Finlay river. The locality around Finlay river is very rich in minerals, and I have seen splendid samples of gold from that region. But it has been almost impossible to reach that country in the past, because the only means of transporation has been by pack train. The snow does not disappear from the trails until the middle of June or early in July, and the rivers being in flood it is difficult to ford the streams. It therefore takes six weeks by pack train to make the trip from the railway into the mining district. These people, however, have inaugurated a hydroplane service, and the trip that formerly took six weeks now occupies but two hours. They are so enterprising that at the present time,—they have

taken the pontoons of the hydroplane, fitted them with skiis and will—beginning next week—make the trip over the snow. This hydroplane of theirs will carry 1,500 pounds of supplies, so that we can expect a great deal of development in that region. I am particularly interested in this matter because in that district are located the great coal deposits of the Groundhog country. There is an unlimited field of semi-anthracite coal that should prove a tremendous asset to western Canada. We have to-day, as it were, a river of money flowing out of Canada for the purchase of oil. Canada is not an oil-producing country, and we should make every effort to see that we burn just as little oil as possible and as much coal as we can in public utilities. We have steamboats plying on the Pacific and most of the railway trains are burning oil. This is not as it should be. Now, in developing our own coal mines we are only developing Canada. We are providing labour for our own people, providing a market for our own producers, and providing tonnage for our own railroads.

In this district of Skeena alone I am sure that the natural resources are of such a magnitude that they would be sufficient to discharge our national debt. In the mining locality of Stewart we have a gold mine known as the Premier, which in my opinion is the richest mine of its kind on the American continent. Last year it paid a dividend of three million dollars. In the same locality of Stewart there are a great many valuable mining properties; and the same can be said of Alice Arm, Anyox, and Surf Inlet. At Anyox one of the greatest industries of this country is in steady and continuous operation. The town of Smithers has blossomed out as a new mining centre, and excellent mines have been developed there. In far-off Atlin the miners are still carrying on the operations that have not ceased since the days of the early Klondike rush. At Telkwa we have coal mines, and at Ocean Falls there is located one of the greatest and best pulp and paper plants to be found anywhere in Canada; while a magnificent pulp mill is in operation at Swanson Bay.

The development of these resources is being carried on in spite of the difficulties confronting the country. In my own home town of Prince Rupert I am delighted to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that last year we produced and shipped 26,000,000 pounds of halibut. Eleven hundred refrigerator cars were required to convey it to the eastern market, and each car earned approximately $1,000. The fishing industry of the Maritime provinces was touched upon by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) yesterday, and the same disabilities that he complains of are also troubling our fishing industry in Prince Rupert. Recently the American tariff has imposed a duty of two cents a pound upon our halibut. This is not the time nor place to discuss this matter, but I hope that steps are being taken by the government to remove this disability.

Allow me to say a word to the western Progressives and the growers of grain on the prairies. Complaint has been made that the benefits which accrued from the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement have been largely nullified by the action of an alleged combine of shipping interests on the lakes. I would say to the grain growers of the West that I believe they have right now a remedy in their own hands to meet that handicap. If you will ship your grain through the port of Prince Rupert you will find that no combine exists there; you will find that you can ship your cars right on to the wharf instead of their being stopped twenty-five miles from tide water and transferred to another railroad; you will not have to pay tolls to cross any bridge; you will not be called upon to again transfer your cars to a third railroad and be subject to switching charges; and moreover there will be no danger of your wheat being mixed with inferior grades. We have heard something recently in regard to the adulteration of western wheat when it gets into New York city. Let me assure you that when your No. 1 hard is shipped from Prince Rupert it will still be No. 1 hard when it reaches the foreign market for which it is destined.

But you may ask: What port facilities have you got? We have at present the most up-to-date ocean-going freight warehouse on the Pacific coast. Not in Los Angeles, nor in San Francisco, nor in Seattle, nor in Vancouver is there such an up-to-date warehouse as we possess to-day. This warehouse is 800 feet long by 200 feet wide and is equipped with the most modern machinery. If your wheat is in sacks, we can handle it more expeditiously than any other port in Canada. If it is in bulk, our facilities can take just as good care of it as those of any other port in the Dominion. And the Canadian Government Merchant Marine would be glad of your business. Further, when your wheat is taken by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, or by any other shipping organization, you will not be subject to any pilotage charges from Prince Rupert, for there is no dangerous entrance to be navigated, and it follows that no high rate of insurance is charged. Let me add that if you give your business to the port of Prince Rupert, and if the present

facilities be found inadequate, our northern people will see to it that adequate facilities are forthcoming. Allow me to quote an article from the Financial Post of January 29 last dealing with the same question:

> The Winnipeg Grain Exchange has ascertained from actual transactions in 1922 that the farmer can get twelve cents per bushel more by shipping his wheat through a Pacific port than by the Fort William and the Great Lakes route. This is on the basis of the present railway rate discrimination against the Pacific coast whereunder wheat is hauled 1,400 miles eastward for the same rate charged to haul wheat 700 miles westward. When the present discrimination is removed, the permanent advantage to the farmer will, it is said, be about sixteen cents a bushel, and the total gain to the farmers as a result of shipping by the Pacific coast reach $40,000,000 a year.
>
> Prince Rupert has been working for months on an elevator project, and business interests in that city believe that the government is likely to co-operate with them in this enterprise. The fact that Prince Rupert is the northern terminus of the Canadian National Railway (G.T.P.) and closer to the grain country of northern Alberta and Saskatchewan than the southern seaports of British Columbia is strongly in that city's favor, as well as the fact that the route between Prince Rupert and the Far East is considerably shorter than the route between Vancouver or Victoria and the Far East.

I think this will give our farmer friends some indication of the faith we have in the development of our northern port. We in Prince Rupert do not intend to see this port terminal of the Grand Trunk Pacific with all its advantages overlooked. This road was built for keeps, and we propose to keep it. We have a grade only four-tenths of one per cent, and at that we have compensated curvature. It was stated in the House yesterday that the Canadian Northern end of the Canadian National system in British Clumbia is the best part of the road. Well, I believe that the hon. member who made that assertion was conscientious and made it by reason of having some report placed in his hands; but that report to my way of thinking must have been prepared by a Canadian Northern official. On the face of it, it might appear as if the Canadian Northern end of the National Railways into Vancouver was all that the report claimed for it; however, I do not believe that that is the case. The Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific run over the same tracks from Edmonton as far west as Red Pass Junction. The Vancouver people take it upon themselves to term their portion the main line, and our portion a branch or stub line from the junction to Prince Rupert. They have not half as much right to term their portion the main line as we have to claim that distinction for our portion, for the reason that the Grand Trunk Pacific line into Prince Rupert is much better constructed than the Canadian Northern line ever was or ever can be.

We have been put to some disadvantage by these comparisons. On my way down here the porter of the car in which I was riding told me of an incident that happened on his previous trip. The train for the West is made up at Edmonton and includes a sleeper for Vancouver and another for Prince Rupert. This train is run through as far as Jasper, where it is split up, one part going to Vancouver and the other part to Prince Rupert. There were two travellers on the train going west on this particular occasion, one for Vancouver, and one for Prince Rupert, and both were placed in the Vancouver car. The Prince Rupert car was pulled empty as far as Jasper. When one of the travellers got his ticket at Edmonton, he was advised, "When you get to Jasper, transfer there, because the Prince Rupert car will be waiting for you," and when he arrived at Jasper he was transferred from the Vancouver car into the Prince Rupert car. Undoubtedly the reports will show that the traffic going into Vancouver received credit for that particular sleeping car accommodation from Edmonton as far as Jasper, when in reality it belonged to the business going into Prince Rupert. I am fairly satisfied that the freight traffic is handled in the same way.

When the Montreal Board of Trade paid our coast a visit last summer they came to Prince Rupert in sixteen heavy Pullman cars. One of the Grand Trunk officials was ordered to put two engines on that particular train, but he did not do so because in his judgment one engine was enough. I suppose he since may have been dismissed for his insubordination, but be that as it may that train of sixteen heavy Pullman cars was hauled by one engine from Prince Rupert right through to Winnipeg, and there is no other road on the North American continent that can equal that feat. If they had put on two engines, as the official was ordered to do, I suppose the statement would have been made that they had to use two engines. But no, they did not. One would have done it, and if one would have done it, why would they use two? That is the kind of game we have had played on us ever since the inauguration of the Grand Trunk Pacific. In the early days of the construction of the Canadian Northern railway, a train coming out of Vancouver was headed off by a slide in front and hemmed in by a slide in the rear, and for five days that train stood stalled on the track on the banks of the river. The outcome was that they had to sling a cable across the river and rescue the passen-

gers. That is a deplorable accident that may happen on any road, but picture, if you can, the advertising it would have received if it had happened on the Grand Trunk Pacific. Why, every man, woman, and child in this Dominion would have heard about it, and would not have been permitted to forget it. They would have had moving pictures of it, showing the rescue of the passengers from the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I have spoken at much greater length than I intended. I simply wish to say in closing that the people of northern British Columbia are, many of them, carrying on their part in the face of adverse conditions and unfair freight rates, but they have faith in the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as expressed in the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and we hope and expect that that road will still come into its own.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, at the opening of my remarks, may I associate myself with those members who have spoken so many words of congratulation to the mover (Mr. Putnam) and the seconder (Mr. Rhéaume) of the Address. May I also associate myself with the expressions of condolence in respect of members who are now no longer with us, and with the words of welcome to our new brethren.

It was not my intention at all to weary the House with a speech on this Address, but the speech made the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has made it necessary that I should trespass somewhat upon the time of the House.

I want first to say something else in the way of congratulation. I want to congratulate the House and the Minister of Finance upon the results of that trip of his overseas. He has come back to us in great shape. He is in splendid form, and is looking ever so much better than when he went away. We are all very happy to see him looking so well, and to find him so vigorous. I think we are all at one in that respect. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could say as much for the substance of the speech as I can say with all truthfulness of the speaker.

We have not from this side of the House done anything to prolong this debate. I think I am the third speaker from the official opposition. Nor indeed did our leader in opening the debate enter the field of—what shall we call it?—the field which might be reserved for very contentious political matters. Why, he was so mild and so quiet that the Prime Minister congratulated him upon his utterances, and said how pleased he was to be able to agree with so very much that the leader of the Opposition had said. Then a change took place. Amendments were made to the Address. Something had to be done to revive the party spirit, and the government called to their assistance that gentleman above all others who was most capable of performing that very necessary function: and he did it well. They called to their assistance that member of the government who was the most likely to command the respect of my friends to my left, to whom his appeals were really directed. Yes, and for the purpose of making those appeals more pointed, attacks were made upon the leader of the Opposition growing out of his address.

I want to say in the first place, Mr. Speaker, that in every point taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition he was correct in his information. I want to say that just as bluntly and as plainly as I can. What did he say? He said that there was an increase in the debt. Is there any doubt about it? His figures were the figures of the hon. Minister of Finance. He also said that there had been more collected through customs taxation. Is there any doubt about it? The figures, again, are the figures of the hon. Minister of Finance. He also gave certain percentages. Again is there any doubt about his figures? The percentages are correct. It may well be that percentages do not amount to much. The taxpayer, after all, is not so much interested in percentages. But the fact is that a considerably greater sum of money has been taken from the people of the country for customs this year than was taken last year, and that is the gravamen of what the hon. leader of the Opposition said. It is quite true. It is also true that, over and above that, increases were made in the sales tax.

There is another thing. Although corrected by my hon. leader, the hon. Minister of Finance stuck to it that a direct charge had been made against him of floating money in the New York market, that that of itself was a crime, and he maintained that it was a charge, not simply a remark which had grown out of something said by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) during the election campaign. Let us have no doubt about this matter. During the speech of the Minister of Finance, as reported at page 99 of Hansard, the leader of the Opposition is thus reported:

> Mr. Meighen: The hon. member will do me the justice to say that I introduced that with reference to the speech made by the Minister of Justice, who stated that we owed the United States so much in 1921 that we were drifting towards annexation.

The following discussion then took place.

Mr. Fielding: No, my right hon. friend did not say that.

Mr. Meighen: Oh yes.

Mr. Fielding: I think I have what my right hon. friend said. What he may have had in the back of his head. I do not know, but what appears on Hansard is the simple statement that we were increasing our obligations and increasing our obligations to the United States. That was our great offence.

Mr. Meighen: I referred to the speech of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Fielding: My right hon. friend, in the speech to which I am replying, to the best of my knowledge, made no allusion to the Minister of Justice.

With the consent of the House I propose to read exactly what was said by the leader of the opposition, and I quote from page 21 of Hansard:

In that speech—

Referring to the Speech from the Throne of last year—

—the government which had described our national condition as perilous, as bringing forbodings into the minds of masters of finance, in the words of the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), as making even rich men uail with fear, as indeed making patriotic men dread the day when, because of our obligations to the Republic to the south, we would drift into annexation.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that there was not a single thing said by the leader of the Opposition which was not literally and accurately true.

Why, we had another issue, Sir. The leader of the Opposition stated that as a result of this sales tax everybody that bought the necessities of life contributed to that tax, and a list of food stuffs and other things was read by the Minister of Finance as showing that there are exemptions to that tax and therefore everybody did not pay. He put emphasis upon the "all" and upon the "everybody". The emphasis is put entirely in the wrong place. The leader of the Opposition did not say that the purchase of every necessity, of all necessities, was accompanied by the tax—not at all. We have practically exempted food stuffs, food in its raw condition, products of the mine, and products of the forest. I wonder if the minister will say now that a pair of boots is not a necessity of life.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend wish me to answer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend thought it was a necessity of life why did he not include it in his list of exemptions?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very much gratified at the answer. We have never pretended that all the necessities of life were exempt from that tax, we knew they were not. We were honest about it—they are not exempt. What we did do was to exempt the articles of primary production. We were not exempting manufactured articles, we were not exempting the articles which had been advanced to a high state of manufacture and value, whether it be food, whether it be clothing, whether it be anything else.

I would like to put another question to my hon. friend. He evidently has another idea of the sales tax. His idea evidently is that the necessities of life are exempt. He added somewhat to those necessities of life—not very much, and they were never described as the necessities of life but he added somewhat to them. If he considers boots as necessities of life why did he not exempt them? I think, perhaps that question also deserves an answer. However, I will not press it. The thing is so perfectly ridiculous. The leader of the Opposition did not say that all the necessities of life are subject to a tax, but he did say that those who bought them paid a tax; and in this climate of ours are not boots, clothing and the like, necessities of life? I am inclined to think that what the Minister of Finance said as to my leader, in connection with some of his statements, should be applied here: I fancy he was so anxious to get his message to the Progressives, so anxious to sound that note of warning, so anxious to get up some avenue which would entirely disassociate him and his party from this iniquitous group here, that after all he did not waste very much time considering just exactly what was being said.

Another thing. The Minister of Finance talked about the tremendous additions to our New York indebtedness. I agree with some of the things my hon. friend said. I agree with him that we cannot do everything ourselves, I agree with him that sometimes we have to go out of the country in order to meet our demand. Yet I think, again, that he will agree with me that to the greatest possible extent practicable Canada's loans ought to be held in Canada. But to return for one minute to the tremendous burden of this country's obligations in the New York market. My hon. friend last year brought down the public accounts and I am going to quote from appendix No. 3, on page 56 of that blue book, and I am going to give the House the position of our New York loans at that time. We had two different sets of loans in New York then—I am speaking of this country's obligations and our own loans. The first are loans bearing 5 per cent, and the second loans bearing 5½ per cent issued at a time when money was dear. We had, roughly

speaking, I do not give the old amounts, 50 millions on the New York market of 5 per cent money; we had 60 millions on the New York market of 5½ per cent money; we had in all 110 millions of direct obligations on the New York market. That is the showing made by the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly wonderful, absolutely remarkable, to see the Minister of Justice sitting there calm and composed to-day. Where is that dread of annexation that possessed him? The rich are no longer quaking. Patriotic men now are sleeping. The extraordinary thing about it is that the Minister of Justice sits there, calm, quiet and undisturbed, although in the short time of one year there has been a direct increase of Canada's obligations in the New York markets of 90 per cent.

Well, there was another thing said, and that is what my right hon. leader stated about the debt. These figures are true; they are the government's figures, they are the exact figures and, therefore, they are true, so far as we know. We accept government figures, but while that is so, the hon. Minister of Finance says, "Oh, if it had not been for these awful railways we would have had a surplus of thirty to forty million dollars". I think, to be frank, he would have had more than that. I am amazed that he is not going to have a very much larger surplus. What was the taxation in the past compared with the taxation to-day? We have had government newspapers talking about the wonderful way in which revenues are kept up. Well, they have been kept up. Where has the money gone? In the last year which has just closed, in which we had very marked deflation, a year of tumbling prices and restricted credits, we nevertheless had a surplus, as reported by my hon. friend in the same accounts of 1922, of thirty-four and a half million dollars, without asking all the people of the country to lick stamps pretty nearly every time they turned around. We had a thirty-four and a half million dollar surplus without the 50 per cent increase in the sales tax. I am amazed that my hon. friend does not give a very much larger figure than the one he has given. Let us go back and take my hon. friend's basis which he says will give him a surplus of from thirty to forty million. On the same basis in the year 1919, I learn from the accounts, there was a surplus of eighty million dollars, at a time when we were attacked right and left by gentlemen now sitting on the other side of the House who at that time were on this side. The figures that year showed a surplus of eighty million dollars. In the year 1920, on the same basis, the surplus was forty-five million, nine hundred thousand, in the year 1921 the surplus was fifty-eight million, and I have already given you the surplus of 1922 on the same basis, which was thirty-four and a half million.

Then I take another statement that my hon. friend has made. Of course there is an addition to the debt—no getting away from that. But my hon. friend asks: "What is that compared to your additions to the debt?" I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if really at the present time it would not have been somewhat better if the non-partisan attitude of the leader of the Opposition in his address could not have been maintained. Is it really a question of what past deficits were? Is it really a question as to how the money was spent in the past, here, there and everywhere? Is the wrong of to-day right because we had a wrong last year or the year before? Would it not have been better, if recognizing the condition of affairs, recognizing the condition of the country, we were at liberty to forget all party differences, forgetting what has been done in the past and addressing ourselves to a really wise consideration as to how matters to-day can be mended. But, as I said these remarks call for replies. My hon. friend said "why look at the increase in the debt of 1921 and the increase in the debt of 1922." Well, of course, there were increases then; there were very heavy increases. There was not so much said about the size of those increases then as is said now.

But there is another story. Let us again see what is troubling my hon. friend to-day. It is the railways. Why he thinks he may have to spend as much as sixty-seven millions on the railways this year. Well, he has the railways to-day—lines that are functioning. He has them in such a condition that trains stay on the track. He has the deferred maintenance all caught up. He no longer has to think about the rehabilitation of lines of rusty metal. Something has been said to-day about equipment. Why, in the old days when we took those lines over there was every need for equipment. The locomotives were not there to any great extent and the freight cars were practically not there at all. While it is perfectly true that hon. members can in any country—I do not care how big the supply of cars is—at certain times find a car shortage, it is also true that in this very year there were locomotives greased up and laid aside, and cars parked by the hundreds simply because there was no work for them.

If equipment is to be bought to-day, it is nothing compared to the necessities for equip-

ment in the days that have gone by. Why, when we took that road over, even taking one of the best lines, say the line between Toronto and Ottawa, not only could the trains not make their time, but trains went off the track. I myself have been in a wreck on that line. There was an immense amount of work to do. The line practically had to be rebuilt. What is it to-day? How is the bulk of the business between Toronto and Ottawa going to-day? Why, by the Canadian National road, by the best equipped, the safest and best graded line. That is where it is going, that work has been done, and that was carried out by this country, and carried out, through the operation of the public accounts.

Let us go back and see what was done in those two years my hon. friend refers to. He points to an increase of debt in 1921 of ninety-two million and he is absolutely right. There was that increase, and it was a very very bad thing we had to have it—a most regrettable thing. But as against the $67,000,000 that my hon. friend now talks about, the special payments in that year, over and above consolidated fund expenditures, amounted to $150,000,000. Yet to-day, with taxation doubled and multiplied, there is difficulty with this $67,000,000. Next year the deficit was not quite so bad, but it was too bad altogether. The increase in debt in 1922 amounted to $81,000,000, and again, if we go back to my hon. friend's basis, dealing with these extraordinary payments, payments made that year, outside of consolidated fund expenditures, amounted to $115,000,000, as against the $67,000,000 that my hon. friend refers to. Why, Mr. Speaker, the work has largely been done. I am frankly surprised and amazed when I hear from my hon. friend that he expects, in the next year, that the railways will cost this country $67,000,000. They ought not to cost anything like that sum. I do not know what the present directors fear; I do not know what the present organization are afraid of, what benumbing influences they have been subjected to; but I know this, that with the improved facilities which they now have, with the business worked up as it has been, subject, of course, to this most regrettable delay that has taken place and the consequent disorganization, if the betterments shown in the past two years of $20,000,000 and $16,000,000 are maintained, if the ordinary downward curve is followed on deficits and if the ordinary upward curve of business is followed, we ought to have but very little deficit on the railways next year.

In order, however, that that may be the case, the railways must be left in the position in which these hon. gentlemen got them. I am a great deal puzzled by this whole question. I want to believe that everyone is acting in good faith. I want to believe that we are getting to a point in Canada when party objects, party aims, party desires, are much smaller than the general weal of this country. I would love to be able to think that, but I confess I am wholly puzzled. On the one hand, Sir Henry Thornton tells us that politics has absolutely nothing to do with the line; that it is entirely free of political influence. He has made that statement often, and the newspapers describe how at the minute of making this declaration, Sir Henry Thornton would stiffen his chin and stick out his chest. He has a first-rate stiff chin and a grand chest, but I hope they will stay stuck out as described. I am, however frankly puzzled. I was very much interested in a speech made by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), when he was addressing, I think, the Ladies' Club in Montreal. Perhaps it was the Gentlemen's Club, but my recollection is that it was the Ladies' Club.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. member is quite right. It was the Ladies' Club.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He touched on the question of the railways and he was rather mournful about them; but one thing he said was: "We have a new board and they are all Grits." And he said: "If Grits cannot do the impossible, no one can." Of course, that is a difficult thing to do. The Prime Minister says: "These railways are going to be kept out of politics," and so as to keep them out of politics, so that there can never be any political discussion around the railway board, he sees to it that the directors are all Grits. Consequently, this puzzles me a little, but I am much more puzzled at what the Minister of Finance says. He says frankly: "The railways are in politics." If the idea be that the railways are to be in politics, had we not all better stop and do a little thinking? In the other board, they were not; there were Liberals and Conservatives on the other board.

Mr. JACOBS: Unionists.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend may say "Unionists." Is there anything particularly bad in being a Unionist? But there certainly was no politics in the former administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hon. gentlemen laugh and hon. gentlemen sneer. It is very

easy to do that. They have had a good opportunity of going over this whole question since they came into power. Mr. Speaker, do you think if anything wrong had been found out we would not have heard about it? There was no political interference, and I challenge any evidence apart from a laugh or sneer.

Mr. CANNON: Sir Joseph Flavelle was no politician.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I have my hon. friend's statement to that effect, and I think everybody will agree that Sir Joseph Flavelle was no politician. We are getting confirmation every minute. As I say, there was no politics, at least that I knew about, in connection with the railways, and if there is to be politics, we should stop and do a little bit of thinking. Can we afford to own a glorified Intercolonial of 22,000 miles, with passes everywhere and anywhere, with deficits always and eternal, very often hidden as, I admit, it is so easy to hide these things. You know, one way in which you hide your deficits instead of reporting them, as has been done by the dismissed directorate, is to add to the capital cost of your road. You just pass it to capital. I remember one time when the capital cost of the Intercolonial was $24,000 a mile, and under the wonderful political management, in some way or another, it reaches something like $70,000 or $72,000 a mile. Who is right? Is Sir Henry Thornton right, or is he wrong? Nothing, whatever, has been said about the former management. I do not know of any charge the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) now wants to make against the former president. If he wants to make any, he has not made it yet.

I am reminded how one of the gentlemen who was approached in connection with the presidency, reported his conversation. It is well known that eminent railroaders were offered that position, and the government, determined on getting rid of Mr. Hanna, went originally to the right place. They went looking for a gentleman who understood the transcontinental business; they went to Chicago. And this is how the conversation is reported to have gone. After the proposition had been made, this gentleman said: "I used to know Hanna; he was a pretty good railroader. He was competent. Is he incompetent now?" Well, there was no evidence of any incompetence adduced and the admission was made that so far as it was known he was competent. "Well," continued the gentleman, "he used to work pretty well. Is he on the job now or is he beating the clock?" And again, so far as was known there was no charge of any lack of diligence. "Well, he used to be honest. Is he honest now, or has he been taking moneys of the system?" And again there was no charge; on the contrary there was absolutely no evidence of anything like that. "Well," said this gentleman again, "just let us see how the situation stands. Here you are, offering me a position from which you now discharge a man whom you describe to be competent, diligent and honest. What the dickens do you want to hire me for?" Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was any real reason for Mr. Hanna's dismissal we should have known it before now. The reason there was none; it was just the result of hectic politics from one end of the business to the other. There was also the idea on the part of some gentlemen in the government that the man who knew something about this system, the man who had started to develop it and turn deficits towards profits was the man who was likely to make it go and who was likely to make it impossible for pre-election pledges in certain parts of the country to be fulfilled.

My hon. friend referred to another thing. But before I go on, I am just reminded of something that shows how right the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is and how wrong Sir Henry Thornton is. We had an election the other day down in Lanark and this document I hold in my hand was circulated in that constituency:

> Vote for the Liberal candidate, and help to build up local industry.

A very praiseworthy sentiment.

> The W. R. Automatic Train Pipe Connector is manufactured by the Smith's Falls Malleable Iron Company and the Frost and Wood Company. The Canadian Government—

Oh, yes, is the government that runs the railways.

> —are testing out this device on a train between Montreal and Ottawa. It has given such satisfaction that they are about to place another order in Smith's Falls for the equipment of some passenger coaches for further experiment. If the W. R. Connector is the success which the railroad men claim it will be it means the building up of a great industry in the town of Smith's Falls. Vote for David Findlay, the candidate of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and "Jim" Murdock.

The Prime Minister was there, Mr. Speaker, the man who tells us that these railways are to be left entirely out of politics. Yes, he was there and spoke in Smith's Falls after the circular had been doing its work for three days around the streets and wherever it could work. But you did not hear a word of reproach from the right hon. the Prime Minister. Besides him there was, as

stated by the circular, in quotation marks, "Jim" Murdock, the Minister of Labour. Why, he was going around saying to all these fellows to whom this circular was distributed: "Oh, the government is running the railways; the government is conducting this test." There was no kick from him. Oh no. The election was not over. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends across the way have already been but too successful in launching this business into politics.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance speaks about the domestic loan. He does not like it. I do not blame
10 p.m. him for not liking it. Indeed, I should be surprised if he did like the refunding loan. It is quite true, as he says, that he offered good terms. He offered 5½ per cent and a month's interest. But then, having offered that, my hon. friend, I think, made a great mistake. He did not try to sell those bonds; he did not try to get the new subscriptions in the ordinary way of business. I do not know, of course, what occurred between him and the bond brokers, but I should think it very unlikely that my hon. friend approached the bond brokers and they refused to have anything to do with him and his business. I am sure they think more of him than that; I know I do. I should be glad to do anything for him myself except in a political way, and I am quite sure that the bond brokers would have liked to accommodate him. But, no; the ordinary, proper and approved methods of doing business are not followed. I am confident that in a large matter of this kind my hon. friend could have arranged for the taking up of the whole issue by the brokers on the basis of a quarter of one per cent. That is what they are handling business for just now. Rivalry is getting keen in the bond broking business and there is a very narrow margin in the business to-day. It used to be large, but to-day it is small, and I have no doubt my hon. friend could have made that arrangement. Of course, if he tells me that he offered them a quarter of one per cent and they declined his offer, I shall immediately accept his word and admit that he did everything in the matter. But I feel fairly confident that he will not say that. He does not like the loan. Well, the loan was $194,000,000, and we got rid of $12,000,000 through the former loan stabilization committee operations. If I remember rightly—my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong—there was $182,000,000 to be refunded, and—again he will correct me if I am wrong—he managed to refund $110,000,000 of it. He does not like it, and he is quite right. Why, it is the first domestic loan in Canada that has ever been a failure. All the others have been oversubscribed.

Of course, my hon. friend does not like it, he prefers the New York market. Indeed, I think he prefers the New York broker too, because he sells to him at 97½, and to the public at 100—2½ per cent commission for what the newspapers said next day was two hours' work; and the whole loan was taken up. My hon. friend says it is very expensive to float a loan here—there is a lot of advertising to be done. Well, there are expenses in New York. I do not know what his expenses are here but I would like to give him the expenses of floating our war loans. Our 1915 loan of $100,000,000—just the same amount as he placed in New York—cost here ·425, less than ½ of 1 per cent as against 2½ per cent he paid in New York. The 1916 loan cost ·797; the loan of 1917 ·888; the Victory Loan of 1917, when we had the first big advertising campaign and raised a tremendous sum of money, cost 1·185—the first time you get over the decimal mark, Mr. Speaker; the loan of 1918 cost ·903. My hon. friend says that the impetus of war was on. Well, he is quite right, and there is no doubt that it was easier by reason of making appeals to our loyalty and the like to raise money then than is the case now. But the first taxable loan in Canada was floated more than a year after the war was over, in 1919, and we had subscriptions up to $638,000,000, and we accepted $607,000,000. The cost of that loan was only 1·061.

Now, my hon. friend points to other loans in the New York market. We did not like the New York market as well as he does; I admit that. We felt that we could do better at home, and we did do better. But I would ask my hon. friend if he is responsible for the low price of wheat. It is just as reasonable and just as sensible to say that this government to-day is responsible for the low price of wheat, as it is to say that the Union government in the days of the war was responsible for the high rate of interest in the New York market. Why, there is only one thing a trustee can do: discharge as best he can the job that is entrusted to him. That is all he can do, and if you are going to make comparisons, it is only fair to make them when they are of some use and cover the same relative period of time.

I thought I would not hear anything more about this loan business, and I still feel that my hon. friend did not look into the matter as carefully as he might have. Last year we discussed it and then I dealt with the issues by the British government which were made

in New York relatively at the same time as our issues. I admit at once that that money cost a lot, in fact a great deal more than it ought to have cost. I wish I had had the fixing of the terms instead of the New York bankers. But we had to have the money. In connection with some of those loans that my hon. friend refers to—and they are railway loans—the moneys were not required in Canada, but mainly in the States and in Great Britain. On one of those loans, by making the issue at the right time and taking advantage of the condition of sterling exchange, we saved on capital account, if my memory is correct—the Department of Finance has the figures; I have not—we saved $16,000,000.

I refrain from again troubling hon. members with the details of these loans, but I want to say that we stand prepared to justify every single loan that we made, having regard to the conditions then obtaining, the price of money, and the commissions that other borrowers were paying. I go further. I assert, and I challenge my hon. friend to deny me, that Canada got better terms in the New York market at that time than did any other nation in the world. I assert also without fear of successful contradiction that Canada's loans were made on a more favourable basis than even were Great Britain's herself. This was all gone over in the course of last year's budget debate, and was never answered. Until these figures were flung at us here without any further substantiation, no attempt was made to answer my statements.

I am going to ask my hon. friend: Will he be content to have his New York loan judged upon the same basis as we are very well content to have ours judged? Great Britain paid bigger commissions than we ever paid; she paid 4.4 and then sold at a discount. It is not because she paid those tremendous commissions and interest during the war, and now is getting a very much lower rate of interest from the American government, that her financiers can be regarded as guilty of wrongdoing at that time. But that is exactly where the hon. gentleman wants to put us.

I give some illustrations of the commissions paid the very day that his $100,000,000 New York loan was issued. The government's issue cost them—you will see there is two and a half million dollars they do not get and on which they pay interest—something like 5.18 or 5.20. I have not the exact calculation before me, and I am quite content to take any corrected figure that my hon. friend gives me. This issue was heralded as a great financial feat, but that very day the Greater Winnipeg District sold bonds on the New York market at a rate of 5.1. The city of Des Moines, Iowa, sold its bonds at 4.2. But I want to be fair with my hon. friend; I am inclined to think that in connection with that particular issue there is a partial tax exemption. Either the day before or the day after the city of New York sold $45,000,000 of bonds to a syndicate, which took them over on a basis of 4.12. Again I want to be absolutely fair, Mr. Speaker. In connection with the New York bonds there are certain tax exemptions to the American bondholder. But that is not the point I am getting at. It does not matter so much what the price is where you have your tax exemption; I am referring to the question of commission at that time. One hundred million dollars of Canadian bonds were sold at a commission of 2½ per cent, and forty-five million dollars of New York bonds were disposed of on a basis of profit of .06 per cent. And yet these things are said to us. I only bring these things up because I am taunted with commissions of four and three per cent. I do not know whether these figures are right or not; I have not the figures; my hon. friend has. I do not go into them. I am quite sure my hon. friend did the best he could, but he did not get anything like what the market at that time afforded, having regard to other commissions paid. Why, everybody knows that the Americans to-day are suffering from a glut of gold. They want to get securities. But how difficult it was to get moneys at times when we sometimes had to get them.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House feel that the situation is grave. We feel that the one thing that ought to be done, here and everywhere, is to practise economy. I am perfectly aware that it is a difficult thing to do. It is an easy thing to talk about, but difficult to do, and I have much sympathy with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It is a difficult thing for him to do, but he wanted the job, and he has got it, and he was going to economize before he got the job.

Take, again, the public accounts for last year. The Minister of Finance himself said that last year there had been a saving in expenditure of $12,500,000. Well, so far this year we practically have no saving at all. The consolidated fund payments this year down to January 31st amount to $263,000,000. Last year they amounted to $269,000,000. But just consider the expenditures which have dropped off by themselves. I shall not give them all, but shall mention only three, which are sufficient to account for that $6,000,000 reduction: Pensions, $3,046,574 less; Soldiers' land settle-

ment, $354,987 less; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, $2,945,429 less, or a total reduction of $6,346,990. If you add that amount to what is being spent, the expenditure this year is actually greater than the expenditure last year, and that from a government pledged to practise economy. Why, their expenditure is greater than ours, and we were economizing in a very difficult time, when there was unemployment, when you had shrinking of values, and disarranged conditions. The government now face better conditions in some cases, because they have denuded the country of the people who were troubling them. They are not worried because of unemployment now, because having done nothing for the unemployed, because, drifting as Canada has drifted for a year without the slightest idea of any fixed fiscal policy, so that no one could come in here with clean, new money and start the wheels of progress, the government has got rid of our people. You hear it said of all parts of Canada, of the West, of the East, and of the Maritime provinces. They are driving them out of Prince Edward Island, too, as the hon. member told us who spoke from that province this afternoon. Yes, the government have less troubles, and yet they are not economizing. Mr. Speaker, something ought to be done.

I just want to give another figure. It is not simply the cost of government, but costs everywhere have gone up so much that somebody has got to start something, and I think we are the people who will have to start it. I want to refer for a moment to railway operations. The increase in the cost of carrying on business in Canada by the railways constitutes to-day a greater burden than was placed on the railways by the war. Hon. gentlemen talk an awful lot about the war debt, but do they realize that the gross earnings from operations from Canadian railways in 1917 were $310,000,000, and in 1921 $458,000,000, or an increase of $147,000,000—more than the whole of our war interest. You have that increase on a business less in amount than we had in 1917, and on the other hand you have operating expenses growing up in a far greater degree. The increase in operating expenses is 89 per cent, as against 32 per cent gross earnings from operations.

Something, Mr. Speaker, certainly is necessary, and the thing that is necessary is economy, and we cannot too much stress it. So far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). It is at least one thing: it is a clear, direct call for economy. I am forced to vote for it after hearing the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, who assures us that increases in the public debt are apt to be necessary. He thought so differently a year ago when he brought down his budget. Then he was not only going to stop deficits, but start doing something towards reducing the war debt. That is why we are licking so many stamps. That is why they put on the luxury tax, and why to-day we are being taxed in every conceivable way we can be taxed and still allow things to carry on. Notwithstanding all that taxation, he says the debt must go up. Under these circumstances I am forced to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West. At the same time I intend to vote against the main amendment. Sir, we have too much unemployment, we have too much de-population to-day. I am reminded of the appeal sent out only two weeks ago by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the dairying business, in which it was pointed out that there were only two markets and that the real market for the whole of that industry was the home market, and it is shrinking, shrinking sadly. Mr. Speaker, we can stand no further shrinkage. We vote against the main amendment.

Mr. W. G. RAYMOND (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, in order that I might not appear to be transgressing one of the rules of the House, I might perhaps be permitted to say that through the kindness and courtesy of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who has exchanged places with me, I am not in the place I previously occupied.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the wide range the debate has taken, and the many opinions that have been expressed by the various members—representing a territory stretching all the way from the Yukon to the Atlantic coast—as they have spoken, and I must say it has been very interesting to note the various views that have been given expression to. With the congratulations that have been extended to members entering the House for the first time, I would like to associate myself as well as with the compliments that have been passed, which I do not consider necessary to repeat at this time.

I was very much pleased to hear one hon. gentleman opposite in particular last night. He was giving us a very interesting story of a sale that took place in the West in which two teams of horses—such horses as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) would consider fine, I understand—sold for the sum of $35, and one second hand wagon sold for $90. I expected to hear that gentleman say

that the wagon in question was made in Brantford because, Mr. Speaker, in Brantford are made the most durable farm wagons that are produced in this country. I do not think that there is a wagon of any other manufacture that could be used in the manner described and then be sold second hand for $90. I felt it was a compliment to my constituency, and I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman make the allusion. But I would have liked him to have gone on and stated the origin of the wagon to which he referred. With reference to the price of the horses he later answered his own question. He stated that only $35 could be realized, as I understood it, for two teams of good draught horses—good young horses—and a little later he said that they had to pay 5 cents here for apples that were much cheaper in the Annapolis valley. Now if he had taken the horses in question to the market where they were in demand, he would have obtained a better price for them, or if he had gone to the place where the apples were produced he would have got the apples cheap, at the price at which they are grown in Nova Scotia.

I think that the mistake that has been made, perhaps, in the minds of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite is in painting the part of Canada from which they come—that is the three prairie provinces—in too dark, too gloomy, too unattractive colors. Those of us who have not had the pleasure of visiting that part of the country, and have to judge of it only by their description, would not, I think, form a very pleasurable picture of it or of its attractions. In fact, if we compare that description with the one that was given of the Yukon we find the latter of an altogether different character. Although we were told that the temperature was sometimes minus 60, yet the whole tenor of the address of the gentleman from that part of Canada was cheerful and optimistic, as compared with the utterances of those who live in the more fertile parts of the prairie provinces. I should like a more cheerful spirit inculcated by those who wish to see the country filled up with immigrants.

I must congratulate the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) on the fact that he has been elected to the leadership of the Progressive party. During the time he has been in this House I feel sure that hon. gentleman has received the confidence, and has justly earned it of every member in the Chamber. He certainly has the universal respect of this House, and I am sure will always enjoy the respect of gentlemen on this side. But there is one little suggestion that I would make, if I may, to that hon. gentleman. In his criticism of the Speech from the Throne he alluded to the omissions from it, and said it was notable for what it did not contain, and I observe that many of those who saw fit to criticise the Speech took the same ground. While I have not examined the Hansards extending back to confederation I believe, and I am assured upon the best authority, that there have been very few Speeches from the Throne since that time of which exactly the same remark has not been made—that they are very notable for the omissions from them rather than for what they contain. It is a remark that is hoary in its age, but I do not know that it would indicate any particular originality in the gentleman who makes it.

Then when the hon. member went on to express condemnation because there is no allusion in the Speech to a still further reduction of the tariff, and expressed the desire of his party that there should be a still further reduction of the tariff, I would like to say this: I am, of course, but a new man in this House, and I can only judge of things as they appear to me, but it does seem to me that when the hon. member was elevated to the leadership of the Progressive party that elevation brought certain responsibilities with it that do not belong altogether to the position of a private member of the House. I mean in this way, Sir, that when he undertook to say that a certain section of the revenue of this country, amounting to $88,000,000, should be removed it was his place, as a statesman, to suggest to the Finance Minister some way in which that loss of revenue could be made up. But there was no suggestion as to what should take the place of those taxes that would be taken off by removing the tariff; and we know, as everybody knows—I believe the gentleman who has just taken his seat, the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) knows—that the great difficulty of government to-day is to raise enough revenue to meet the requirements of the country—that instead of removing taxes—because the tariff is, of course, a tax—the difficulty is to raise enough money to meet the national requirements. They are large; we have heard them explained from all points of view. It is difficult to take them up now without consuming a great deal of time; but we have heard the various speakers allude to the existing charges, the interest on the debt, and the necessity of raising more money; and therefore it seems to me that

when it is suggested that a certain amount of money now raised through the tariff should be taken from the revenues of the country, it would be only fair and reasonable to expect a man, who is looking at the country's interests, to specify in what manner that money could be replaced in the public exchequer. It was a matter of regret to me that the leader of the Progressive party did not in his very able address indicate how that was to be done.

There is another matter to which I wish to allude. The hon. gentleman who introduced the amendment, which we understand is to be supported largely by the Progressive party, took, it seems to me a rather peculiar stand. When an amendment is introduced into this House by any serious minded member, it is surely introduced in the hope that it will carry. If this amendment carries the effect of it, I think, must be apparent to hon. members opposite. I do not know that the question is as to whether or not there is an exact precedent for it, but the amendment, if carried, would be equivalent to an expression of want of confidence in the government, and that would mean immediate dissolution. Hon. members must know that this is so, and I have no doubt they will endorse my statement. In that case, we would find no fault whatever with them. But this is the position in which those who support the amendment, whoever they may be, would find themselves; they would force the government to the country before they had time to introduce a redistribution bill. I presume they have their reasons for such a desire, although they have not explained them. I presume they could explain if necessary. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, they would have to explain to those people who expect, and who are, by constitutional right entitled to greater representation when the redistribution bill is passed, and they would have to justify themselves in causing a dissolution and a general election before a redistribution bill had been passed. It seems to me that is very plain. Members from certain provinces expect additional representation. Their increase in population entitles them to it. There would have to be an adjustment of the representation in the cities. The representation of the city of Toronto, for instance, is based, I think, on a population of some 300,000. In the redistribution the representation would have to be based on a population, I think, of 507,000. Manitoba, I understand, would be entitled to an increase of some three or four members, and the province of Saskatchewan would have an increase of five members. How would these hon. members answer the people who live in the cities and provinces if they brought about a general election, which postponed for five years the redistribution which would give them the additional representation to which they would be entitled?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does it not follow from the hon. member's reasoning that as long as the government neglects to pass a redistribution bill nobody should vote against it?

Mr. RAYMOND: If I understand the hon. member aright, he stated that as long as the government failed to pass a redistribution bill nobody should vote against them? The answer is that the government has not had an opportunity to pass a redistribution bill, and you would have an opportunity to vote against them after they had passed redistribution.

I think that it is worth while to bring this matter to the attention of hon. members opposite and the members of the House generally. It does not seem to me that it is a contentious question particularly. I think it is a very plain question. I do not observe any legal quibbles or anything of that kind in it. It is a plain proposition; it is common sense and good judgment. If an election is brought on before the redistribution bill is passed, certain parts of the country will not be represented, and it will not be the government that will be responsible, but it will be the hon. members who forced the government to resign and go out of office. That is plain enough.

Another matter has been alluded to in various ways, and the omission of it from the Speech from the Throne was referred to by more than one hon. member who spoke on the other side of the House. No particular reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the Near East troubles which occurred last September. The discussion on this question in the House and in the press rather tends to show what a variety of views may be taken of it. Some made it a ground of attack upon the government. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) in referring to it, described himself as a patriot and a lover of peace, and at the same time wished to place himself with those who would condemn the government because they avoided war. It was a position which was hard for me to follow, as were other things in the hon. member's address. I thought, however, that it was very difficult to see how a man could be a lover of peace, a conscientious man and a patriot, and at the same time find fault because war had been avoided by the government of the country in con-

nection with the embroglio which occurred last September. He said, as I understood it, that parliament should have been assembled. Now, I do not know that it is advisable on every such occasion that parliament should be assembled. It would rather tend to indicate that we had not the confidence in the administration that we should have. Nothing has transpired since to show that it was necessary that parliament should have been called together, and when he or some other member who criticised the government action, said that the only one that was consulted then was the then leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) and suggested that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) should have been consulted, it seemed to me that the member's mind was going back to 1914. I think hon. members might well go back and consider who was consulted then. Was the opposition at that time taken into the confidence of the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, they were.

Mr. RAYMOND: The right hon. member says, "yes, they were," but if they were, why was it necessary afterwards to form a Union government? If the opposition had at that time been taken into the confidence of the government, we would have had a united government, and never would have had any cause afterwards to remedy the mistake, or to pretend to remedy it by forming what was called the Union government, but it will forever be looked upon by future historians as the greatest mistake that ever happened in the history of Canada, that party politics—I can call it nothing else—prevailed to such an extent that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party were not taken into the confidence of the then government of Canada, in order that they might turn their attention to winning the war. To me that is and always will be one of the most regrettable incidents in our history, and I think there is no man who remembers those times who will not say that the action of the then government was strongly coloured by that partisan spirit that hon. gentlemen have this afternoon deplored, or pretended to deplore from their seats in parliament.

But to go back to the incident of last September, I understand—and I think I do—the events that happened then and their sequence, I will endeavour to describe them without meandering through the circuitous paths of diplomatic language or crossing the plain highway of thought. I would ask the House to consider carefully this circumstance, because it was the actual circumstance by which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had to be governed at the time. A telegram came, which was as a bolt out of the blue, asking the extent to which Canada was prepared to back up the British policy in the Near East. I think hon. members will agree with me so far that that is what happened. The Prime Minister had to consider from whom that telegram came. It did not come from the coolest-headed member of the British government; it came from one who has been considered rather impetuous, a very Hotspur, one who said, if you remember, Sir, at the beginning of the war, that he would send the British navy to dig the Germans out of their holes like rats if their fleet stayed in port. That was a bold statement; but it was one at which the First Sea Lord and the men of the Admiralty smiled with their tongues in their cheeks. It was from a man of that impetuous disposition that this telegram came, and the reply of the Prime Minister, when he asked for further information that he might be informed more distinctly what the policy of Great Britain was in the Near East with regard to Turkey, sprinkled upon the ardour of the one who had sent the message those few cold drops of modesty that were necessary to cause a more deliberate consideration.

If as the event proved, it became unnecessary either that Canada should signify her distinct acquiescence in the policy of Great Britain with regard to Turkey, or state whether she would send a contingent to assist in the execution of the British plans in the Near East, it would have been absurd or ridiculous for the Prime Minister or the government to commit this country to anything of the kind. We should know exactly what we are going to do before we undertake to support any commitment. Some say: "Well, Australia did this, and New Zealand did it." I do not want the action or the attitude or the mind of Australia or New Zealand ever to influence the mind of Canada with regard to her destiny. We have a right to say that, amongst the various dominions of the Empire, this Dominion, which was the one which solved the problem of Imperial government and made it possible for those other dominions to come into existence and exist as a commonwealth of nations, is not called upon to heed to their actions. Each one must act for itself, and it is for Canada to take her own place, her own part, to look at her own future and destiny in the decisions which she makes.

Some say: "It should have been done for the moral effect." Mark the use of the word "moral"— the moral effect. If bluffing

is a moral game, then it would be done for the moral effect. In effect, to back up a bluff, was what Canada was asked to do, and I should be very sorry if it ever was in the history or nature of this people to become bluffers, to become rattlers of the sabre, and in a great crisis to take that kind of attitude that would be brow-beating and boastful. I would rather that Canada were a nation that does not say too much, but that acts right up to what it says and does it. That is what the people of the nation after which we claim to model our institutions, to a great extent are noted for—not saying more than they will do, but thoroughly doing that which they say. That was the attitude of the Prime Minister of this country at that time, and we have every reason to be proud of him that he acted in the good old traditional way in which we would expect a Canadian government to act. It is not always hasty action, the showing of alacrity, that is the wisest course. There is an expression that came to me often in 1914 when I thought of the great crisis and how much was in the balance, when I thought how deliberately Britain took the stand that she did. I would apply those same words to Canada in September last and through her future history, and I hope it will always be the idea that will govern her statesmen. The words are these:

> Rightly to be great
> Is not to stir without great argument,
> But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
> When honour's at the stake.

Was honour at the stake? Our government did not stir without great argument. They did not see the argument in the matter, and they did not stir; but had honour been at stake, I feel sure they would have taken those steps that would have been necessary to protect the honour of this country. No, there was a reversal of policy. Almost immediately that those few drops of cold modesty were sprinkled upon the ardour of the British ministers, their policy was reversed, and newspapers came out in England applauding Canada for the stand she had taken. Resolutions were passed by city councils and other bodies, congratulating this Dominion that she was able to take the wise stand that she did. The election came off, and hon. gentlemen know what happened. That policy was reversed by a majority in that election, and that showed that the people did not back up the gentleman who was then Prime Minister of England, nor the gentleman who sent the message.

When the gentleman who sent the message, who was known, I believe, as I said, as a Hotspur, to be of an impetuous nature, and who wished to play this game of bluff in the East, went north to his constituents in Scotland, why, Sir, he was beaten. The people showed him that they did not approve his policy.

An hon. MEMBER: By a prohibitionist.

Mr. RAYMOND: That is just what I was going to say. It is bad enough to be beaten at any time; but when hon. members consider the bitter irony of the position of being beaten in Scotland by a prohibitionist, they will realise the strength of feeling that was in the hearts of those voters must have been much more than usual. I consider the fact that these incidents were not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne was rather a good thing than a bad one. Why should these incidents have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne? If you are going across the Atlantic and you pass a dangerous rock or reef, and if the captain or the pilot were to point it out to you and say: "We passed that rock safely," you would think he was looking for credit for passing it. Had this matter been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we would have had the criticism that the government was looking for credit for having saved the country from the dire calamity of war, the most dire calamity that could have befallen it. The government did not mention it in the Speech from the Throne, not desiring to have that criticism, and hence its absence is commented upon. I think it is a good thing that no reference is made to it. It was an event that sank deeply into the hearts of all the Canadian people. It was one of the events that will help to make and mould the public mind of this country, so that whenever the eventuality faces us, whether we shall be at war or at peace, those who are rulers at the time when this may happen, will consider the matter so carefully that they will not stir without great argument; that they will form their decision very resolutely, carefully and wisely; that they will count all the costs; that they will count the cost in money.

There is no one who will not admit that even the enormous sum that the war cost us was very little indeed to what it cost Canada in other respects. We cannot forget those graves which you, Mr. Speaker, went over to visit last summer; and he who would commit this country to war at any time must do it so that he can look the widow and the orphan in the face afterwards. The Prime Minister did not feel that he could do so last September,

and naturally, until the necessity should present itself with overwhelming force, he shrank from any appearance of committing this country to war, or anything of that kind. We have every reason to be proud of a government that could take such a step, and we hope that successive governments in Canada will always follow that example and avoid in the future as far as possible any entanglements in war.

Are we to be responsible for the foreign policy of Great Britain, whatever it may be, without knowing what it is, without its being clearly defined? Why, the question is not worthy of being discussed here. I do not think there is a man who would take that stand here. If so, we have gone back to a position of tutelage, as a colony, from which we thought we had escaped many years ago. As a part of the commonwealth of nations or, as you please, of the dominions that form the great British Empire, we in the future are going to take our own position on these matters. We are going to form our own opinions, and are not going to be bound to follow the foreign policy of Great Britain in every matter that would entangle us in war. Nor do I think that the statesmen of Great Britain feel that we should be so bound. They have no right to think for a moment that we should be bound by their foreign policy without some say in the matter. Of course, if the occasion arose again as it did in 1914, when the principles of liberty, and honour and justice were at stake, Canada could be depended upon to perceive her duty by instinct, as she did then. But let it be known to those who are ambitious to prosecute certain policies in certain parts of the world in which we are not interested, that we are not going to spend either blood or money to further their designs. The revulsion of opinion showed after the event that the policy of Great Britain in regard to the East had not been of the wisest. When the military headquarters were at Chanak on the south side of the Dardanelles, had Canada sent any message, such as Australia despatched in regard to the situation that then existed, so as to strengthen the hands of those who were carrying on this bluff, and had there been the least conflict between those armies that were then face to face within gunshot distance of each other, had there been a few rifles discharged on that occasion, the consequences would have been inconceivable. We did not know for certainty then, but we know now, that at once Turkey would have plunged into war against us; and she would have been joined immediately by Russia, whose soviet government is as anxious to drive Britain out of those states as Britain is to drive Turkey out. Then that combination of Turkey and Russia would have been joined by Germany, who would be only too ready, if she had the allies, to take some military position that would enable her to repudiate all her enormous responsibilities of debt and reparations and depreciated currency. I am not overstating the case, for subsequent events have actually proved it; had the action of our Prime Minister at that moment been rash there was a possibility that the world might have been plunged again into a war not much less serious than that of 1914. Now, I hope that the same temperate course will always be followed by the rulers of this country. It was Victor Hugo, I think, who said that moderation is the very breath of judgment; and I believe it is. And judgment is the quality that is required in all such cases.

11 p.m.

I trust we shall always beware of entering into any quarrel, but that having entered it, we shall so play our part that the opponents may beware of us. But those who impute any lack of loyalty in the fact that we did not make some boastful or threatening declamations do not know the history of this country. Certainly, such a statement could never be made by an Englishman or by any other Briton, because he knows what Canada did in the late war, and he would never think that she lacked loyalty. I should be very sorry to think that such a statement could ever be made by a true Canadian, because the history of no country is more inspiring so far as the courage of its inhabitants is concerned. Canada's people have always shown themselves a brave people from the very earliest days of its history until the present time. Of course, we have had but few wars, but in her record Canada has never shirked her duty, and her sons could never be called cowards. There is not a more interesting event in modern history than the fact that after the Treaty of Paris in 1763, when this country was invaded from the south and no British troops were here to defend it, the French Canadians rose and repelled the invaders and saved the country to the British flag. In the war of 1812 all the inhabitants took an equal share; and in all succeeding struggles down to the last great war there has not been a time when Canada could be accused of failing to take her rightful place when occasion called. Anyone who suggested the contrary could not be either a true Briton or a true son of Canada. We have, I think,

every reason to congratulate ourselves on the stand which the Prime Minister took, and which shows that he possesses that particular kind of wisdom that is required in men who have the responsibility of governing a great country and of meeting issues that are fraught with terrible consequences.

Mr. T. H. McCONICA (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to participate in this debate but circumstainces are such that I deem it my duty to myself, to my associates and to the members of the House to make some pronouncement as to where I stand. I should like to go to some extent into the discussion of the Speech from the Throne, but I have decided under the circumstances to forego that pleasure. I am admonished that it is the desire to conclude this debate to-night and I shall certainly not weary the House. I want to congratulate the mover (Mr. Putnam) and the seconder (Mr. Rhéaume) of the Address on the excellent speeches they delivered in discharging that duty. I concur in all that has been said in commendation including the speech that I was unable to understand when the seconder delivered it I do not think it is entirely my fault if I could not understand it. I spent long hours in my younger days trying to master the French language, and I failed. The trouble was not that I did not study with sufficient diligence, but that the Almighty did not seem to have intended me for a Frenchman. But I would say to the hon. member that I have since given myself the pleasure of reading the translation of his able remarks, and I most heartily congratulate him.

I would say a word with regard to those who are not with us. I was well acquainted with but one of our late members, who have crossed the dark river, and I feel that I should say something as to him. I refer to the hon. member who formerly represented Lanark (Mr. Stewart). My acquaintance with him was all too brief. Soon after coming into the House I met him as an inexperienced, green member meets the experienced member who has reaped the reward of occupying a high position among those with whom he is associated, but I found him to be a considerate, kindly, courteous, polished gentleman. A gentleman in all that the term applies. I had the pleasure of being associated with him as a neighbour on this side of the chamber and in committee work for one session, and I came to esteem him as a statesman, careful, industrious, painstaking, honest, efficient and able—a most valuable member of this House. I esteemed him as a citizen worthy in every respect, patriotic, and devoted to the best interests of his country. In a word, Mr. Speaker, such a gentleman, such a statesman and such a patriot as we may well honour, and therefore I desire to add my tribute to what has been so well expressed concerning him.

I would touch on one or two matters that have arisen in this debate. I am still from the West, Mr. Speaker, and I am still proud of the West. I am proud of her people, and I would admonish you that they are not a whining, complaining set of people out there; they are men with good, strong nerves, they are patriotic, they are intelligent, they are industrious, they are courageous, and they are bound to fight to the bitter end. This they are doing under most adverse circumstances. I can assure you. I am not here to retract anything that has been said as to the arduous conditions existing there. Indeed, I am personally in such a position that I dare not attempt anything of the kind. We are not getting enough for our wheat; that is what is the matter with us. Wheat is the thing we must depend on in that country. My esteemed friend, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says he can see that there is a relation between 75-cent wheat and an exhausted, bankrupt Europe with exchange demoralized and credit gone. We can all see that. But I want to remind the right hon. gentleman that Europe has bought all the wheat we could send them. There has been no trouble to find a market for our wheat over there. And they have paid for it. But if the papers are to be credited, the spread between what they pay to-day for our wheat and what we get for it is from 40 cents to 50 cents more per bushel than it was before the war when conditions were normal, when money was plentiful, and when exchange was in their favour rather than otherwise.

Now, where is the trouble? There is a leak somewhere. That is what is the matter with us. The two parties that are interested in this business, the producer and the consumer, are not receiving proper consideration. They are the real parties in interest, and the gap is too wide. We are informed by my esteemed friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) that bread costs about a third less in London than it does in Saskatoon where we raise the wheat from which the bread is made. There is something wrong. I am not going to emphasize this now, although I should like to discuss it fully, and I may say to my hon. friends that I am still for the Wheat Board. We intend to have a board of that kind some of these days, but I won't weary the House

with that subject to-night. We must have some relief. We are promised in the Speech from the Throne that a committee will be appointed to investigate, with power to make recommendations. I have lived in Canada quite a considerable number of years, for fifteen years I have been trying to raise wheat, and I think I have put in about one-half of my spare time reading reports of investigations by committees, Mr. Speaker, and yet to-day we are still in worse shape than we ever were in respect to the wheat business. We want investigation, but we want something more.

But it is to the amendments that I desire to speak. We have offered an amendment through the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), raising a question which we still think is vital to Canada. We attempted to raise that same question last year, and were ruled out. I am not disposed to question that ruling. However, we had no opportunity of bringing that question to a discussion. Now it is objected that we are attempting to embarrass the government by introducing the amendment at this juncture. Nothing of the kind is intended. Here is a proposition upon which the people of this country are divided, upon which the members of this House are divided. Now if we can bring that to a square-toed issue and draw that line, and this government is defeated, then I am willing to accept the consequences, Mr. Speaker. That is where I stand on that proposition. There are two sides to that question, and I am here to maintain the platform upon which I was elected and the principles in which I believe, namely, that the tariff should be reduced. I do not believe that this country can continue to exist and prosper half free trade and half high protection. The farmers must sell their products in the markets of the world in competition with the cheapest labour imaginable, they must encounter everything that tends to pull down their prices, including an exorbitant spread between them, the producers, and the consumers, and they, the producers, must buy what they require at high protective tariff prices. As I say, we are selling our wheat cheaper than we did before the war. And what are we getting? We are getting a dollar which is worth sixty cents as compared with the dollar we got before the war. The reason for that to my mind is not that Europe cannot buy, for she is buying our wheat. I say we are here to support the amendment offered by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and we are ready to accept the consequences, even if the government should decide in the event of the amendment carrying, that it was ready to retire from office. We do not want that, I will admit. Personally I do not want it. It would interfere with my plans to some extent, and I do not believe the country wants it. But I believe the country does want a pronouncement on this question, and if the majority of members in this parliament are in favour of a radical reduction in the tariff, and say so, I do not know but what we could form a government out of that element and run this country in pretty good shape. Therefore, I am going to support that amendment, and I hope everyone here will.

We have another amendment, offered by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). In presenting his amendment to the House, he was good enough to relieve the Progressives from all responsibility in connection with it. He defined his position in the House, which we have well understood, and with his definition and attitude we fully agree. It is perfectly proper that he should take the position he did; he was so elected. We would like to co-operate with him fully in such legislation as we think should be enacted, and in that respect we would like to co-operate with every member in this House. But we would like it understood that when he says it is not our amendment he is proposing, that that is the position exactly. We have a notion on our side that we will vote as we please on a thing of that kind. What is the amendment of the hon. gentleman? He says:

> The House views with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt.

In that sentiment I fully agree. I apprehend we are all of one mind upon that. We must view with alarm the fact that the national debt has been materially increased. It has been fashionable with me to view with alarm any increase in my own indebtedness or any indebtedness of the country, so I think we are all a unit on that. But is it the office of the Speech from the Throne to catalogue all the things we view with alarm? If that is its function, I submit that the list is far too short. The hon. gentleman seems rather to insist on limiting it to one thing. If he would submit the list to my good friend for St. John (Mr. Baxter), who delivered that Jeremiad this afternoon, I am sure he would view with alarm conditions with regard to the potato growers, lumbermen, and everything else in that part of the country, and my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell) could also add a lot of things that he views with alarm. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) could also furnish him with a list. When the cars on his line, are hot they are too hot, and when they are cold they are too cold. If the hon.

gentleman really wants a substantial list of woes, let him consult his own associates from the province of Alberta. Why, they could furnish him with an unvarnished tale of woes that would make each individual hair stand up like the quills upon the fretful porcupine, and the pity of it is they would all be true. That is the tragedy of it. They would all be more real than the rather academic and thumb-worn general proposition which he has seen fit to include in his pronouncement. I think he would have been well advised to have left out that part of his amendment, because it is a proposition with which we all agree, and the list is not in any way complete when he limits it to the one thing. He says:

> This House views with alarm the increase in the national debt and urges Your Excellency's advisers to exert every possible effort to economize in the expenditure and administration of government.

I agree with that. It is proper that we should have economy in the expenditure and administration of government; I think they mean about the same thing. But I want more economy than that. I want to see economy in the management of our railways, that great enterprise that has passed out of the hands of the government and in which the people of Canada are vitally interested. I want to see economy in the management of our harbour commissions and terminal elevators, and in all our great quasi-public institutions. I go further, I want to see economy in all the railways and among all the people of Canada. We must have economy everywhere. The trouble with that part of the amendment is that it does not go far enough. It is limited to the expenditure and administration of government. My friends to my right seem to think that is all we should economize on in this country, but I do not agree with that at all.

The amendment goes on to say that the purpose of this economy is "to lessen the burden of federal taxation." That is a very commendable thing to do, and I am in favour of it. I think we would be very wise indeed if we were to practise economy everywhere and lessen the burden of taxation. But I would go further than that. I would say that we should conserve our resources to such an extent that we can not only cut out this deficit but pay something on the national debt and carry on all the great public improvements that are needed. We might improve the harbour at St. John, for instance, and at Quebec and Montreal. We should complete the Hudson Bay railway. Let us economize to that end. We should send out feeders to our railroad lines on the prairies—build branch lines. My good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) some little time after the new Board of Railway Directors was appointed, and before they had had their first meeting, I think, certainly long before Sir Henry Thornton came from England, is reported to have said out in the West that they were going to build a lot of lines on the prairies. I do not know how he got his information. I thought Sir Henry Thornton was the man to make a statement of that kind. It embarrassed me a good deal, because I could not back it up. I did not know, and I did not know whether he knew or not. If he did, I would like to know how he found out, because I do not think Sir Henry Thornton knew as he had not then seen the railways.

But I want to see economy. It will assist us in that respect, it will assist us in the building of the terminal facilities out at Vancouver. I do not want to limit our economy to merely relieving the burdens of taxation. The qualifications that the hon. gentleman has put in here are words of limitation. They cut down the scope of our aims. If I had drawn that amendment I should have said, "I am in favour of economy," that is all. Economy is what we want—economy in administration and expenditure, economy in the operation of every public enterprise, and in our own private lives, and to the end that we may not only reduce the burdens of taxation but that we may build up this country to the future that certainly lies before us. When that is done we shall have the results which are spoken of here, and many more blessings will follow in its train. So I say this amendment does not commend itself very much to me.

Now what is the pronouncement of His Excellency? He says that the public accounts will be down soon, and declares that a strict economy in all public expenditures continues to be a necessity. Now, does not that cover the matter pretty thoroughly? Is not that just about as broad as you can make it? I ask the hon. gentlemen on my left, does that not mean a lot more than the statement of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw)? I think it does, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the first place this amendment is not germane to the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey); it does not touch a single thing that is contained in that amendment; it is not relevant in the most remote degree; and I do not quite understand how it was held to be in order. It is also a contraction of the declaration of His Excellency. The Governor General de-

clares that economy in all public expenditures continues to be a necessity. That course we are admonished to follow, that rule is set up for us to adhere to. What more do we want? I apprehend it would hardly do for His Excellency to intrude into our private lives and tell us what we should do there; he was instructing parliament. My platform is a litle broader than his. I want economy to begin right in my own household, and then to permeate this whole great country of ours, permeate public and private bodies, permeate every enterprise and every interest; and when that time comes I believe that the clouds that lower upon our horizon will be buried in the deep bosom of the ocean.

That is all I care to say, but I think I have made myself clear as to the position some of us occupy upon this matter. But we are not going to be unanimous—some voting one way and some voting another. I do not propose to cast a vote that will dissolve this House unless I mean it. Suppose a vote on the second amendment had the effect of dissolving parliament, as I infer it would from the excellent speech of the Minister of Finance, what does it mean? What would we be going to the country on? On something as to which we are all agreed—that is that we want economy—and what good could result? I think the hon. gentleman would be well advised to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize, as a comparatively new member, for intruding myself into this debate at this late hour. However, I shall endeavour to be brief, and I have to a large extent condensed what I proposed to say on this occasion. I feel some embarrassment in speaking as a new arrival and I entertain a greater sense of responsibility in discussing such matters as we are considering at this time.

I wish to join with the other speakers who have extended their congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address, and to associate myself with the congratulations that have been extended to the new leader of the Progressive party. I would also extend a warm word of welcome to the new members to this House, and express the hope that they will all take the active, intelligent interest in the proceedings which the older members have taken.

In the Speech, His Excellency has been pleased to refer to the pleasure which he has derived from his extended tour through Canada, and the many courtesies he has received at the hands of the Canadian people. We are very grateful indeed that Their Excellencies have taken such a kindly interest in our welfare, and that they are making themselves so familiar with all parts of the country. We would recognize in the office of the Governor General one of the bonds of Empire, and we are sure that so long as the occupants of that high office display the same intelligent, active interest in our affairs, as the present incumbent and his predecessors have done, they will continue to receive our expressions of appreciation and gratitude. We wish Lord and Lady Byng success and happiness in their continued visit with us.

Some extended reference was made by one hon. gentleman who has spoken to the Near East question. I rather thought that he gave it more attention, perhaps, than it deserved. Some of the cablegrams exchanged with the British government were read, and a summary of others given, by the Prime Minister. I think it is perfectly clear to all that the British Empire was not preparing for war, that the British authorities were endeavouring to bring about peace in the Near East. Yet the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred, approached this matter as if the British government were endeavouring to launch a new war. Quite the opposite was the intention. I am sure nothing could have been more calculated to prevent war than the knowledge that all parts of the great Empire stood together united for the same purpose. I am sure that the answer which went from Canada did not make for peace, that it was very disappointing to the British authorities, and to many people in Canada itself. I am likewise sure that a prompt cablegram assuring the Imperial authorities that we, with the other portions of the British dominions, were united with the Mother Country would have had a very good effect indeed. In short, a cablegram of that nature, promptly sent, would have been better than a contingent despatched months afterwards.

I think, Sir, it is very fortunate indeed for all concerned that this crisis has passed, but it is no more fortunate for anyone than for the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government of this country.

The Speech from the Throne has referred to an increase in our commerce. It is true it is not very substantial, but it is a step in the right direction. It is encouraging and it is satisfactory to us on this side of the House to know that that increase in our commerce was accomplished without any change in the fiscal policies which had been pursued by the predecessors of this government.

There is a belated acknowledgement that our financial depression is due to financial conditions in Europe following the war. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that that explanation should have been given to this country much earlier by the Prime Minister and the members of this government, because I am sure that explanation was not made by him before the last election and I know that all of our troubles, financial, commercial and otherwise, were attributed to the alleged shortcomings of the then existing government.

Some reference has also been made to the trade conventions with France and Italy. It will take time to study these, and it will also take a considerable period of actual working to know whether the results will prove beneficial or otherwise. We will have to leave that to those who are more familiar with the trade question, and await results.

The removal of the cattle embargo or the alleged approaching removal of the cattle embargo, has also been referred to, because it does not yet appear that it has been entirely removed. In the province of Ontario we have been told that the credit for this action is due in a very large measure to the Minister of Agriculture for that province, the Hon. Manning Doherty, who, as we recall, went to the Mother Country and engaged in a campaign there in support of the removal of that embargo. He offended public sentiment in that country, received a well merited rebuke, and, I think, his activity retarded rather than helped the removal of the embargo. Yet in that province they are claiming for the provincial government and for the Minister of Agriculture in that government a large measure of credit for this removal. There is, of course, a difference of opinion as to the value of the removal of this embargo. I think that it has been exaggerated. But again, we will have to await its complete removal, the regulations that follow, and the results also that will follow the removal of the embargo. The ultimate removal of the embargo will come in fulfilment of a promise secured by Sir Robert Borden at an Imperial Conference.

Some reference is also made to immigration, and upon this very important question I believe it is well understood that there are two views or two opinions fairly strongly held in this country, one in favour of practically unrestricted immigration, and another in favour of restricted immigration. As far as we can judge from the speeches of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), and from the record, the government has not yet made up its mind upon this very important matter. They have not yet adopted a policy, and we are without any knowledge as to what their intentions are in this respect. Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I favour restricted immigration, restricted both as to quantity and as to quality—restricted as to quantity to the extent that we shall receive into Canada only those who can be well placed when they come here, only those who can come with advantage to themselves and with advantage to those who are already here, and restricted as to quality in that they shall be suitable for agriculture and for the industrial occupations which they may desire to pursue in this country. I submit that it is the duty of the government to bring down to this House and submit during the course of this session a well considered and well rounded policy upon this important matter. We have, I am afraid, been drifting, we have been losing time and losing opportunity, and immigrants have been going to other parts of the Empire, when they should have been coming to Canada. We should also, if possible, do something to prevent the emigration from this country which has been so pronounced in the last year.

I think it is only fair Mr. Speaker, that the government should have credit for having decided to make use of the Soldiers' Land Settlement organization in connection with the placing of immigrants in Canada. This excellent organization formed by the late government has rendered invaluable services to the returned soldier, and is, I believe, capable of equally valuable service to immigrants. I say the government are entitled to credit in this respect for their expressed intention of making use of this organization.

Then we are promised a revision of the Bank Act. It comes to us in the ordinary course. It is not a matter for which the government claims or, I think, is entitled to claim any credit. The act has in the main worked well, but changed conditions and certain occurrences of the last few years have demonstrated the necessity for some amendments to it. I wish to suggest an amendment which, I think, will give some relief to agriculture in this country. At the present time, as I understand the provisions of that act, a bank cannot lend upon the direct securities of farm products or chattels, it must be done in a roundabout way, and I know that in the province of Ontario there is a strong feeling on the part of those engaged in agriculture that too much of the funds that are received on deposit are not available for the immediate requirements of agriculture in Ontario. I would suggest that an amendment be made which would permit banks to loan to those

engaged in agriculture and others requiring advances the amounts which they require on the direct security of chattels. A simple form comprehensive in terms could easily be made a record, and when made of record would create a lien on the chattels. In this way there would be a fair, proper, and safe extension on banking accommodations, and agriculture would receive a stimulus. I submit this for the consideration of those who may have this matter in charge.

Another matter that is referred to in the Speech is an investigation into the alleged combine in connection with shipping rates. That brings to mind the allegation, particularly, of the member who now occupies the position of Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in this government in the last election campaign, that combines were rampant, that they were numerous, and the Dominion Textiles Corporation was mentioned. It was pointed out that they were simply eating up the poor people of this country, and he promised that there would be investigations; that there would be prosecutions, and that this matter would be attended to at once. Since he has come into the House, we have not heard so much about the matter. We have not had any investigations; we have not had any prosecutions, and if these combines did exist, they have been allowed to continue and to flourish.

Redistribution is in order, and this suggests a subject of considerable difficulty and possibly of bitter strife. I hope this will not be necessary, and I do not think it is necessary if the government who will have the measure in charge, is prepared to follow well-established lines, to make a fair distribution, to adhere to county boundaries, and to appoint a committee of all parties represented in this House who will, upon these general principles, settle the details of this troublesome matter. I think it was one of the members of the Progressive party who suggested that we might have proportional representation in some of the cities. I do not know why this experiment should be wished upon cities and not upon other parts of the Dominion. I suggest that it might as well be tried out in Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta; but I am not in favour of it at all. I think, when you consider the fact that only about sixty to seventy per cent of the electors vote in any general election, you will find, if you ask them to adopt a new and complicated system, that a smaller proportion of the vote will be cast. The results of this are uncertain; it leads to groups and to group government with all its compromises, with all its uncertainties, and with the difficulty of fixing responsibility. What I think the Canadian people desire is that they shall, by a direct, simple and positive method, be able to cast their votes in favour of a government which they approve or against a government which they do not approve, and the present method is the best calculated to accomplish that result. I admit, of course, that there are anomalies and inconsistencies in connection with the present method. Sometimes the majority of the voters do not elect a majority of the members of this House. But then again, I think this is due to some faulty redistribution of the constituencies. This may be overcome, and there are anomalies and difficulties also in connection with the system that has been proposed. We had better, I submit, "bear those ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of." Therefore, I submit that proportional representation should not be adopted, either in the cities or in any other part of Canada at this time.

I was pleased with the address of the last speaker (Mr. McConica) who dealt with the subject of economy in such an illuminating manner. I was pleased to hear him say that he was prepared to go the whole way in connection with this very important matter; but really if he was prepared to go as far as he outlined, I could not see how he could be hurt very much by voting for the principle that is involved in the resolution of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr Shaw). I can see, however, how he might fear, and his party might fear, that this would embarrass the government of the day, and of course they do not wish to do that.

I wish to refer to another statement that was made during the course of the debate. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) moved the amendment, and I have before me Hansard at page 69 of which he is reported to have made this statement. He seemed to go a little bit out of his way, I thought, to make some references to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and to this party. In order that we may have exactly his words, I will read a sentence or two of Hansard. He said:

> I could not help but think as the right hon. gentleman concluded his remarks that he himself was rapidly becoming Canadianised. But what of his immediate followers? I trust the Canadianisation of my right hon. friend will not lead to the fossilization of his immediate followers. Why this ominous silence? The country did not expect much from them, we know, but surely the country expects something. Well might an angel exclaim "Why seek ye the living amongst the dead?"

I wish to assure that hon. gentleman that this party is neither dead nor sleeping. I

wish to tell him that it is resting and recuperating from a long period of arduous activity, both in peace and war, in the interest of the people of this country. I wish to point out to him that these professions of superior virtue from his following, these reflections that are, from time to time, made upon both the old parties, would come with better grace if my hon. friends had to their credit some slight achievement in the interest of Canada. After hearing the address of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), I think my hon. friend will revise his opinion and come to the conclusion that this party is not dead after all. No, Mr. Speaker, we are not dead; we are not sleeping; we are observing everything that is happening in this House.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Keep on observing.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): We are rejoicing in the vindication of the policy and the programme of our party that is coming through the merciless logic of events and by the action of our successors in office. I repeat that we are not dead, nor sleeping; and when the time comes—and it may not be very long—we shall be found ready and well equipped to resume the conduct of the complicated and difficult affairs of Canada, keeping her, with all her obligations, national and international, in a position of respect and responsibility in that great family of nations that go to make up the British Empire.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this debate; but the placing in the discussion of the two amendments, and my attitude to one of them, makes it, it seems to me, incumbent upon me to utter a few words. As regards the last amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) in favour of economy, I find these words in the Address itself:

> A strict economy in all public expenditures continues to be a necessity in the existing financial situation.

These words being incorporated in the Address, I cannot see the raison d'être or real necessity for the sub-amendment and therefore I will vote against it. As regards the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) I find myself obliged to take another position. I do so with considerable regret because I shall have to run counter, I am afraid, to the greater number, if not all, of the members of my own side of the House. Is there any objection to the material of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Springfield? The amendment merely deals with the question of the reduction of customs duty and the desirability of having a downward revision of the tariff at this time. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in his instructive and most able speech the other day, himself said:

> The general sentiment contained in these two motions is largely of a sound, sane and sensible character.

With this certificate of character of the amendment given by the Minister of Finance himself, it is unnecessary, it seems to me, to labour the point and to insist upon the desirability of the amendment. The question which has been brought up by the Minister of Finance is the propriety of urging this resolution at the present time. I have taken some time in studying this question and I have come to a conclusion somewhat different from that arrived at by the minister. I advance my arguments with a certain amount of diffidence in view of the long experience and the great public services which the Minister of Finance has rendered to this country. The Minister of Finance takes the view that the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and the debate connected with it are really a matter almost of form rather than a matter of real importance. "It is simply a resolution," he states, "politely acknowledging the speech which His Excellency has kindly addressed to the House and giving him the assurance that whatever matters are brought before us will receive our respectful consideration." That is quite accurate as a statement of form; I respectfully submit that it is not accurate as a statement of reality. In reality the Speech from the Throne does not emanate from the Governor General at all; it is merely put into his mouth by his advisers. The Speech from the Throne is the more or less sketchy pronouncement of the government as to their legislative programme for the session; and our discussion of it is not, I take it, merely a courteous interchange of compliments with the Governor General. It is a debate in which the mind of the nation is to be expressed, and I think that it is the more modern reality rather than what may have been and no doubt was in the past the fact. The question is to my mind an interesting one and I would refer the House to three authorities that I have before me. The first is Parliamentary Government in England by Todd, Vol. II. I find therein expressed the view which has been so well placed before the House by the Minister of Finance. On page 364 the author states:

> Accordingly, it has gradually become the practice to refrain from moving an amendment to the Address in answer to the royal speech unless some great political objects were in view, and likely to be attained—

Even under that interpretation of the situation, I take it that there is some great political object in view in the desire of a great number of the members of the House to have a downward revision of the tariff.

—or unless some assertion were made in the address to which the opposition found it impossible to assent.

And just while I am referring to this authority I should like to point out that amendments to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne have been moved and been accepted by the government.

On January 16, 1840, the Duke of Wellington moved an amendment to the Lords' Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne wherein Her Majesty's approaching marriage with Prince Albert was announced, for the insertion of the word "Protestant" before the name of the Prince. Having shown that it was in conformity with precedent, the amendment was agreed to, notwithstanding the opposition of the Prime Minister. But the success of this amendment was attended with no political consequences, though the matter gave rise to much discussion, both in and out of Parliament.

I would next refer the House to a very much more modern authority, Anson's Law and Custom of the Constitution. In Volume I on page 67 I read:

To this Address—

The Address we are now discussing—

—amendments may be moved, and thus the general policy of the government, as indicated by the Speech from the Throne, is brought under discussion.

This thought is more fully developed in another modern authority The Procedure of the House of Commons by Redlich, with an introduction by Sir Courtney Ilbert, who was one of the Clerks of the House of Commons at Westminster. At page 59 I read:

The King's Speech gives in broad outline the legislative programme of the session, comments upon the position of foreign affairs and the state of the Crown Colonies, and, in a special paragraph, of nearly invariable form, addressed to the Commons only, it promises an early submission of the estimates for the wants of the coming year. The course of the deliberations of Parliament is thus indicated, and they begin regularly with a debate upon the Speech and the Address in reply thereto. The general political character of the King's speech leads to the result

12 m. that the course of the debate upon it is untrammelled as to subject matter, a circumstance to which the modern adoption of the principle that general debates should be as much as possible avoided has given great importance. General criticism of the government from all imaginable points of view, demands for redress of grievances, the statement of aspirations and proposals of all kinds, are rendered possible. The whole policy of the country, domestic and foreign, is open to discussion. The form of procedure adopted is that, immediately upon the speech being communicated to the House by the Speaker, a motion for an Address in reply is proposed, by some member chosen beforehand, generally some young member on the government side, and seconded by another. Formerly the Address in reply followed closely the wording of the Speech, but in recent years it has become usual to frame it as a brief expression of the thanks of the House.

The further debate is carried on in the strict formal manner characteristic of English parliamentary procedure. Any body of political opinion represented in the House, any member who wishes thus early in the session to influence the Government's legislative programme at any point, or to call the attention of ministers or the public to any question, brings up what is desired in the form of an amendment to the address, proposing the addition of some words having reference to the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully submit that those are precisely the circumstances which confront us to-night. I take it that when this book of Todd's was written, some fifty years ago—the author's note to the introduction is dated Ottawa, February, 1869—it was considered proper even at that time for the government to accept an amendment. Surely when this custom has developed into the holding of a general debate and the making of proposals of all sorts, the government is not precluded from taking any of these suggestions which they may deem best and making them their own. That leads me to the conclusion that those of us who think it is proper to introduce this resolution at this time are not only following what, it seems to me, is indicated by common sense, but also is sanctioned by the best modern constitutional practice.

Why is it wiser to introduce this resolution now rather than during the budget debate? It would seem to me, and I submit it with a considerable degree of confidence, that the budget is reached as a rule somewhat late in the session and represents generally the final decision of the government as to the manner in which it proposes to raise money for the use of the state, and that when that moment has arrived it would require a considerable amount of grace and forbearance on the part of the government, after all their plans had been laid and arrangements made for the raising of money for national purposes, to revise their plans and accept suggestions coming from another quarter. Therefore it does seem to me that this is the time when we can hope by respectful representations to influence the government in taking the view of the matter which a number of men in this House do take.

I am very anxious that this should be done, for two reasons. First, because I think it is of primary necessity in the interests of the whole country that there should be a downward revision of the tariff. At this late hour I am not going into the reasons which lead me to that conclusion. They are precisely the same reasons which have led the Liberal party since 1878 to hold that lower tariffs were in the interest of Canada; the same reasons which led the Liberal party in the great con-

vention of 1893 to take that position before the country; the same reasons which led the Liberal party in 1919 to reaffirm those same principles; the same reasons which led the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) within the last few years to place on the pages of Hansard his reason for believing that the protective principle was not the proper principle on which to base the tariff laws of this country. That is one main reason. The other is this: I am afraid that if the government do not accept this proposal they lay themselves open to the charge which has already been made, that in refusing to put this proposal of tariff reduction in the Speech from the Throne, and in neglecting to make any firm statement that that is their idea, they will leave the door open for people to say that they have abandoned their trade principles. That, I think, would be an unfortunate thing for the Liberal party. That, of course, is something which I, as a humble member of that party, can do no more than respectfully urge my leaders to follow. But although I have no power more than any other member to influence them, I have the power to see that no one can throw that charge in the face of the member for Brome. I think at this time when parliamentary institutions, nay, representative government, are on trial, it is of the utmost importance that there should be no possibility in the public mind for even the suspicion of the thought that public men say one thing in opposition and do another when in power. I am making no charge that that is done or is being contemplated. I do say that the adoption of the suggestion which I make with all seriousness, with all respect, would obviate the very possibility of such a contingency.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is late. I have said what I have got to say on this subject. I commend it to the attention of the House and trust that those who have listened to me will be impressed with what I regard as the soundness of my argument.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will excuse my speaking from a seat that is not my own, but, owing to this bedroom drapery effect that has been wished upon us in our absence, we miserable members who are condemned to sit on the back benches are perpetually in a state where we are deprived of light—either the light of day or artificial light, and when we do wish to speak we have to emerge from our caverns and stand blinking in the light of day or artificial day. The same condition prevails with my hon. friends on the back benches opposite, and I think we will soon qualify under the description contained in the lines of that favourite old hymn:

> The race that long in darkness pined
> Have seen a glorious light.

While I am on the subject I also wish to enter a protest against the colour scheme of this arrangement. It is a well-known scientific fact nowadays that in cases of mental or nervous diseases and disorders the colour of the apartment has a good deal to do with the patient's condition. For instance, red irritates a man and blue has a soothing effect. I cannot conceive of any effect that perpetual association with this colour scheme will have on the unfortunate member except to lead him to commit suicide. I never saw a colour like it except in an undertaker's parlour. If the government find the percentage of suicides is greater on the back benches than on the front, they will know the cause.

Now, it is late, and my state of health prevents me dealing with the subject matter of the Speech from the Throne at length. I only wish to touch very briefly on the two amendments, but before I do so I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Independent party in this House on the large and important accession to its numbers of late. I say to the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) that he will find in that party great opportunities for preferment and promotion. The position of whip to that party is vacant to-day. It can be had at a word. The position of chairman of the caucus is also vacant and I would even dangle before him bright hopes of becoming leader of the party. No doubt at the first caucus that will be a subject for our most earnest consideration. I recall some years ago in British Columbia a similar condition occurred. There was a party there of two; I was not one of them. The party consisted of two Liberals, and a divergence of opinion arose between them as to who should be the leader. Unfortunately they brought their dirty linen to wash in the House, and it was described how they had squabbled as to who should be leader. One man said to the other, "Look here, Tom, the position of leader is one of some social standing, and you have to be able to wear a dress-coat and talk to the Lieutenant-Governor. I have a dress coat, and you know, Tom, you have not. Therefore, I think I should be the leader." The other man retorted, "I do not know about dress-coats or about the Lieutenant-Governor, but I can swing a better paint brush than you anyhow." They quarrelled so bitterly over the leadership that one of them became the

leader, and the other left the party and affiliated himself with the Conservatives, since when he has never been heard of politically. In view of his youth and Apollo-like figure, and the fact that my friend is a bachelor—I think he is; he looks like one—I am prepared to make this deal with him, for I am always ready to make a deal and to make a public one: I will give him the social element. He can be the leader at society functions. I will yield the party's dress suit if we find we have only one, to him on such occasions, if he will leave to me the more arduous but to me the more congenial task of carrying on the leadership in the House, and then we will have that most beautiful of things, peace and harmony in our young and vigorous party.

Coming to the amendments the one that will be taken first, I presume, has been well termed the economy amendment. I rather fail to understand why the government might not have accepted it. It is one of such a purely academic nature that nothing particular would happen if the government accepted it. It is true we want economy and thrift and honesty and virtue. These are all admirable qualities, and an academic recital of them would not have done the government any harm, and possibly would have pleased a certain number of members. However, I presume the government have a good precedent when they take the stand that it must be regarded as a vote of want of confidence. Before I pass from the subject of economy, I might mention that during the last recess I have been instrumental through representations to the government in having four official positions cut out in my district, and if I am left alone I will have some more cut out, in the direction of economy. These men have not been discharged, but their positions have been done away with, resulting in an aggregate saving of $4,000 a year, and I have only begun. I have saved the amount of my salary, and if the members of the Progressive party have done the same—perhaps they have, I do not deny it—the aggregate saving would be a quarter of a million dollars. I think that would be an evidence of a more genuine demand for economy than coming before this House with a brick loosely wrapped around with a resolution for economy in one hand, and a demand for the completion of the Hudson Bay railway in the other. Of course, I only take a small view of these things, but that is my idea of economy, putting it into practical effect as we go along.

As regards the other amendments, what is known as the free trade amendment, there is a form of free trade policy to which I would heartily subscribe as I heard it enunciated in the House the other day by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft), whom I have the honour to sit beside. In his excellent speech, short, but full of sound common sense and logic, he enunciated the tariff proposition that he was in favour of wiping out the present high tariff tax on woollens and boots and shoes, and like a true diplomat he stopped there. I am prepared to go with him any length along these lines. Like Agrippa, I was inclined to say: Paul! Paul! Almost thou persuadest me to be a Progressive. If he and his party had stopped there I would have been with him, to use a vernacular expression in the West, "till Hell froze over"; but it does occur to me that perchance the fact of my hon. friend and myself being perhaps fair-minded men, open to reason and argument, occupying the same desk for the last twelve months day by day and month by month, perhaps indulging in quite friendly arguments, has at last resulted in a sort of compromise frame of mind between us by which he was led to modify his earlier extreme political tariff views to a point where I could meet him half way. I submit, without any desire for recompense in my behalf, that idea to the government. It might be worked out along similar lines next session. We might find the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) associated with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) and see what effect that would produce, or the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), or even the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter), or the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) with the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). Such an arrangement might produce a new and desirable frame of political mind in this House. At any rate, the idea is one that is possibly worthy of consideration by the government.

On the economy resolution, I propose to vote with the government, but with a good deal of reluctance, but on the other amendment, I shall certainly vote with the government with great cheerfulness, because I cannot come down here and stultify myself as regards the people who sent me here to look after their interests, and not play a political game. I have been here zealously in season, and, possibly some members of the government will say, out of season, clamouring at the

door of the Finance Minister for protection for various infant industries in British Columbia, demanding from the Public Works department appropriations for my large district—and not only large, but growing. When you get a district with between 9,000 and 10,000 miles of waterfront and the people are active and progressive, the first thing they need is wharves, and wharves mean a large expenditure of public money. I can hardly come down here and ask for appropriations and tariff protection on the one hand, and then vote for the very opposite under these amendments. For that reason I feel justified in supporting the government. It is all too true, I am sorry to say, that I have not received anything like the measure of justice my district is entitled to. I say it with regret and reproach, and perhaps with the secret idea that the reason may be that too large concessions were being given to my friends to my left. Perhaps that is why British Columbia has had to go more or less hungry in these matters.

Let us glance for a moment into the future and see where the passage of this amendment would lead us. Suppose—what shall I call it?—this unnatural union—between the party of high tariff on the one hand and low tariff on the other, political inexperience on the one hand, and political subtlety on the other—suppose it produces a majority against the government to-night, what will be the result? We know that under constitutional law the government will have the right to appeal to the country. That will mean loss—loss of money, expense and loss from the derangement of business, and as an hon gentleman sitting on this side of the House said, "It does not agree with my personal arrangements either". But there are moments when we have to place the benefit of the country before your own particular desires. I feel that it is desirable here and now that the question should be settled, at least for two or three years to come, whether the minority in this House is going to dictate the tariff policy of this country. If it were any other party but the gentlemen to my left I might be inclined to say it was only a political gesture, that they do not intend this resolution to pass. But I know so well the character of the hon. member for Springfield who moved it, and many of the other gentlemen behind him, that I realize they are sincere. I say it with all sincerity myself, I believe they are sincere and absolutely prepared to take the consequences of their action, and therefore it is the more fitting, the more necessary, that we should have a show down to find out in this country just where we stand, at least for some years to come.

I admit that the amendment is modestly worded—that is to say it does not go the whole length to ask for free trade. I confess that it is different from what I think they had in mind; but when we come down to a question of this kind we have got to go beyond the present amendment, we have got to get down to the final analysis, and I think I am justified in saying that the fiscal policy of the Progressive party is one of absolute and unadulterated free trade. I do not think that can be gainsaid. You have only to look at the debates of last year to prove that. But you do not even need to do so—the speeches that have been made this evening bear me out when I say that in the final analysis the aim, the aspiration, the goal to which the Progressives are finally committed is free trade and absolute free trade. They have served notice on the government that if they wish to secure, or to have continued, the ever wavering and always uncertain support of the Progressive party, they must carry out the fiscal wishes not only of an extreme party but the fiscal wishes of the extreme members of that extreme party; and it is for the government and for the country to decide whether a party which, after all, numbers only 27 per cent of the total membership of this House is to dictate to the other 73 per cent. That is the question which presents itself to me in connection with this matter. If it was any other party I might use the term political "extortion" but I do not do so because I have too much respect for these gentlemen to my left. Many of them are men of my own kith and kin, we are of a common origin, and I share their views to a very large extent except on the question of the tariff. We have many views in common, and have learned our lessons in the bitter, grinding school of experience; that is why we have so much in common on almost every point of view with the exception of the tariff. Therefore I will not use the phrase "political extortion," but rather the milder term of "political extraction." But, Mr. Speaker, there are times when we weary even of the painless dentist.

Now I have spoken of the situation as it presents itself here to-day. A number of years ago—too many years ago I am afraid, at any rate a long time ago—in Australia in the state—it was before the period of the Commonwealth—of Victoria, of which Melbourne is the capital, there was an election where

the new premier of the day found himself in office with a very slim majority. He had been elected on a popular policy but the party which he opposed was strongly entrenched. Being in power he proceeded to carry out the policy on which he had been elected. The opposition were fully aware that it was dangerous and fatal for them to go to the country, but at the same time they proceeded to aggravate, and annoy, the new ministry, and to obstruct to the fullest measure of their ability. They would bring in amendments and the government would not know if they were going to be defeated or not. The opposition endeavoured in every way not only to embarrass the government in carrying out its policy, but at the same time by insidious propaganda to represent that the more or less vacillating conduct of the government was due not to their obstruction but to its inherent weakness. The premier was supposed to be a man lacking in political experience and they thought they could play that game with him. He went along with the policy he had outlined but one fine night the opposition found to their intense surprise that they had defeated the government. In six weeks, however, the administration was back in power again with a sufficient majority. The premier had arranged the thing with a couple of his followers, and, in slang parlance showed the opposition "where they were at," and it has been a lesson to me ever since.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEILL: Had hon. gentlemen opposite allowed me to finish my remarks they would have heard me say it was a lesson to me not merely politically but in all phases of life, for I have ever found that a bold progressive policy always gets a man farther than one of hesitating for fear he gets his feet wet. I believe—and I believe it is as true here to-day as it was in Australia at that time—that this country wants a policy of moderate protection, a policy of protection to the young and struggling industries in all parts of the country, particularly of the West, also a tariff policy that will ease up and reduce the heavy protection now existing on the older and better established industries. I believe that if the government appealed to the country on such a policy they would get an ample and sufficient mandate to carry it out.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Shaw), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson,	Knox,
Arthurs,	Ladner,
Bancroft,	Leader,
Baxter,	Lovie,
Black (Huron),	Lucas,
Black (Yukon),	Macphail,
Bowen,	McKillop,
Boys,	McTaggart,
Brethen,	Manion,
Brown,	Maybee,
Caldwell,	Meighen,
Campbell,	Morrison,
Charters,	Preston,
Church,	Reed,
Clark,	Ross (Simcoe),
Coote,	Ryckman,
Davies,	Senn,
Dickie,	Shaw,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Sheard,
Evans,	Simpson,
Findlay,	Spence,
Forke,	Spencer,
Gardiner,	Stansell,
Garland (Bow River),	Steedsman,
Good,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Gould,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Grimmer,	Stewart (Leeds),
Guthrie,	Sutherland,
Hanson,	Thompson,
Harris,	Thurston,
Hodgins,	Tolmie,
Hoey,	Wallace,
Jelliff,	Ward,
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Warner,
Jones,	White,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Wilson,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Woods,
King (Huron),	Woodsworth—76.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Euler,
Baldwin,	Fielding,
Beaubien,	Finn,
Béland,	Fontaine,
Bénoit,	Forrester,
Binette,	Fortier,
Boivin,	Fournier,
Bouchard,	Gauvreau,
Boucher,	Gendron,
Bourassa,	Gervais,
Bureau,	Gordon,
Cahill,	Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Cannon,	Graham,
Cardin,	Hammell,
Carmichael,	Hatfield,
Carroll,	Hughes,
Carruthers,	Humphrey,
Chevrier,	Hunt,
Clifford,	Irvine,
Copp,	Jacobs,
d'Anjou,	Kay,
Déchêne,	Kellner,
Delisle,	King (Kootenay),
Denis (Joliette),	King, Mackenzie (York),
Denis (St. Denis),	Kyte,
Desaulniers,	Laflamme,
Deslauriers,	Lanctôt,
Desrocher,	Lapierre,
Duff,	Lapointe,
Elliott (Dundas),	Lavigueur,
Ethier,	Léger,

Lovett,	Neill,
Low,	Papineau,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Parent,
Maclean (Halifax),	Prevost,
McBride,	Pritchard,
McConica,	Putnam,
McDonald (Timiskaming),	Rankin,
McGiverin,	Raymond,
McIsaac,	Rinfret,
McKay,	Robb,
McKenzie,	Roberge,
McMaster,	Robichaud,
McMurray,	Robinson,
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Robitaille,
Marler,	Sales,
Martell,	Savard,
Mercier,	Séguin,
Michaud,	Sexsmith,
Millar,	Sinclair (Oxford),
Milne,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Mitchell,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Morin,	Stork,
Morrissy,	Tobin,
Motherwell,	Trahan,
Munro,	Vien,
Murdock,	Walsh—114.

PAIRS.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Ministerial.	Opposition,
	Messrs.
Logan,	Bristol,
Murphy,	Porter,
Power,	Mewburn,
Rheaume,	LeSueur,
McKinnon,	McQuarrie,
McCrea,	Stevens,
Malcolm,	Duncan,
Chisholm,	Maclean, W. F. (South York),
German,	Chaplin,
Chew,	MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),	Garland, (Carleton)
Ouimet,	Kennedy (Glengarry),
Marcil (Bagot),	MacKelvie,
Casgrain,	Hocken,
St. Pere,	Ross,
Fafard,	Hubbs,
Hudson.	Drummond.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). Had I voted I would have voted for the sub-amendment.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Chew). Had I voted I would have voted for the sub-amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): I was paired with the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Ouimet). Had I voted I would have voted for the sub-amendment.

1 a.m.

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Had I voted I would have voted against the sub-amendment.

[Mr. Neill.]

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Hoey), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.	
Bancroft,	Knox,
Beaubien,	Leader,
Black (Huron),	Lovie,
Brethen,	Lucas,
Brown,	Macphail,
Caldwell,	McConica,
Campbell,	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Carmichael,	McMaster,
Coote,	McTaggart,
Davies,	Millar,
Elliott (Dundas),	Milne,
Evans,	Morrison,
Findlay,	Pritchard,
Forke,	Reed,
Gardiner,	Ross (Simcoe),
Garland (Bow River),	Sales,
Good,	Sexsmith,
Gould,	Shaw,
Hodgins,	Spencer,
Hoey,	Steedsman,
Irvine,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Jelliff,	Thurston,
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Wallace,
Kellner,	Ward,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Warner,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Woods,
King (Huron),	Woodsworth.—54.

NAYS.

Messrs.	
Anderson,	Ethier,
Archambault,	Euler,
Arthurs,	Fielding,
Baldwin,	Finn,
Baxter,	Fontaine,
Béland,	Forrester,
Benoit,	Fortier,
Binette,	Fournier,
Black (Yukon),	Gauvreau,
Boivin,	Gendron,
Bouchard,	Gervais,
Boucher,	Gordon,
Bourassa,	Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Bowen,	Graham,
Boys,	Grimmer
Bureau,	Guthrie,
Cahill,	Hammell,
Cannon,	Hanson,
Cardin,	Harris,
Carroll,	Hatfield,
Carruthers,	Hughes,
Chaplin,	Humphrey,
Charters,	Hunt,
Chevrier,	Jacobs,
Church,	Jones,
Clark,	Kay,
Clifford,	King (Kootenay),
Copp,	King, Mackenzie (York),
d'Anjou,	Kyte,
Déchêne,	Ladner,
Delisle,	Laflamme,
Denis (Joliette),	Lanctôt,
Denis (St. Denis),	Lapierre,
Desaulniers,	Lapointe,
Deslauriers,	Lavigueur,
Desrochers,	Leger,
Dickie,	Lovett,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Low,
Duff,	Macdonald (Pictou),

Mackinnon,	Rankin,
MacLaren,	Raymond,
Maclean (Halifax),	Rinfret,
McBride,	Robb,
McGiverin,	Roberge,
McIsaac,	Robichaud,
McKay,	Robinson,
McKenzie,	Robitaille,
McKillop,	Ryckman,
McMurray,	Savard,
Manion,	Séguin,
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Senn,
Marler,	Sheard,
Martell	Simpson,
Maybee,	Sinclair (Oxford),
Meighen,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Mercier,	Spence,
Michaud,	Stansell,
Mitchell,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Morin,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Morrissy,	Stewart (Leeds),
Motherwell,	Stork,
Munro,	Sutherland,
Murdock,	Thompson,
Neill,	Tobin,
Papineau,	Tolmie,
Parent,	Trahan,
Power,	Vien,
Preston,	Walsh,
Prevost,	White,
Putnam,	Wilson.—140.

PAIRS.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Ministerial	Opposition
Ouimet,	Kennedy (Glengarry),
Hudson.	Drummond.

Main motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, seconded by Mr. Fielding, it was ordered that the Address be engrossed and transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

SUPPLY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow, to consider of the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not suppose it is really intended to go into committee to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING: No, it is the usual formal motion made at the opening of the session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I merely call attention to the fact that it does not seem necessary to be made. It is not in order now, we are not under motions.

Mr. FIELDING: This motion is always made at the beginning of every session. It is merely a declaration on the part of the House that it will grant supply at a later time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just call attention to the fact that it should be made under motions. We are under the Orders of the Day now.

Mr. FIELDING: It always follows immediately after the adoption of the Address. My hon. friend will see that if he consults the record.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but under motions.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a committee to-morrow to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Mackenzie King moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What will be the business for Friday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We propose to take up to-morrow government notices of motion if the House will give its consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What government notices of motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those that appear in to-day's order paper. According to Friday's procedure they will be the first on the Orders of the Day to-morrow, and they have been on the order paper now for some days. I think members are all familiar with them, and I should imagine would be ready to proceed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it intended to take up all the government notices of motion? There are six or seven of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That will depend entirely upon the length of the debate in each case. I think some of them are noncontentious and will occupy but a short time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister give the order in which they will be taken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest that they be taken in the order in which they appear on the order paper.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 1.28 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, February 9, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 7, to amend the Northwest Territories Act. He said: The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit the trial outside of the Northwest Territories of persons charged with crimes committed within those territories, and to provide for such trial by the same court and according to the same procedure as if the trial took place within the said territories. The amendment is of particular importance in view of the necessity which confronts us of bringing to trial next summer a number of Eskimos charged with murders in different parts of the Northwest Territories. These Eskimos are now under guard at Herschell Island where we propose to try them on account of facilities which we find at that place for their confinement and trial. Furthermore, provision has to be made so that the decisions given pursuant to that new and large jurisdiction may be enforced, by execution or otherwise, at the place where they are made outside of the Northwest Territories.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 8, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The purpose of this bill is to abolish the death penalty for all crimes for which it may be imposed under the present criminal code, and to substitute therefor life imprisonment. I may add that the bill I am now introducing is exactly the same measure, in every particular, as the one which was introduced in this House by Mr. Bickerdike on February 9, 1915.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

VIMY RIDGE MONUMENT

FRANCE'S GIFT OF MEMORIAL SITE GRATEFULLY ACCEPTED

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament at the opening of the session, mention was made of a gift by the Republic of France to the Dominion of Canada of a tract of land on Vimy Ridge. His Excellency referred to this gift in the following words:

> The Government of France has graciously offered to the Canadian Government a tract of land of 250 acres on Vimy Ridge, at the site selected for the erection by Canada of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian troops in the Great War. This gift has been gratefully accepted, and a bill approving the agreement has been duly introduced in the French Parliament. An appropriate resolution expressing Canada's appreciation of the action of the French Government will be offered for your acceptance.

There would appear to be something peculiarly appropriate and gratifying in the circumstance that His Excellency, whose name and fame are so inseparably associated with the achievements of the Canadian army at Vimy Ridge, should be the one whose privilege it was to announce to the members of our parliament this gift of the Republic of France to the Dominion of Canada.

I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, to move:

> That it be resolved by the House of Commons,
>
> That Parliament do approve the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the gift graciously made by the Republic of France of a tract of land 250 acres in extent on Vimy Ridge at the site selected for the erection by Canada, of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian soldiers in the Great War and in so doing records its sense of gratitude for and its high appreciation of the motives which prompted France to associate herself with a project so dear to the hearts of the Canadian people.

Hon. members will recall that in the consideration last session of the appropriation for the Battlefields Memorial Commission a general wish was expressed by the leaders of the different parties in this House that if at all possible the commission should acquire a tract of land on Vimy Ridge which would form a suitable environment for the monument to be erected at that place in commemoration of the heroism of Canada's soldiers overseas. It was in pursuance of that wish that you, Mr. Speaker, during the interval since last session, visited France and conducted on behalf of the Battlefields Memorial Commission negotiations with the French government for the acquisition of this tract of land. The fact that we have received as a gift, what we should gladly have acquired by purchase, while due to the generosity of France, which we acknowledge in the fullest measure, is no doubt also due in part to your well-known tact and diplomacy in dealing with international affairs.

I would like to read to the House the text of the agreement with respect to this grant of land. The agreement was drafted on the 5th December, 1922, and concluded as between the French government, represented by Mr. Charles Reibel, Minister of Liberated Regions

on the one part, and the government of Canada, represented by Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Speaker of the House of Commons on the other part. It reads:

Whereas the Government of Canada desires to erect on Vimy Ridge (Pas-de-Calais), in the centre of a park which they intend to lay out, and the maintenance of which they will assume, a monument to the memory of the Canadian soldiers who fell on the field of honour in France during the war of 1914-1918, the French Government put at their disposal the necessary land which will remain the property of the French Republic.

Whereas, on the other hand, France desires to associate herself in the tribute which Canada wishes to pay to the victims of the great war, and as moreover, the land concerned, comprised in the red zone, is to be acquired by France in conformity with section 46 of subsection 7 of the Act of the 17th April 1919.

Article I

The French Government grants, freely and for all time to the Government of Canada, the use and free disposal of a parcel of land of 100 hectares on Vimy Ridge in the Department of Pas-de-Calais, the boundaries of which are indicated on the plan hereto annexed.

Article II

The Government of Canada pledge themselves to lay out this land into a park and to erect thereon a monument to the memory of the Canadian soldiers fallen on the field of honour in France during the war of 1914-1918.

They moreover pledge themselves to provide for the maintenance of the park and monument, in default of which the French Government would resume the free disposal of the park, except however the land on which the memorial is erected.

Article III

The land granted to the Government of Canada by this agreement will be exempt of all taxes and imposts. The French Government will take the responsibility of all difficulties with the borderers, except those arising from damages caused by the personnel or the material belonging to the Government of Canada and kept in France for the maintenance and protection of the park and monument.

Article IV

There shall be obligatorily mentioned on the monument the names of all units of the same class of the Canadian army having fought on Vimy Ridge during the same period of time.

Article V

This Agreement will become effective by the passing, by Parliament, of a bill approving its provisions which the French Government has laid on the Table of the House.

In testimony whereof, on the day and year above mentioned, this agreement was drawn in four copies, each copy having the same force and effect as an original by the French Government represented by Charles Reibel, Minister of Liberated Regions, and the Government of Canada represented by Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada.

It is the purpose of the Battlefields Memorial Commission to erect, in all, eight monuments, three of them in Belgium, the other five in France. Of the eight monuments to be erected, the most important, indeed one of the most imposing and noble monuments in the world, will be the Allward monument to be erected on Vimy Ridge. As mentioned in the agreement I have just read, this monument will record the names of other units which fought at Vimy Ridge of a like standing with the Canadian army. There is, however, another record to be placed on that monument which will, I imagine, touch even more deeply the hearts of all Canadians. It is the names of some 20,000 Canadians who were numbered among the missing, and for whom there are not individual graves in either France or Belgium. Happily their names will for all time be recorded on this monument to be erected at Vimy.

I need not say anything to the House of the significance of Vimy Ridge. There were many battles fought in the great war; and for many purposes, it would be unwise to seek in any way to draw comparisons between them. This possibly may be said of Vimy which could not be said of the others: that it was at Vimy that the Canadian corps first fought as a unit, composed of men from every part of Canada. It was at Vimy that the Canadian army was welded into an efficient fighting organization, so strong that no opposing armies could resist it; and that Canadian soldiers were able to achieve what no other army had been able to do in the meeting of the enemy at that point. Vimy Ridge stands as one of the world's great altars of sacrifice. As one reflects upon the significance of the Great War, one cannot but feel a resemblance, albeit on a world's scale, between that colossal tragedy and the tragedy of 1900 years ago, when the best life which the world has ever known was sacrificed through the materialism of its day that mankind might enjoy a wider measure of spiritual freedom. In the tragedy of the late war, it was not one life only, it was an appreciable portion of humanity, which was sacrificed for the sake of the larger freedom of mankind. History will look upon the battlegrounds of the Great War as the places of sacrifice. Among the number, no altar will be more conspicuous through the years than that of Vimy Ridge.

There is something which is more deserving of recognition in the gift of the French Republic. It is not so many years ago, as history records time, that Canada was a part of France in the new world, and that, in what was considered enlightened opinion of the day, Canada was referred to as so many acres of snow. To-day, under world conditions as transformed as any the human imagination can well conceive, the Republic of France, in a spirit of gratitude, grants to our Dominion, no longer her possession, not a few acres of land covered with snow, in some

remote and unknown part, but a tract of land, as sacred as any in Europe, consecrated with the blood of human sacrifice of Canada's own sons in the cause of the world's freedom. This is the gift which we to-day as a parliament acknowledge with gratitude to France, and this we do, deeply moved by all that it implies of a close relationship between the British and French people. We recognize in the gift this larger significance, that above and beyond all the changes that time may bring, changes of the past and uncertainties of the present, there is an enduring friendship between the French and the British peoples, which stands for all that is best in the maintenance of human liberty, and the freedom of the world.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my warm approval of this resolution. The site of Vimy is, beyond comparison, of the various battlefields of the war, the most closely associated in the hearts of the Canadian people with all that the war involved in story and in sacrifice. I am moved by one regret, that the feelings of this parliament, as embalmed in the resolution, feelings of undoubted gratitude and appreciation, cannot be expressed, rather than by me, by one who like yourself, Mr. Speaker, or many others assembled here, is linked by memories more sacred with all that sacrifice. I stood on Vimy Ridge four years ago, and again in 1921. As an observer, I could see something of the story of turmoil, of blood, of terror, of heroism, in which the sons of this country bore so conspicuous a part, and I know that Canadians returning there in the years to come, will be filled with feelings of gratitude to the nation for whom the boys of this country fought so gallantly and who, in recognition of all that has been accomplished, have given us this historic site. It is not in any way related to the question of overcoming a difficulty of purchase that we recognize the value of this gift; the significance of it all lies in the feelings that prompted the French parliament and the French people. That is what makes the gift infinitely more valuable than would be its acquirement in any other way.

Since the war ended, in the tragedy of the events that have ensued, differences of view, differences that I cannot help but think are intellectual and intellectual alone, have unfortunately, in some degree, parted the pathways of Britain and of France. I think I can say that notwithstanding differences of conclusion as to methods that have arisen, the heart of Britain is to-day in sympathy with France, and if the test were necessary, would be shown to be in sympathy to a degree equal to that which prompted her efforts in four years of war.

I believe the action of France in this regard will meet with fitting response throughout the whole of this Dominion, and I hope that years will not measure the time before the heart of Canada will be severed from France. We fought that France might be free; we fought as well that Britain might be free; we fought as well that Canada might be free. In the memory of the common struggle and the common sacrifice, we are linked, and linked forever.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I should like, in a few words, to associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this resolution. In these trying days, when troubles surround us on every hand, incidents such as these reveal to us the inherent goodness and kindness of the human heart. I know there is an enduring memorial inscribed in the breasts and hearts of the Canadian people to those splendid men who went overseas and sacrificed so much for us. The passing years will, no doubt, obliterate in some degree the memory of those great gifts bestowed upon the Canadian people, and I rejoice in the fact that there will be erected upon the soil of France a monument to those sons of Canada; and that—lest we forget—that monument will still stand during ages in the future. I also agree that it is fitting that you yourself, Mr. Speaker, should have had a part in the negotiations in connection with this splendid gift which France has seen fit to make to the Canadian people. I will not add any more than to say that I am sure that once again this day we remember with gratitude the heroism and devotion of those who sacrificed their all for the freedom of the world and for the good of our Canadian land.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, Canada, to-day, in the eloquent terms uttered by its Prime Minister, sends forth to France the acknowledgement of its gratitude. The leaders of the other parliamentary parties have associated themselves with these sentiments; perhaps it is befitting that a French voice should join in this unanimous expression of the heartfelt feelings of the Canadian nation. This plot of land that we possess in France has been rendered illustrious and sacred by the heroism of our soldiers, they have written there a page of history that the sons of Canada will always read with pride and emotion. By granting it to us, France wished that it should ever be dedi-

cated and consecrated to the glorious memory of those who came there to fight and die so that she might be free and victorious. It will be a bit of Canadian fatherland in the greater fatherland of France, an everlasting pledge of the sacred union and close friendship which must always subsist between our two countries. Mr. Speaker, it was your acknowledged privilege to negotiate, in the name of Canada, this gratifying concession which was granted to us. On more than one score you were entitled to this honour and you were particularly qualified to make such a request. By granting it, France wished to pay you a personal homage whilst bestowing an honour on our country. I feel fully confident that the monument which will be erected on the historical ridge of Vimy will recall to future generations the great ideal for which our soldiers so valiantly battled. Sixty thousand Canadians had died so as to establish a reign of justice and peace; all fought to prevent any further war and it is our ultimate hope that the civilized nations of the world will respect their sacrifice by not rendering it fruitless and illusory.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that perhaps someone much more worthy than myself would say a word in this connection as representing rather the men who were over there than the people of this country. However, as a returned soldier, as one of those who had the honour of being at Vimy Ridge on April 9, 1917,—and let me assure the House that I say this with no thought whatever of self-glorification—I should like to say a word—although without the authority of the returned soldiers in the matter—by way of associating myself and them with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe), in the acceptance from France of the site for the erection of a monument by this country. I do not think that there has been exaggeration on the part of any of the speakers who have referred to the glorious deeds of the Canadian boys, and I doubt whether any situation could be chosen by the Canadian government, if the choice were left to them, that would be more emblematic of the deeds of the Canadian soldiers than the site which has been offered so generously by the French government to the government of Canada. May I also congratulate you, Sir, on the part you have played in this matter, and express the opinion that you deserve the thanks of this country both as its honourable representative and as one who has made very great personal sacrifices in the promotion of peace and good government in the world. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman through whom the French government made this offer, and I cherish the hope that the erection of this monument may help in some small way to bring about that "parliament of man, the federation of the world," which was so eloquently spoken of by an English poet many years ago.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The spendid gift of the French government, in the negotiation of which you, Mr. Speaker, had such a useful and honourable part, is evidence of the gratitude of the French nation—because I am sure that in this case the gratitude comes not only from the French government but from the people of France as well—for the service which Canada rendered the world in the great war. I rise now only that I may be permitted to mention another incident which illustrates the feeling of the French people. Of course, every Canadian who goes to France now makes if possible a pilgrimage to Vimy, and naturally I did so. And I recall the fact that on the way to Vimy we passed through the town of Cambrai. There the Canadian visitors were met by the mayor and town council of the town who desired to express in a very formal way their recollections of the services rendered by the Canadian soldiers in and about their town, and to give utterance to their gratitude, in order that the Canadian people might learn that the French people were not unmindful of what our soldiers had done. In terms of the warmest commendation they spoke of the service rendered by our men and of the great part they had played in the battles in that stormy region; and then, to mark their feelings in a more tangible way, they brought us a magnificent wreath of flowers that we might use it as expressing their sympathy. It was placed in one of the graveyards, which are too numerous, I am sorry to say, in the Vimy region. I do not know whether this incident was ever recorded in Canada, but it is one of the indications that the part played by the Canadian soldiers in that great drama is fully and gratefully remembered not only by the French government but by the French people as well.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): There will be no resolution introduced into this House at any time with which we shall be more proud to associate ourselves than the one which has just been moved. When we remember the circumstances under which the great war broke upon the world; when we remember

the fear that took possession of us for a time: when we remember the call that went forth to all the world to join in the battle for freedom; when we remember that from among ourselves there went out young men who had known nothing about war, it is not surprising that we wondered at that time whether, when the great trial came in actual battle, our young men would prove equal to the demands that would be made upon them. It was but natural that such a thought should enter our minds, for our boys had had no experience of such events as they were soon called upon to participate in. But when the time came and they were actually face to face with the enemy, they proved, Mr. Speaker, as I believe it will be proved again and again in human history, the falsity of that old Satanic cynicism that "all that a man hath will he give for his life." And should such occasion arise again our men would undoubtedly give similar proof that there are things men hold dearer than life when, in the course of their days, they are called upon to make great decisions, not for life, not for personal honour, nor for glory, but for the cause of God and the cause of right. Our Canadian boys fully met that demand that was made upon them. In all ages men have been pleased to set up stones of commemoration to remind their children of the deeds performed by their forefathers. And for centuries to come there will stand on Vimy Ridge a stone of remembrance to which the French people of future generations will point their children and say: Here is the place where men from far over the seas came in order that they might help us preserve not only for France, not only for Europe, but for the whole world, the great benefits which have been won for us and which we enjoy through our civilization of to-day. Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say it is a proud moment in my life to be able to associate myself with this resolution.

Mr. J. G. ROBICHAUD (Gloucester) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot allow this occasion to pass by without making the voice of the Acadian people heard. If, in the past, the Canadian people had misgivings and underwent sufferings, we, in Acadia, received the crown of martyrdom, and this is the reason why I feel it is my duty to say at least a word in behalf of our dear Acadia.

When the trumpet sounded summoning all the civilized nations of the world to take part in the great war, the Acadians from the Maritime provinces answered the call. In the county of Gloucester, which I have the honour to represent in this House, whole villages answered the call of the Motherland. For instance, in a village numbering twenty-two young men, twenty had fought overseas while the other two had been found unfit for military service.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to mingle my humble voice with those—far more eloquent—we have just heard in order to second this resolution, and, in the future, when the Acadians together with the other elements of the Canadian population will visit "la belle France", they will find there, as it was so happily expressed by the speaker who preceded me, a diminutive fatherland which they can admire.

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING thereupon moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing Their Honours that this House has adopted a resolution approving the Government's acceptance of the gift made by the Government of France of a tract of land on Vimy Ridge for the erection of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian soldiers in the Great War, and requesting that Their Honours will unite with this House in the approval of the said acceptance by filling up the blanks therein with the words "Senate and"

Motion agreed to.

COLD STORAGE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Cold Storage Act, chapter six of the statutes of 1907, and to provide that the Governor in Council may enter into contracts with properly constituted co-operative societies or associations, for the construction, equipment and maintenance in efficient working order of public cold storage warehouses in Canada equipped with mechanical refrigeration, and suitable for the preservation of any food product.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject matter of the resolution and recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The bill to be introduced shortly, based upon this resolution, is an amendment to the Cold Storage Act of 1907 and the amendments thereto. The act provided for certain subsidies to encourage the construction of cold storage plants throughout Canada. During the first few years after its enactment very little advantage was taken of these subsidies. However, as the people become more familiar with the act, and less fearful of cold storage, advantage was taken

of the opportunities offered by that legislation, and during the war still greater advantage was taken. After the war, in 1919, the government of the day, and, I think, quite correctly, amended the act and made it apply to municipal cold storages only. Before that it applied to all and sundry, but the activity under it began to absorb a good deal of money to pay the subsidies earned. In the meantime the local authorities went ahead with the construction of a cold storage plant at Montreal, and we now have one of the best plants at that harbour to be found on this continent. But that was four years ago, and in the interval no subsidies have been earned under the amendment providing for the encouragement of municipal cold storage plants. It would appear as if municipalities are not anxious to construct cold storage plants even with this encouragement. Only one other municipality has attempted to comply with the act, but up to date it has not got sufficiently far on to earn the first instalment of the subsidy, neither do I know if it ever will be able to reach that point.

Mr. HANSON: What plant is that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: At Sydney, Cape Breton. In view of that, Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when we should amend this act so that it will function. The proposal is to make these subsidies apply to co-operative cold storage plants. This is an age of co-operation, as to the advantages of which, however, there is some difference of opinion. A certain number of municipal cold storage plants had been constructed before the act was amended in 1919. Now, it is proposed to revert, though not entirely, to the old act of 1907, which applied to all kinds of cold storage plants, including those constructed by private enterprise. The proposed amendment will make the act applicable to co-operative cold storage plants, preferably to those of a non-profit-making character that pay out a portion at least of their profits to their patrons in proportion to the business they have brought to their respective plants.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it intended to apply to municipal cold storage plants?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That would be a matter for the committee to consider. Personally I do not think it should; the application to municipal cold storage plants has been given a fair trial, and nobody seems to want it. These municipal plants have not, perhaps, been so successful as to justify our subsidizing them, but I suppose there would not be much objection to retaining that option in the bill. I do not feel strongly on the question, though. The point is that the Cold Storage Act should be permitted to function some way, preferably in the direction of co-operative activity.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): On what basis is it proposed to distribute these subsidies?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They will be distributed on the basis of the old act—in four annual instalments, at the rate of 30 per cent of the cost of construction.

Mr. SALES: Do I understand the minister to say that there was no change in the act until 1919?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There was an unimportant change in 1909.

Mr. SALES: Was there no suspension of the act until 1919?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The act was made to apply to municipal cold storages only. It was not a suspension, but it had that effect.

Mr. SALES: The minister is, of course, aware of the conditions in Saskatchewan. I understand that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery undertook work at Saskatoon and at Melville, at considerable expense. They did not get the assistance they expected to get under the act, and they consequently ran into difficulties. Has the minister any information on that subject?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend is not correctly informed. The erection of that cold storage plant was started by a private institution; it was subsequently purchased by the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery as a going concern, and they went on with the construction. The government of that day decided that the subsidy should follow the new ownership, and the company received $32,400 on that account. The cubic measurement of the building was 98,832 feet, and the total cost of construction was $108,000.

4 p.m.

Mr. SALES: Can the minister give me the figures for Melville as well?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was after the suspension, as my hon. friend calls it, that the Melville cold storage plant was constructed.

Mr. ANDERSON: This amendment will not interfere with any private persons going into the abattoir or cold storage business as a joint stock company?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. ANDERSON: The words are used here, "properly constituted co-operative societies or associations." What is the minister's idea of a properly constituted co-operative society?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, there are differences of opinion as to what constitutes co-operation. Some people take the ground that ordinary joint stock companies with benevolent intention may be looked upon as co-operative, and frequently they are so classed —not without jurisdiction. Strictly speaking, a co-operative organization is one which distributes at least part of its profits. But the intention is to make the definition elastic. If we make a rigid definition in the act we may find that it will not apply to certain enterprises that may be quite worthy. The matter will be determined, therefore, by regulations that are flexible and may be changed from time to time.

Mr. BRISTOL: Will incorporated companies be shut out by this amendment?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Joint stock companies?

Mr. BRISTOL: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not necessarily. That will be a proper subject for consideration by the committee—whether a co-operative concern may be defined as a body organized in the ordinary way under the Companies Act.

Mr. BRISTOL: I think incorporated companies are excluded now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Everything is excluded now except municipal plants—though not, of course, in the original act.

Mr. HODGINS: Are the provinces giving any assistance along this line?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not that I know of. Perhaps some of the members from British Columbia would be better able to answer that. I believe that the British Columbia government has assisted the fruit industry by certain loans, but I do not think any subsidies are paid. Hon. Manning Doherty, of Ontario, has it in mind to introduce a bill—if indeed, he has not already done so—providing for provincial assistance to cold storage plants by way of loan, but not, I believe, by way of subsidy.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If this resolution carries in its present form, how will it be possible in committee to enlarge it to include incorporated companies? It seems to me we should insert the words "or other companies" so that the Committee on Agriculture will have power to enlarge it if they see fit.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a proper question, but the idea is not to tie ourselves down to anything too specific. The explanation now being given is of a general character, and the details can be dealt with either in the Committee on Agriculture, or later in Committee of the Whole. I think it is the custom, as a matter of expediency, to first introduce a resolution that is to be the basis of a bill. As to the details I do not think we should be tied right down hard and fast at this stage. The bill itself is ready, I think.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if this resolution passes we are absolutely debarred from enlarging the scope of the bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is not my understanding. I have often wondered why it was necessary to introduce a resolution at all, because you have to go over the same ground on the second reading, but we have to follow this procedure as a matter of parliamentary practice. However, the passage of the resolution is not supposed to tie us down in the matter of the changing of the bill at a subsequent stage. The second reading of a bill simply expresses the approval of the House on the general principles embodied in the measure. Then you go into committee and the details of the bill are dealt with. That is the procedure as I understand it.

Mr. HODGINS: I would draw attention to the expense which the proposed legislation will involve if it is taken advantage of all over the country. It has always seemed to me that it is our duty to provide for terminal facilities, but to make provision for co-operative associations all over the country will involve tremendous expense.

Mr. TOLMIE: The cold storage principle has rendered valuable service in connection with our range beef production in the West, and is of great utility at the present time in connection with our fruit industry, particularly as regards shipments for a distance where it is necessary to pre-cool the fruit. I would ask the minister to define the kind of company whose business would be of sufficient importance to entitle it to a grant. How many tons output would he consider necessary before such a company could receive aid?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the past the act has provided that mechanical storage must be supplied. The cubic contents of the building has not been defined nor yet the total cost upon which to base the subsidy

As I understand the working of the act in the past, the grant has been made in the case of a business sufficiently developed to want to establish a mechanical cold storage, or that would be sufficiently large to justify the erection of such a plant. Compliance must be made with the conditions on which the grant is earned, by the installation of mechanical cold storage. The plans and specifications have to be supplied to the Department of Agriculture before the grant is made. I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Tolmie) that if a provision as to minimum size was necessary it could be inserted in the bill. It has not, however, proved to be necessary in the past because the stipulations with regard to mechanical storage have taken care of it.

Mr. TOLMIE: Will the application of joint stock companies and municipalities for cold storage be included?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Personally I do not think so. At the same time I shall seek the advice and counsel of the committee later on in regard to these details. I may say to the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) that the first cold storage plant taken over by the co-operative creameries in the West was one that was constructed in Regina and operated municipally. It was a magnificent failure, and it was with a great deal of trepidation that the co-operative creameries took it over, because they were afraid that the bad reputation it had earned in the past would follow it under the new ownership. Notwithstanding that, twelve months after they took it over and operated it on a business basis, they made it pay. I would not like to condemn cold storage in all individual cases. As a general rule, however, they have not been successful, and I could not advise, from my knowledge of them, that we should grant subsidies in all such cases, particularly as money is so scarce at the present time.

Mr. SPENCE: As I view the matter the municipalities are to be deprived of the right of taking advantage of this grant for cold storage purposes, and it looks as though this assistance was intended to be limited to co-operative societies. That, I think, would be an actual injustice. I claim that the municipality has just the same right as any co-operative organization in this matter. I would like to know specifically from the minister where he intends to establish these cold storages and what existing co-operative societies they are intended to benefit. What is the idea underlying this legislation?

Mr. CARROLL: Some years ago I interested myself in the matter of cold storage—

Mr. SPENCE: If my hon. friend will pardon me, I asked the minister where he intended to establish these cold storages and if the co-operative societies sought to be aided are in existence.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In answer to the hon. member's last question I would say that they are not in existence. The regulations stipulate that the institution must be established before a subsidy can be paid. As to where they are going to be established that is something with which we have nothing to do at all, it rests with those who are going into the enterprise whoever they may be. They can get together and put up an institution of this description, and when they comply with the regulations and the law they will get their subsidy. I think my hon. friend wants to know whether the bill, when passed, will be retroactive, and whether it will apply to institutions of any description? I hope it will not be retroactive because the dear knows where that would lead us. It would not be encouraging anything new at all, it would be subsidizing something already in existence. Consequently the law will apply to new plants, or possibly the extension of old ones. That will give additional accommodation and service to the country. As to including municipal cold storages, in view of the fact that this grant has been held out as a drawing card for four years to the municipalities of Canada to influence them to construct cold storage plants, and has not resulted in one earning a dollar under it, and in view of the doubtful reputation that these institutions have as an economic success, surely we would not be justified in continuing such aid, but we should rather take such moneys as we have at our disposal and develop something else that is more urgently required at the present time—that is, the co-operative institution.

Mr. MORRISON: During the last four years municipalities have been going through a series of hard times, and have been hearing that word "economy" a little bit in their midst. They are all overtaxed, and the people have been crying for rigid economy, and perhaps that has militated against municipalities taking advantage of this act. I for one would not exclude them from the benefits of the act, but I am not much of an advocate for subsidizing anything. In the past the system has been abused, and the people have had to pay for it. If it was desired to help the cold storage business the government might consider the matter of

facilitating a good credit system. That would be more advantageous and would not cost the country anything. If those who are engaged in co-operative movements had a good line of credit supplied to them on security, they should be able to get along. With reference to people who are co-operating for their mutual benefit, I do not believe in giving anybody something for nothing. My experience is that it is bad practice. I believe in giving them credit facilities, and if they obtain those facilities and cannot manage their business, I do not know why they should manage it on the public money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The benefit of cold storage facilities is so great that it seems to me remarkable that greater advantage has not been taken of the opportunities offered. My recollection of the situation as it was in 1919 is that the co-operative companies who had earned the bonus which was given by the government did not afford the facilities to the public that the Cold Storage Act was intended to afford, and it was hoped that by confining it to municipal bodies the general public would have access to the facilities afforded by cold storage. It appears that there has not been very much done along that line during the past few years. I would like to ask the minister: Will those who do not belong to co-operative companies be permitted to use the cold storage plant, provided they pay for it? I would like to know whether the public are being safeguarded in that respect.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that is the intention, although I might say that after the subsidies are all paid it will not be an easy matter. It is difficult for the federal authorities to extend jurisdiction over certain activities, and this is one of them. As a rule these institutions are very submissive to federal control as long as any unpaid subsidies are still due them, but after the final payment has been made, I think no method has been discovered of controlling them to the extent some people want. You can control the rates, but just to what extent you can control them and say what amount of space shall be allotted to the public is hard to say. There is some doubt about our constitutional right to so control those institutions. That is a matter that we run up against in the administration of several of our acts—the Grain Act, for instance, and several others. So far as we have jurisdiction, we propose to have control over these institutions.

Mr. ANDERSON: Has there been any demand from the co-operative companies for cold storage plants, and if so where did it come from?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On the spur of the moment, the only one I can name—although I can recall discussing it with many farmers—is the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, Hon. Manning Doherty. People would come and ask what is being done in the matter of cold storage; I would refer them to the act, and on further discussion I would have to admit no money was being spent over it. I have to take the responsibility of asking for money here in parliament, and I do not want to come back here year after year and say that I am not spending the money. The act must be made to function, or we might as well let it lapse. In fact, it has been lapsing. I have personal knowledge that these subsidies in the past have been given to co-operative storages, and in answer to the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Morrison) I think if my hon. friend had his money invested in cold storage plants a few years ago, and had to administer the cold storage plant, with the sentiment that existed in the country at that time against cold storage and cold storage produce, he would find he would not get very large return on his investment, and some form of assistance and encouragement in the way of a subsidy would be required to get him to put his money into it at all. That has been my experience. Of late years people have become more familiar with cold storage and not so alarmed about it. I did not care to state any reduction in this resolution, but I intended to raise the question whether so high a rate of subsidy as 30 per cent was required to encourage people to take advantage of the act at this time—possibly 25 per cent would be enough. That would be a fluctuating matter, and I am not committed to it in any way, in fact, I think it could be argued that if it required 30 per cent of the cost of construction to encourage a man to go into the cold storage business fifteen years ago, it could easily be argued that 25 per cent should be enough now. These are details and this is not exactly the proper time to go into them, but I have no objection, if the hon. members desire, to taking the matter up.

Mr. MILLAR: What security, if any, is it proposed the government should take? If one of these co-operative associations should become financially embarrassed and close its doors, what security would the government have for the money advanced?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is not a loan but a subsidy, and none of it will have to be paid

till after the building is constructed and the store is open for business. If the company should fail, and cease to give the service, we would not go ahead with the payments. That is one reason why the instalments are divided into four.

Mr. MORRISON: I would like to suggest to the minister that, instead of giving a subsidy, he should give a loan. Then he would have control of the service for all time. When these people refuse to give patrons reasonably good service, if they were to get notice that their loan expired, I think it would be a pretty good equalizer for a government that is participating in this building business. You need to have some control over your money invested, and I think the government, as representing the people and putting up the people's money, should have a say in the service, and that would be a leverage for the government.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that is a very proper suggestion.

Mr. CARROLL: With reference to the control of cold storage warehouses, I think it is time that this government and parliament, if they are giving any sums of money, whether large or small, towards the establishment, maintenance and working of cold storages in this country, should have some control, at least as regards the health of the people. I believe that cold storage has done considerable good for Canada. On the other hand, I fear that people who have taken advantage of the Cold Storage Act of 1907 have not given as much attention as they should to the care of the products put into the cold storage warehouses. Some question has arisen as regards the jurisdiction of this parliament to make regulations governing cold storage. I have in my hand an opinion given by the Deputy Minister of Justice in 1919, in which he expresses grave doubts as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to make general regulations regarding cold storage. On the other hand, he does express an opinion that this government may make regulations regarding the goods that go into cold storage, as affecting the health of the people of Canada. When this bill comes down, I think I shall take the opportunity of moving some amendment which will preserve, to some small extent at least, the health of the people. There is no doubt in the world that articles of cold storage have been foisted upon the public as being fresh. I do not know whether that is a criminal action or not, but it is absolutely wrong. In the first place, cold storage articles should be so labelled that persons who are using them may know exactly what they are getting. In the second place, regulations should be made governing the removal of articles from cold storage to an outside wholesale place, for example, because there is no doubt that such a change is calculated to injure the article, if it is meat or any farm product. As I said before, I did not have an opportunity of telling the minister my opinions upon this matter; but I mention to him now that when this bill comes before the House, I shall be prepared with some amendments to the Cold Storage Act of 1907, in addition to the ones which he has brought down in this resolution.

There seems to be some doubt whether or not municipal corporations have a right to take advantage of the act of 1907, and to get the 30 per cent which this and other governments have given to persons going into the cold storage business. As a matter of fact, the Cold Storage Act of 1907 placed no limitation upon people or corporations that decided to take advantage of it. The Governor-in-Council accepted applications from municipal corporations and private corporations. If in the good judgment of the Governor-in-Council, applicants could properly carry on a cold storage business, they gave them 30 per cent of the cost of building and equipment. It may be interesting to note that, prior to the outbreak of the war, a sum amounting to $722,506 was paid to persons and corporations that took advantage of the Cold Storage Act. For one year after the war there was only one applicant, and the government of that day thought it was time they should place a limit upon persons or corporations to whom this advantage should be given. I find Order in Council, P.C. No. 1103 of the year 1919, which recounts various transactions, amounts of money paid, and so on, in connection with cold storage, and one of the closing paragraphs states:

> In view of the above, it would appear inadvisable to continue the payment of subsidies, except in the case of warehouses to be erected by municipal or other public governing bodies.

I am not prepared to say what the effect of that order in council is as against a statute; but at least it shows what the policy of the government was at that time. It shows also that the government of the day had particularly in view the matter of extending those privileges of cold storage to municipal corporations or other public governing bodies. I am afraid the matter of administration of cold storage under the act of 1907 has not been exactly what it should be. I take the same stand as the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Morrison), that if this government is going to contribute sums of money, large or small,

to help out private individuals, municipal corporations, public bodies or others, for the public good, it should have absolute control over the general working out of that scheme. Unless this government is amply aware of the fact that it has the power to make regulations which will give it control over such bodies, I am afraid I am one of those who will be obliged to vote against the resolution of the Minister of Agriculture. We must not be hampered by laws as to jurisdiction; we must not be hampered in respect to technicalities. I think I know one way of getting over the legal technicality suggested by Mr. Newcombe, and that is to introduce a new bill to amend the Cold Storage Act. Instead of making regulations which may or may not have the force of law, this parliament has ample and plenary jurisdiction to pass an amendment to the Cold Storage Act to preserve the rights of this government, this parliament and this country in the matter of cold storage. I would suggest to the minister that he should ask the law officers of his department or the law officers of the Justice department what their opinion is regarding my suggestion, because we, as legislators here, should realize to the full that the time has come when, if we are going to distribute public moneys over this country, we should have a great deal to say as to the purposes for which they are to be expended, and the regulations under which they are to be expended.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The point brought up by my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) is a very important one. Shortly after I came down here, I took this matter up with the Deputy Minister of Justice. I had been familiar, in a general way, with the limitations of the federal laws with respect to matters of trade in provinces and similar matters, but I was not sufficiently familiar with them to have any opinion worth while on the subject. In discussing the question of making amendments to the Cold Storage Act, we very soon ran up against the limitation to which the hon. member refers. Since then, on further consultation with the Deputy Minister of Justice, we think we have discovered a solution. I was not intending to discuss it and I do not think I should discuss it here, because the matter is still in a tentative state. I think it will work out. It is along the line of supplementary legislation on the part of the provinces. That is, one way of getting over the difficulty is that to the extent that we have not authority, they, if they are willing, delegate to us that authority. The solution is not sufficiently advanced to discuss it any further just now than to say that I have the matter in mind, and I hope, before any cold storage institutions are established and are eligible to draw any subsidies, the solution will be at hand. We shall have to act on faith in the meantime. I think we should get the advantages of these subsidies; I think corporate institutions require to be built, not only in the dairy industry, but even more in the fruit industry, for example, in the Annapolis valley and in British Columbia. If we find that we cannot control these institutions—but I think we can—we can consider some subsequent action to take. I think, after that statement, I may hope for the support of my hon. friend. I recognize the limitations that the law had before, and I can see the absurdity of subsidizing an institution, if after the last instalment is paid, you have not full control. We hope that we have found a solution that will meet the situation; otherwise I would not be unfolding this proposition to the House to-day. As my hon. friend (Mr. Sales) knows, we have had some experience with these matters, and fortunate, too, notwithstanding the limitations. But we were working from the provincial standpoint then; now we are dealing with the matter federally. In reply to my hon. friend from Weyburn (Mr. Morrison), I might explain that when we started to prepare the bill we had the alternative of either a loan or a subsidy. Now, it is not considered quite the thing for a new minister to upset the work of his predecessor to too great an extent at the beginning, and as a compromise with that idea I at first thought of giving assistance in the shape of 15 per cent of a loan and an equal amount by way of subsidy, the loan of course returnable, the subsidy not. However, on more mature consideration I thought it best to re-introduce the matter in the same old way, and as time went on we could make any necessary changes. Personally, I do not like the idea of the federal government going into the loaning business; and if we were to give a loan I should have to consult the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who I am sure would be obliged to weigh the matter very carefully. On the other hand, the subsidy basis was established away back in 1907, and we thought it would be best just to make the old act begin to function again. That, no doubt, was taking the line of least resistance, but I think that in that direction we may hope for the best results in the immediate future. As time goes on modifications can be introduced. I am ready to modify the act now and accept

my hon. friend's suggestion of half loan and half subsidy, or, if he likes, all loan. But I question very much whether the Minister of Finance would care to take up the loaning proposition, and I do not want to run counter to his views on an important matter like this that devolves so largely on his shoulders. For the present I prefer the subsidy. Government loaning of money, even in the provincial arena, has never appealed strongly to me. I believe that people can get into debt easily enough through the ordinary channels without becoming obligated to their respective governments, with all the objections that are implied in such relationships. And there are a whole lot of objections to governments loaning money to people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I desire to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). In 1914 an order in council was passed safeguarding to a certain extent the rights of the general public. I believe it was the original intention of those who drafted the act to afford the public every access to the cold storage plants that were receiving bonuses from the government; and an order in council to that effect provides that owners of cold storage warehouses with whom contracts have been entered into for the payment of subsidies shall give refrigerator space to the public when such space is available. The minister said he doubted whether control could be exercised over these cold storage warehouses after the subsidy had been earned. But this order in council goes so far as to provide a penalty of $50 in any case where the public are denied cold storage space when spare space is available. So that I think the rights of the general public can be safeguarded. As to "co-operative associations," I think the word "co-operative" is very misleading as applied to many organizations to-day. As a matter of fact, the great majority of the organizations known as co-operative associations are in effect joint stock companies. I know of some that are nothing else than joint stock companies; and no doubt when the bill is under consideration in committee we shall have a clearer definition of just what co-operative companies are. I merely want to point out, however, that control has been exercised in the past over the plants that have received a bonus from the government, and evidently the amendment passed in 1919 was intended to make it clear beyond doubt that it was the general public who were being taken care of rather than the joint stock companies, the co-operative associations, or any other organization of that kind.

Mr. THOMPSON: The minister might explain what a properly constituted co-operative society is. In the past, and particularly during the last two years, we have had some experience with co-operative societies in Ontario. I have in my hand the Trade Bulletin of February 2nd, and I shall quote briefly from it. In this journal, which is described as "a national business newspaper", there appears the following:

> Insufficient business was given as one of the reasons for failure by 200 farmers' buying and selling associations out of a total of 243 organizations which have ceased to function since 1913, a survey by the United States Department of Agriculture shows. Some of the other reasons given were, inefficient management by 148 organizations, insufficient capital by 73, over extension of credit by 35, dishonest management by 29 and concentrated control of the organization in the hands of a few members by 12.
>
> The organizations included creameries and cheese factories, co-operative stores, fruit and vegetable associations, grain elevators, cotton organizations, tobacco organizations and miscellaneous co-operative associations. Of 219 organizations, 70 were creameries and cheese factories having an average life of 7.69 years; 20 were cotton associations with an average of 5.23 years; 37 were co-operative stores with an average life of 4.78 years; 38 were grain elevators with an average life of 4.39 years; 4 were tobacco associations with an average life of 4.25 years; 46 were fruit and vegetable associations with an average life of 3.07 years, and 4 were miscellaneous co-operative associations with an average life of 1.54 years. Of the organizations which failed, 170 were incorporated. Of the associations, 168 had capital stock and 58 organizations had no capital stock.

Until these co-operative societies are on a more stable basis the government I think would do well to be very careful in the spending of money along this line. Speaking for myself, I am opposed to the subsidizing of cold storage companies. The hon. minister stated that the reason for the change in the act of 1919 was the fact that it had ceased to function, that municipalities were not taking advantage of the act. The hon. minister has also stated that there has been no demand from co-operative societies. The government, it seems to me, is too anxious to spend money. We heard a lot yesterday about economy and I think they would be well advised to practise economy. For my part, I am opposed to expenditure along these lines. I am opposed to discriminating against the municipalities in favour of the co-operative societies.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 9 to amend the Cold Storage Act, 1907.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LIVE STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting Live Stock, and to provide for the establishment and regulation of live stock exchanges in connection with stock-yards, the making and amending of by-laws, the issuing of licenses for commission merchants, the creation of Exporters' Associations, the regulation and issuing of licenses therefor, the equipment and regulation of stock-yards, the fixing of tariffs of fees therefor, the prescribing of general regulations of stock-yards by the Governor in Council, the requirements for shipping of live stock, the creation of inspectors and the providing for ports of importation; and to provide penalties for violations of the Act.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, the bill that is to be introduced, based upon this resolution, is a consolidation of the Live Stock and Produce Act of some years ago and all the amendments thereto. The new features of the bill are important though not numerous.

First, the bill provides for the removal of members of live stock exchanges when they are expelled by their fellow-members. In the past, live stock exchanges, although able to discipline members for misdemeanors, have had no authority to carry their decisions into effect. This provision will give the Department of Agriculture the necessary authority to carry out the wishes of live stock exchanges in that respect.

The bill also provides for the establishment of an egg-breaking plant to take care of inferior eggs, of which there are always some in Canada. A good many of these eggs in the past have been imported from China for baking purposes. We think now we have sufficient domestic supply of these eggs to satisfy our own requirements if they are taken care of in such a plant, where after being broken they are dried or frozen.

Exporters' associations are also provided for. As soon as the cattle embargo is taken off by the British authorities we expect our present exporters' associations will be supplemented by the organization of others, and by this amendment these institutions are brought within the provisions of the act.

We also propose to supervise imports of live stock and live stock products as to grading and such like to see that they comply with the standards set up under our own grading system.

I think that in a general way outlines the main features of the bill, which, after all, is largely a consolidation of the laws that we already have, merely supplementing them by giving additional authority to the department. It is not a money bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do I understand that the words "to provide for the creation of Exporters' Associations" do not apply to the department, or is it the intention of the government to organize such associations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is intended only to supervise the regulations of these associations and by incorporating them in our own regulations thus giving them the authority of law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The wording of the resolution is "to provide for the creation of Exporters' Associations."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have a number of these associations now, but they are more or less disjointed, and we are providing for them to be recognized as legally constituted institutions. We have found a disposition in certain of our live stock yards to challenge our authority over their administration. The purpose of these changes is to make it quite clear that the Department of Agriculture has full jurisdiction over them, and that when any violations of the regulations occur we can give full effect to the law. In a word, our intention is to put the O.K. of parliament on the by-laws and regulations of these organizations and so incorporate them as part of the regulations of the department.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it proposed to provide against discrimination in the unloading of cars at stockyards throughout Canada? In some cases railway companies have to unload the stock in the yards of competing companies, and I could produce evidence to show that where a railway sends its stock into the yard of a competing company, say after six o'clock at night, and the company owning the yard brings its stock in perhaps in the middle of the night or early in the morning, the company that owns the yard sees to it that its stock is unloaded first. I was wondering whether provision would be made in the bill to do away with that discrimination.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If this has to do with alleged discrimination on the part of railways, I should think it would have to be taken up in connection with the provisions of the Railway Act. I will make a note of what my hon. friend says and see whether such a provision can be incorporated in the bill, but I do not think it can.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that the Minister take the matter up and consider it care-

fully, because it is very important. He can readily understand that one railway can discriminate very severely against another in this respect, and that is not a very satisfactory condition so far as stock-raising is concerned. I would ask the minister also whether under the provisions of the bill it will be possible for an owner to take his own stock into one of these yards and sell it on his own account if he so desires, after he has paid the necessary tolls and fees. Further, will it be possible for a farmer desiring to buy, say, a carload of stockers, to go into one of these stock-yards and buy from a farmer who may have stock there, without having to consult the commission men?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister has stated that some of these exporters' associations are in process of organization in Ontario.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In eastern Ontario and Montreal.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will this legislation affect the individual shipper?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These associations are organized bodies of shippers, having mutual benefit in view, like any other organization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: And they are to be licensed by the department?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They will have to submit to certain regulations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The individual shipper will not have to submit to those regulations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He will have to submit to the regulations in connection with this bill. Of course, the provisions with regard to the exporters' associations will not apply to those who do not belong to them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: A year ago we had quite a discussion on the live stock business of this country, and the minister stated that certain persons were employed by the department who might have to do with the exportation of Canadian live stock. Has it been on the recommendation of some of the persons engaged by the department that these provisions have been enacted?

5 p.m.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As a rule, all these enactments are the result of recommendations made by those who are interested in the matters concerned, and who know what the rquirements are.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is provision being made to prevent the exportation of any particular classes of live stock?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know of any.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: About a year ago, I believe it was, great hopes were held out for the building up of an export trade in live stock to South America. Has anything developed along that line?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. TOLMIE: The resolution refers to provision for ports of importation. I may point out that we already have certain ports through which live stock may enter Canada from foreign countries. These are well defined in connection with the work of the Health of Animals Branch and the operation of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. Are these words used here in connection with the working of this bill only?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 10, to Amend and Consolidate the Acts respecting Live Stock.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT AND FRUIT CONTAINERS

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers, and to provide for the fixing of grades for fruit in closed packages, and apples, crabapples and pears in boxes; for the marking and repacking of fruits grown in Canada; for the packing and branding of such fruit; for the regulation of dimensions of all packages, barrels and other containers of fruit; for the defining of the powers of inspectors; for the different penalties in consequence of the violations of the Act; and for the procedure to be followed in the enforcement of the Act and of the penalties prescribed.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may say briefly that the new provisions of this legislation were asked for last year by the various fruit grower's organizations throughout Canada, but the request came in too late to be opera-

tive during last year's fruit season and so the bill was not brought into force at that time. Now it has been again asked for, and we are bringing in a consolidated bill taking care of all the amendments, numbering some five or six, which have been made since the passage of the original act, known as the Fruit Marks Act, I think in 1901. The proposed bill in its entirety was asked for and agreed to by the different interests involved, including the growers and packers of fruit, the wholesale dealers, and all parties directly concerned in the fruit industry. The principal changes deal with the size of container. It has been found that our berry containers are only about four-fifths of the size of the American containers, and the result is that the surplus of our crop that is shipped to the United States has to be presented on that market in smaller containers than the United States containers, and consequently appears at a disadvantage. The request has also been made for a package of apples containing one-half of a barrel. It is said by those in the trade that many sales could be made of half a barrel when a full barrel could not be sold. It is therefore proposed to make provision for a container equal to the contents of half a barrel. None of these changes will take place arbitrarily until the year 1924. All material that is now cut awaiting manufacture into containers of the present size may be used in the meantime if so desired.

The bill will provide for a new grading of apples. Our apple growers have found that with apples graded as No. 1 and No. 2 they are regarded as inferior when competing with fruit styled "fancy", and "extra fancy" as it is styled in the United States. Now it is often said there is nothing in a name, but having had something to do with the naming of our grades of wheat under the standards board many years ago, and even quite recently, I know there is something in a name. I know that if an article on the market is given a bad name it is handicapped with a bad getaway. Accordingly it is proposed to make a new grade for some of our fruits, particularly our apples, and also to have new-sized containers so that they will compete favourably on the American market when we ship any of our apples over there. I think that covers fairly well all the contemplated new provisions of the bill all of which, as I have already explained, were agreed to by the conference that met in Ottawa last February. The only thing that those attending the conference were not unanimous on at first was with respect to the size of berry boxes, but even in that matter they eventually reconciled their difference, and unanimously made the recommendations which I have outlined.

Mr. BROWN: In the proposed legislation is it made any easier for those who buy fruit and find they have been deceived in the grade to secure redress? I know that sometimes when we used to buy apples by the car load and distribute them co-operatively, we would find they were not up to standard, and it was almost impossible to get any redress, despite the fact that there were regulations in effect.

Mr. CALDWELL: Were those British Columbia apples?

Mr. BROWN: I shall not tell you where they came from.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I may say, the producers were in strong force at the conference referred to, but I cannot recall whether the consumers as a body were represented. I think they were, I believe I have a list of the representatives here.

Mr. BROWN: It is the consumers I am thinking of in this respect.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will bear with me for a moment I think I have a list here of all those who were present at that conference. I observe that those represented were—the growers' shipping organizations, the wholesale dealers, the barrel manufacturers, the box manufacturers, the basket manufacturers, and others including nurserymen and retailers. I am sorry to admit that the unfortunate consumer does not seem to have been represented. Therefore, if my hon. friend has any representations to make on the consumers' behalf I will be very pleased to take it up in committee. My proposal is that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture where we shall have lots of time to thresh out the contemplated legislation in detail.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if it is the intention of his department to change the marking of the Canadian package to conform to the marking in use, for example, in the state of Washington, where they have "extra fancy," "fancy" and so on, and to eliminate from our law the provision requiring that the grades be No. 1 and No. 2?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We propose to make the change in accordance with what the grade may be over there. If the committee decides that to use the names "extra fancy"

and "fancy," as in the United States is preferable to our system of grading apples as No. 1 and No. 2, then, of course, the packages will be marked accordingly.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I repeat my question—is it the intention to make the grades here the same as the United States grade, "extra fancy," "fancy," "choice" and so on?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, I thought I had made that quite plain.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 11, to regulate the sale and inspection of fruit and fruit containers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SEED INSPECTION

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to regulate the testing, inspection and sale of seeds, and to provide for the regulation of the sale of clover, grasses, seed grain and fodder seeds, rape, field root and garden vegetable seeds in lots of over one pound, of one pound or less, and of seeds for export when purporting to have been inspected and graded; for the regulation of the importation of seeds; for the fixing of the powers and duties of inspectors, the time limit for complaints, the method of taking official samples, of making official reports and the publication of the same: for the fixing of penalties in connection with the violation of the act, the liability of certain purchasers, the costs of proceedings, the rights of civil process, and the evidence acceptable in all cases.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should like to make a short explanation. The original Seed Control Act was passed in 1905. It was preceded by two years of considerable educational work and some opposition. When the bill finally did pass—I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will recall the circumstance—it caused a great deal of discussion and was a long while going through the House. It was the first and the most advanced act of its kind up to that date. However, it stood the test of time until finally in 1911 it was replaced by a new act embodying certain new features and bringing the legislation up to date. That act of 1911 has not been amended since and it is proposed that its place shall be taken by the bill based on the resolution now before the committee. Hon. members will naturally ask: In what respect does it differ? In 1911, when the last act was passed, it was the most advanced act of this nature. Other countries have however come up to its provisions, and are now a little in advance of us. That is one argument why we should again take the act of 1911 and make it the basis of a new act. It is rather significant that the act has continued for this length of time and has never been amended, but instead of being amended from time to time it is now being repealed, and a new act has been framed containing the portions of the old act that were found to be good with such amendments as are deemed necessary.

The old act made the grading of grass and clover seeds obligatory. The new act extends that principle and makes the grading of cereals obligatory when sold in the ordinary way by the dealers, but it does not interfere with trading transactions between farmers. That is distinctly understood. If a farmer goes into the seed grain business and goes into advertising he will have to comply with the act, but with reference to transactions between farmers it does not affect them in any way whatever.

With regard to the grading of clover and grasses, the standards are fixed by statute exactly as the grades of wheat are. Then, with regard to the grading of cereals, in order to take care of the fluctuations in climatic conditions, the grades are fixed by an advisory board from year to year, in the same way as the standards board in the West regulates the standard grades of grain. I think my hon. friends from the West will understand the distinction. I will go more fully into it when the bill is in committee, but it is the same principle that obtains in regard to our commercial grains in the West. The grade of seed clover is fixed by statute and the cereals are regulated by the advisory board in the same manner as the commercial grades are regulated by the standards board. The law also provides for an advisory board which can be referred to from time to time instead of going to parliament for legislation as to details.

There is a departure here which I would like to put before the committee, as it was inserted entirely at the instance of the seedsmen and producers who were here about three weeks ago in conference on this question. Many of the members of the committee will recall at some time or other new varieties of grain being thrown on the market, given fancy names, advertised extensively, and sold at fabulous prices, when they probably had no commercial value whatever. I am sure there is not a farmer in the committee who has not been stung at some time in respect to some of these varieties of grain or grasses, particularly grain, because in order to prevent the exploitation, not only of farm-

ers but of others, good business demands that before any new variety of cereals be put on the market, advertised and sold it be tried out as to its merits at some of our experimental farms. Then, if proven to be good, the introducers or originators are permitted to sell it to the public. We have that principle recognized in certain provinces in connection with the floating of joint stock companies and wildcat schemes. These proposals have to go before a local government board in some provinces before they can sell stock, and this resolution is simply carrying out that principle. I can see disadvantage, but I can also see some advantages. There was a wheat called Alaska sold very extensively in the West as being a fabulous producer, running up as high as 100 bushels to the acre. It had its day and passed away. We grow older but I am not sure that we always grow wiser. Somehow the next fellow who comes along will get somebody else. The idea is to provide against a repetition of that and incidentally to keep up the reputation of our seed merchants that are doing a legitimate business. The conference recommended this; it was in the original bill. When the bill comes before the committee I will be glad to have the benefit of the advice of those who are most concerned and I shall leave myself with an open mind as to whether such a provision shall be incorporated in the bill or not. There is one disadvantage. Take a real bona fide plant breeder who is developing a new variety; it may have a rather restraining and discouraging effect on him if he finds he has to put the results of his experiments in the hands of someone else for a year or two before he can place his product on the market. On the other hand if he believed his product was good, it should be a tremendously valuable medium of advertising to him if, after having tried it for two years on an experimental farm, he found that it was a good thing and he could sell it like hotcakes. So the matter has two sides to it, and I will leave it there with the committee at the present time. It is one of those details which I do not think I should mention at this stage, except that I want the committee to think about it between now and the time when we discuss it more fully in committee.

Provision is made in the bill to protect the quality of our seeds for export so that our reputation abroad will be safeguarded. We want our certificate to be as good as our bond, so that when we say that our seeds are so-and-so and they are accompanied by a certificate, the goods will be found to be the same as the certificate says. The same may be said with regard to a provision respecting imported seeds, to provide that they comply with our standard also. The provisions with respect to the enforcement of the act are practically the same as those in the old act. This is not a bill dealing with money, and therefore it does not require anything further to be said about it in that respect.

Mr. BROWN: In this measure, as in the old one, I suppose the definition of a commercial dealer will hold. Is it recognized that a farmer becomes a commercial dealer when he advertises that he has certain seeds for sale?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. The question of what constituted advertising was discussed for a long time at the conference in my deputy's office. While it would take too long to give the committee all the details which are contained in the bill, a scheme has been worked out that will safeguard the farmers in that respect. The whole question was threshed out thoroughly at that conference. For example, the question of advertising in a farm paper that a farmer had seed for sale as it came from the threshing machine, was discussed. I myself have sold large quantities of grass seed to the seed houses of Brandon and Winnipeg, and that did not in any way infringe upon the provisions of the act.

Mr. BROWN: That is satisfactory.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But if you went out to sell seeds, graded and specified by name and also complying with the conditions of the Seed Control Act, then you would have to come under the provisions of, and have to comply with the act, just as the seed merchants have to do, with respect to the provisions dealing with advertising. In other words, if a farmer became a seed merchant, he would have to be a seed merchant.

Mr. LOVIE: Will there be in this measure a provision to prevent the sale of quack-grass mixed with brome-grass?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a very important question, and I do not know of any act that could provide for such a contingency. Unless the brome-grass is hand-picked and grown on some experimental farm or university farm, I do not think there is on the market any brome-grass that is not more or less mixed with quack-grass. It comes to us from Europe in that way. You may not notice the fact when it arrives; it may take several years before you detect the quack-grass; but it is not very long after you detect it before it becomes a serious menace. It is so like brome-grass that an ordinary observer cannot detect the difference. This legislation

is exactly for the purpose of protecting the quality of seed. Our seed analysts will take the seed under a proper light on a sheet of paper, and by the methods known to them, by segregating the different kinds of seeds, picking out the noxious weeds, such as quack-grass or any other weed seeds, they will leave the residue clean. This measure provides for just so many weed seeds to the pound, but it should not and does not provide for any quack-grass being there. It is extremely difficult to safeguard commercial seeds that are being put on the market from being contaminated with quack-grass, I have grown brome-grass for thirty years, the first seed coming from Austria. It was ten years, indeed more, after I started growing it, before I saw first signs of quack-grass. I had forgotten what Ontario quack-grass looked like, and I attributed this to some of the native quack-grass which you find so prevalent on the prairies and which are not nearly so harmful as the old-fashioned quack-grass. After a time, it got thicker and I had to go out of the business altogether in order to save my farm from pollution and my customers from charging me with selling noxious weeds in grass seed.

Mr. WOODS: What safeguard has the farmer as regards the retail merchant? Have retail merchants to label all grades of seeds conspicuously on the bag containing the seeds so that the farmer may know exactly what he is buying?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The seeds are all graded and named—"Registered, No. 1, 2, 3, 4." There are four grades and the parcels must be so marked. If, upon examination, the contents do not prove to be so, why, you have an action in the usual way in the courts against the seed merchant who supplied you with the seed. The courts are constantly applying for the seed certificates that are given by the Seed branch, as evidence in case of charges in our ordinary courts.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the minister contemplate reducing the number of weed seeds to the pound as under the old Seed Control Act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I cannot just recall that. That is a detail which I do not have at my finger-tips. But you can understand that, in a whole wagon load, you cannot get seeds absolutely free from weed seeds. You have to stipulate a certain quantity of weed seeds, and I do not know whether that has been reduced in number or not. In 1911, when the act was introduced, it was thought to be a very severe act, and I would imagine, now that it is twelve years since then, the restrictions have been tightened up a little more.

Mr. GARDINER: I would like to say, for the minister's benefit, that my experience is that under the Seed Control Act, the number of noxious weed seeds allowed per pound in the average seed is much too high. I have been connected with municipal work in western Canada for something like seven years, in a district where I have had to supply from year to year much seed grass to the settlers of that particular district. I want to impress upon the minister that it is important that he should look into this question and see to it that the Seed Control Act, as regards the number of noxious weed seeds to the pound, is tightened up much more than it is at the present time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that is right.

Mr. CALDWELL: In the old Seed Control Act I always considered that there was one very great fault. Seed men were allowed to have three No. 1's, for instance, three No. 1 Timothy—No. 1 Sun, which had a very small percentage of weed seeds; No. 1 Moon, which would be allowed a larger percentage of weed seeds, and No. 1 Star, which would have a still greater percentage of weed seeds. I have known merchants to be selling No. 1 Star, which was actually a No. 3, or should be, as No. 1. It was the third grade of Timothy; but this was marked on the bag as No. 1 government standard and was sold in competition with the actual No. 1. Our agricultural society used to buy for its members No. 1 Sun. A local storekeeper would be able to sell No. 3 grade marked No. 1, government standard, and assert it was the same, while as a matter of fact it would be two grades lower in quality. In this new act there should be no misunderstanding in this matter. The grades should be marked 1, 2 and 3; there should not be three grades of No. 1, which would have a misleading effect.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think so.

Mr. GOULD: In western Canada many initial elevators in the spring advertise that they have different kinds of cereals for sale. Will these initial elevators come under the provisions of the act and be regarded as dealers in the sense of this proposed legislation? In my town there is a firm that does an extensive seed business, so extensive, in fact, that the other elevators compete with it. It provides seed grains in quantities of 100, 200,

300 and 400 bushels. I myself am a patron of this company, and while I am not particularly complaining of the brand of grain I have received from these elevators, knowing it to be more or less a local product, yet I have wondered whether, in the broad sense of the act, the initial elevators throughout the country that make a business of supplying seed to farmers should not come under the provisions of the act as dealers.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I take it that seed supplied by these elevators is what is called commercial seed. I cannot imagine the seed growing in the district my hon. friend refers to, cleaned with the average machinery that we find in elevators, being such as would come under the provisions of this legislation. If they advertise their seed to be of certain standards and it is not, then they violate the act.

Mr. SENN: The resolution calls for a regulation of the importation of seed. Is there any provision in the bill that the place of origin shall be stated? The value of the seed depends on where it is grown. Alfalfa seeds grown in southern countries would be of little use to us in Canada because the varieties are not hardy enough, and I think it would be well for the minister to provide in the bill that the place where the seed comes from shall be stated.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There will be a provision to that effect. One of the things that gives Canada its good reputation for seed grain is its northern location, and the bill makes provision for that not only with respect to home grown grain but with regard to imports as well.

Mr. GOULD: There is a clause with regard to a time limit for complaints. Has the minister in mind any specific time within which complaints shall be registered against any defaulting seed firm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is a time limit, but I do not recall having seen it in the draft. A farmer might not know until after harvest whether he had been sold grain of the wrong grade; and, in fact, in the case of grass seeds, he might not know for a couple of years. This is important and I shall make a note of it.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: In the cases of vegetable seeds sold in packages of less than a pound, will the weight of the package be indicated on the package itself?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Seeds, like any other grain, are sold by weight, and if the package does not come up to weight requirements, of course the usual action will hold. There is no recognized container for seeds except very small parcels. Seeds are usually put up in sacks which are very often marked, although at times the weight is not indicated. The principal thing is the variety and quality of the seed.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I was referring particularly to seeds sold in packages of less than a pound.

Mr. MOTHERWEL: There is a provision with respect to packages of less than a pound. There is also a provision with regard to garden seeds. I do not know of any law that determines all the things we should know with respect to the seed packages we get from these seed houses, but I shall take a note of this point and look into it.

Mr. BROWN: The seed houses disclaim any responsibility in regard to seed that does not come true to description. Is that taken into account?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They must be responsible for the variety.

Mr. BROWN: But they disclaim this responsibility in their advertisements.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 12, respecting the testing, inspection and sale of seed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide,—

1. That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Corporation of the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, hereinafter called "the Corporation," such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of five million dollars, as are required to enable the Corporation to carry on the construction of such terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the Port of Vancouver.

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these Resolutions the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances shall be deemed to be money required to construct and to be part of the cost of construction of the said terminal facilities, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of five million dollars.

3. That the Corporation shall submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for approval, monthly applications for such advances, with statements showing total expenditure on different items in detail, and upon approval, authority for the payment of the amount applied for may be granted by the Governor in Council.

4. That the Corporation shall, upon any advances being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the Corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half-yearly at the rate of five per centum per annum.

5. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these Resolutions shall be payable by the Corporation out of all its property, assets, tolls, rates, dues, penalties and other sources of revenue and income whatsoever, and shall rank as a charge thereon and have precedence in regard to payment next after the payments provided for in Section 27 of Chapter 54 of the Statutes of 1913.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I would suggest that the hon. minister allow this resolution to stand until Monday. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), who is well informed on this important matter, desires to discuss it, and there are features of it which I think it would be of interest to the House and to the country to have him deal with.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite willing to accede to the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting.

Resolution stands.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As it is a few minutes to six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. We rather expected to take up and dispose of the several government notices of motion on the order paper, but as the last resolution has been postponed, the government orders had better stand over until next week.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Monday, February 12, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Cape Breton South and Richmond) presented the report of the select committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House as follows:

No. 1

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs

Baxter,	Guthrie,
Black (Yukon),	Hammell,
Brown,	Jacobs,
Bureau,	Johnston (Last Mountain),
Cannon,	Kyte,
Copp,	Laflamme,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Lapointe,
Findlay,	Macdonald (Pictou),
German,	Maclean (Halifax),
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Macphail (Miss),
McKenzie,	Ryckman,
McMaster,	Sexsmith,
Morrison,	Stewart (Hamilton), and
Porter,	Vien.—28.

No. 2

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Messieurs

Anderson,	Lapierre,
Archambault,	Lavigueur,
Arthurs,	Lewis,
Baxter,	Lovett,
Beaubien,	Low,
Béland,	Lucas,
Binette,	Macdonald (Pictou),
Bird,	MacKinnon,
Black (Huron),	MacLaren,
Boivin,	MacLean (Prince),
Bowen,	Maclean (York),
Boys,	McBride,
Bristol,	McConica,
Cahill,	McCrea,
Cannon,	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Carroll,	McGiverin,
Casgrain,	McIsaac,
Chaplin,	McMurray,
Charters,	McQuarrie,
Chevrier,	McTaggart,
Chisholm,	Manion,
Church,	Marcile (Bagot),
Clifford,	Marler,
Copp,	Martell,
Crerar,	Maybee,
d'Anjou,	Mercier,
Davies,	Mewburn,
Déchêne,	Millar,
Delisle,	Milne,
Denis (Joliette),	Michaud,
Denis (St. Denis),	Mitchell,
Desrochers,	Morrison,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Morrissy,
Drummond,	Murdock,
Elliott,	Murphy,
Ethier,	Parent,
Euler,	Pelletier,
Evans,	Power,
Fafard,	Putnam,
Fansher,	Rankin,
Finn,	Robinson,
Forke,	Robitaille,
Fournier,	St. Père,
Gardiner,	Savard,
Gendron,	Séguin,
Gould,	Shaw,
Graham,	Sheard,
Guthrie,	Simpson,
Halbert,	Sinclair (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Hammell,	Speakman,
Hocken,	Stansell,
Hodgins,	Stevens,
Hoey,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
Hughes,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Jelliff,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Stewart (Leeds),
Kay,	Stork,
Kellner,	Sutherland,
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),	Tobin,
	Vien,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Wallace,
Knox,	Ward,
Kyte,	Walsh,
Ladner,	White, and
Lanctôt,	Wilson.—129.

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

No. 3

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs

Anderson,
Archambault,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Bird,
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bureau,
Charters,
Chew,
Clark,
Davies,
Denis (St. Denis),
Deslauriers,
Drummond,
Ethier,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gendron,
Gould,
Hammell,
Harris,
Jones,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
King (Huron),
Lewis,
Lucas,
MacKinnon,
MacLaren,
McGiverin,
McKillop,
McMurray,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mercier,
Morin,
Ouimet,
Porter,
Power,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Raymond,
Rhéaume,
Reed,
Robitaille,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Spence,
Stork,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Ward,
Woods, and
Woodsworth—64.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No 4

ON STANDING ORDERS

Messieurs

Binette,
Black (Huron),
Chaplin,
Chew,
Clifford,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Duncan,
Euler,
Evans,
Gervais,
Gould,
Harris,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Lavigueur,
Leader,
Léger,
LeSueur,
MacLaren,
Maclean (York),
McIsaac,
McTaggart,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Munro,
Ouimet,
Parent,
Roberge,
Ryckman,
Steedsman, and
Stewart (Leeds)—33.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5

ON PRINTING

Messieurs

Baldwin,
Cardin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Coote,
Copp,
Euler,
Fusher,
Hocken,
Humphrey,
Jones,
MacKelvie,
McConica,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Michaud,
Preston,
Prévost,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Robichaud,
St. Père, and
Thurston—23.

No. 6

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messieurs

Archambault,
Beaubien,
Bourassa,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bristol,
Brown,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
Clark,
Coote,
Crerar,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Elliott (Dundas),
Finn,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Gauvreau,
German,
Hanson,
Hudson,
Humphrey,
Jacobs,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
King (Kootenay East),
Kyte,
LeSueur,
Lewis,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McMaster,
Manion,
Martell,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Papineau,
Parent,
Power,
Preston,
Rhéaume,
Ryckman,
Sheard,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Leeds),
Simpson,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Vien, and
Wallace.—61.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messieurs

Baxter,
Benoit,
Bird,
Boivin,
Black (Yukon),
Bristol,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Chevrier,
Clifford,
Coote,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Desaulniers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo)
Fafard,
Fielding,
Finn,
Fortier,
German,
Good,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kellner,
King (Huron),
Ladner,
Laflamme,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York),
Macphail (Miss),
McCrea,
McKay,
McMaster,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Marler,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Papineau,
Porter,
Rankin,

Reed,
Rhéaume,
Robb,
Robichaud,
Robitaille,
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Sales,
Senn,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Stevens,
Sinclair,
Stork,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Vien,
Walsh,
Woods, and
Woodsworth.—89.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Benoit,
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Brethen,
Brown,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carruthers,
Charters,
Chew,
Clifford,
Crerar,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Duncan,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Garland (Bow River),
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Halbert,
Hatfield,
Hubbs,
Hunt,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moose Jaw),
Jones,
Kay,
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Knox,
Laflamme,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Leader,
Léger,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacKelvie,
MacLean (Prince),
McBride,
McConica,
McCrea,
McKay,
McKillop,
McMaster,
McMurray,
Malcolm,
Marcile (Bagot),
Maybee,
Miller,
Milne,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Preston,
Prévost,
Pritchard,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Robinson,
Roberge,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sexsmith,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stansell,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Sutherland,
Thompsn,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Warner,
White,
Wilson, and
Woodsworth—105.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messieurs:

Bancroft,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Delisle,
Dickie,
Duff,
Campbell,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Grimmer,
Hatfield,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Léger,
LeSueur,
MacLaren,
MacLean (Prince),
McQuarrie,
Martell,
Morrissy,
Munro,
Neill,
Pelletier,
Putnam,
Robichaud,
Ross (Simcoe),
Savard,
Spencer,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Humboldt), and
Stork—37.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10

ON MINES AND MINERALS

Messieurs

Arthurs,
Black (Yukon),
Bird,
Boucher,
Cahill,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Church,
Clark,
Davies,
Déchène,
Denis (Joliette),
Dickie,
Drummond,
Forrester,
Gendron,
Hanson,
Hunt,
Knox,
Lapierre,
Logan,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Macphail (Miss),
McBride,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marler,
Munro,
Pelletier,
Prévost,
Roberge,
Ross (Kingston),
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spence,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork, and
Warner.—37.

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

No. 11

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS

Messieurs

Caldwell,
Church,
d'Anjou,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Duff,
Finn,
Gervais,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Halbert,
Hoey,
Hunt,
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Kootenay East),
Ladner,
Lanctôt,
Logan,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McKillop,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Millar,
Munro,
Murphy,
Power,
Rinfret,
Robichaud,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Tolmie,
Trahan, and
White.—34.

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

No. 12

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

Messieurs

Boivin,	McGiverin,
Ethier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Fansher,	Prévost,
Gardiner,	Rinfret,
Garland (Bow River),	Robinson, and
Hocken,	Ross (Kingston).—13.
MacKelvie,	

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

No. 13

ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs

Béland,	Lovett,
Carmichael,	Lovie,
Deslauriers,	Maclean (Halifax),
Euler,	Meighen,
Garland (Carleton),	Pritchard,
Gauvreau,	Robinson,
Good,	Ross (Kingston),
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Sheard,
Johnston (Moose Jaw),	Sinclair (Oxford), and
King, Mackenzie (York),	Walsh.—21.
Lapointe,	

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

That the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed the list of members to compose the select standing committees of this House during the present session, presented this day, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That the select standing committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons papers and records, with the exception of the committees on the Debates and on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Carmichael, Deslauriers, Euler, Garland (Carleton), Gauvreau, Good, Gouin (Sir Lomer), Johnson (Moose Jaw), King Mackenzie (York), Lapointe, Lovett, Lovie, Maclean (Halifax), Meighen, Pritchard, Robinson, Ross (Kingston), Sheard, Sinclair (Oxford) and Walsh, a Committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as Members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I observe the name of Mr. R. M. Johnson, of Moose Jaw, on this committee. Is it the ruling of Mr. Speaker that he is a member of this House?

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Sub judice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. I do not know that the hon. member is not a member of this House. Last session, he was, at all events. I dare say that there is a case before the courts of the country, but no report has been made to the Speaker.

Mr. LAPOINTE: So long as you, Sir, do not receive definite notification cancelling his election, he is officially a member of this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not press the matter.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the Members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messrs. Baldwin, Cardin, Charters, Chevrier, Coote, Copp, Euler, Fansher, Hocken, Humphrey, Jones, Mackelvie, McConica, Malcolm, Marcil (Bonaventure), Michaud, Preston, Prevost, Raymond, Rinfret, Robichaud, St. Père and Thurston, will act as Members on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Report for Parliament under section 7 of the Reclamation Act 9-10 George V., showing drainage works constructed, etc.—Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Supplementary rules, regulations and forms subscribed to under the provisions of section 54 of the Irrigation Act.—Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Statement of lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the year ending September, 1922, in accordance with 49 Victoria, Chapter 9, section 8.—Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Report of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment for the year ended December 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Beland.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 13, respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Lapierre.

Bill No. 14, to incorporate La Banque des Cultivateurs.—Mr. Parent.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 3, respecting The Royal Guardians.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 4, respecting certain patents of Leonard Clayton Ridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 5, respecting certain patents of Charles A. Channell.—Mr. German.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FUEL SUPPLY

Mr. MICHAUD:

Is it the intention of the Government to try and secure fuel supply for Canada independent of the United States?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: No steps are being taken to import fuel as a government undertaking either from the United States or elsewhere; but investigations are being carried on further to develop our domestic fuel resources especially in those parts of the country where fuel shortages occur with a view to reducing the amount of fuel imported. It would appear also that some steps are being taken by private interests in Great Britain to secure a permanent place in the Canadian market for domestic coal.

MECHANICS

Mr. MICHAUD:

Is the Government aware as to whether or not Canada is in need of more mechanics?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Information reaching the Department of Labour does not suggest the need of more mechanics for the Dominion at large. Local difficulties occasionally arise and these are frequently met through the agency of the Employment Service, by obtaining workmen found unemployed in other localities. The situation necessarily varies from day to day, and it may be found impossible in a particular case to meet in this way a demand for highly skilled workmen in a particular craft.

MONCTON AND BUCTOUCHE RAILWAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the purchase price of the Moncton and Buctouche Railway been paid by the Government?
2. If not, what is the cause of the delay?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to see that the creditors of the said railway company are paid in full before anything is paid to the railway company?
4. What steps, if any, are being taken by the Government or the Department of Railways, to compel the railway company in question to pay its creditors?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

2. Failure of owners to convey the railway free of encumbrances.

3 and 4. The obligation is on the company to convey the property free from encumbrances. Upon this being done to the satisfaction of the Department of Justice, purchase price will be payable to whoever may be entitled. When agreement to sell was reached, in 1918, the Bank of Montreal filed with the government power of attorney from the company to receive all moneys due or to become due.

TIMBER PERMIT

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

Having reference to Order in Council No. 2614 published in *The Canada Gazette*, December 22, 1922, amending section 47 of the regulations governing the granting of licenses to cut timber on Dominioin Lands, etc.:—

1. Have any permits been granted without competition to cut timber adjoining licenses previously granted? If so, at what location?
2. If such permits have been granted, was an inspection made and a report made in writing by the timber inspector of the district?
3. What quantity of timber is it estimated will be cut in each case?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

No permits have been granted without competition to cut timber under the order in council referred to.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY — LIFTING OF RAILS

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Has an order or other instructions been issued by the Government or by the Canadian National Railways for the taking up of rails from the Hudson Bay road?
2. If so, by whom and for how much mileage and where?
3. What is the weight of these rails?
4. Have orders been issued to replace said rails?
5. If so, within what time and with rails of what weight?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1 and 2. Lifting of rails on unused portion of line (Mileage 214 to end of steel at Mileage 334) for use elsewhere in West was recommended by Vice-President and General Manager, Canadian National Railways, approved by the Board of Directors, and authorized by order in council of November 24, 1922.

3. 80 pounds per yard.

4. No; as a result of representations made to Sir Henry Thornton, when in the West recently, it was decided to let matter stand pending further consideration.

5. See answer to No. 4.

TUG—MURRAY STEWART

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the Government or any department thereof purchased a tug called the Murray Stewart?
2. If so, what department, and what was the purchase price?
3. From whom was the said tug purchased?
4. When was it built and by whom?
5. What is her, (a) gross tonnage, and, (b) registered tonnage?
6. Who negotiated the sale to the government?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1 and 2. The Department of Marine and Fisheries purchased a tug called the Murray Stewart to replace the lighthouse tender C.G.S. Lambton lost on Lake Superior in the spring of 1922, and for the additional purpose of being stationed at Georgian bay ports at the end of each season of navigation to render such assistance, in the event of ice formation, as may be necessary to enable vessels handling grain to move freely. The purchase price was $80,000.

3. From the registered owner, James Frederick Martin Stewart of Toronto.

4. 1918—by the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, Limited.

5. (a) Gross tonnage 234.46. (b) Registered tonnage 92.25.

6. James Frederick Martin Stewart.

CARAQUET AND GULF SHORE RAILWAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the government completed the purchase of the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway?
2. Has the purchase price been paid?
3. If not, what is the cause of the delay?
4. Have the claims of creditors of this company been satisfied?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. Yes; with the exception of $550.

3. The Department of Railways and Canals, at the request of the Department of Justice, retained $550 of the purchase price to protect the claim of the Post Office Department against the railway for loss of registered mail before the road was taken over.

4. One claim filed with the department was withdrawn; others were not considered valid.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER CANAL

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Referring to the following statement concerning the proposed St. Lawrence Power Canal, attributed to Charles P. Craig, Executive Director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in the Toronto Globe, of December 9:

"All further governmental action is impossible until Canada signifies its desire to enter into an agreement on the navigation project," Mr. Craig said. "I am vexed, but not disturbed, at the delay of Canada. There is no doubt in my mind but that Canada will act definitely within the next few days."

1. Is the statement of Mr. Craig correct?
2. What action, if any, has the government taken regarding the project since such statement was made?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I confess I do not quite understand what my right hon. friend is asking for. This question reads:

Referring to the following statement concerning the proposed St. Lawrence Power Canal, attributed to Charles P. Craig, Executive Director of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in the Toronto Globe, of December 9:

[Mr. Graham.]

Then it quotes a statement and says—"Is the statement of Mr. Craig correct?" I notice the statement reads:

I am vexed, but not disturbed.

Is that the part of the question which the right hon. member wants answered?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first part Mr. Craig said, also.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question does not so read. If my right hon. friend will indicate just what information he wants, I shall be glad to give it to him; but I confess I do not know how to give it to him from these questions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The quotation is quite clear: It reads:

All further governmental action is impossible until Canada signifies its desire to enter into an agreement on the navigation project.

That is in quotation marks, followed by the words "Mr. Craig said." Then it goes on with Mr. Craig's remarks:

I am vexed, but not disturbed, at the delay of Canada. There is no doubt in my mind but that Canada will act definitely within the next few days.

What I desire to know is: Are his remarks correct? Is all further governmental action impossible until Canada signifies its desire, and is it, no doubt, correct that Canada will act definitely within the next few days?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think, to the first part of the question, as my right hon. friend has just put it, I might answer, No. To the latter part, as well, I might answer, No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right. Of course, with the exception of the first part, this question cannot be considered answered, the second part still remains unanswered.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards the second question: Since the statement was made, a deputation waited on the government, on the 24th January, making certain representations concerning the deep waterways project, and the government mentioned at the time that their representations would be taken into consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No action?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Nothing further at present.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES AND BONUS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is it the intention of the government to inaugurate a general revision of the Civil Service salaries?
2. If so, will Parliament be informed, and when?
3. Will such revision incorporate existing bonuses with present salaries?

4. Is it the intention of the government to continue existing bonuses during the coming year or pending the anticipated revision?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The government does not deem the present time opportune for a general revision of the Civil Service salaries.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. It is the intention of the government to continue existing bonuses during the coming fiscal year.

RENFREW POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. SHEARD:

1. On what date of the year 1922 did the postmastership of Renfrew fall vacant?
2. After such vacancy, was an appointment made by the Civil Service Commission? If so, of whom?
3. Was such appointment by way of promotion? If not, why?
4. Is the present appointee a returned soldier?
5. Is the appointee of the Civil Service Commission in office? If not, why?
6. Is a returned soldier now occupying the position?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. On 23rd February, 1922.
2. Yes—Dan. W. Stewart.
3. No. Employes of Renfrew post office are engaged and paid by the postmaster, Renfrew; they are not appointed under the Civil Service Act and have not been subject to the Civil Service Act or regulations based thereon.
4. No, but he lost his son overseas.
5. Yes.
6. No.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE ACCOUNTS

Mr. BOYS:

1. What expenses, payments or disbursements of any kind have been made since 1st April, 1922, out of other moneys than those included in the amounts voted by Parliament for the Department of Militia and Defence in respect of items or charges paid in the fiscal year 1920-21 out of moneys voted for the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. Under what authority were such moneys so paid from other votes, and why was the change made?
3. Were objections offered by the Department of the Auditor General to payments being so made or to other attempts to make similar payments? If so, in what cases?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I have read this question several times, and I cannot quite grasp what is required. If any hon. gentleman can tell me definitely, I will try to get the answer. As the hon. member, in whose name this question stands, is not in his seat, perhaps we had better let the question stand under those circumstances until he comes in.

Question stands.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL

Mr. BOYS:

1. Are there any bridges over the Trent Valley Canal which have not been taken over by the Department of Railways and Canals?
2. If so, where are they located.
3. What bridges have been taken over?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Railway bridges at Trenton (3), Hastings, Campbellford, Peterborough (2), Lindsay (2), Fenelon falls, Talbot, Gamebridge, Atherley (2), Washago, Ragged rapids, Severn falls; also the fixed portions of highway bridges at Glen Miller, Campbellford, Healey Falls, Trent bridge, Hastings, Bensfort, Wallace point, Locks, Peterborough; Chemong, Balsover Boundary road.
3. Highway swing spans over excavated channels at Trenton, Glen Millar, Campbellford, Healey falls, Trent bridge, Hastings, Bensfort, Wallace point, Locks, Peterborough; Young's point, Chemong, Lindsay, Wellington street; Lindsay, Lindsay street; Lindsay, Ops.; Rosedale, Balsover, Boundary road.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—BANK ACCOUNTS

Mr. HARRIS:

1. What bank accounts of the Canadian National system or any of the component parts thereof have been transferred since January 1, 1922?
2. From what bank, and to what bank, and on what dates, were such transfers made?
3. Has notification been given of the intended transfer of other accounts? If so, what accounts and to what bank?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Canadian National Express Company; Canadian National Telegraphs.
2. From the Canadian Bank of Commerce to the Royal Bank of Canada: Canadian National Express, on December 1, 1922; Canadian National Telegraphs, on December 30, 1922.
3. No.

MR. JAMES STEWART

Mr. HARRIS:

1. Is James Stewart of Winnipeg a director of the Canadian National railways? If so, when was he appointed?
2. Is the same James Stewart a director of the Bank of Montreal? If so, when was he appointed?
3. Are there any other bank directors who are Canadian National Railway directors? If so. who and of what bank?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes; October 4, 1922.
2. The Department of Railways and Canals has no information.
3. See answer to No. 2.

LATE LT.-COL. W. P. MALONE

Mr. DUNCAN:

1. Was the pension of Colonel Willard Malone cut off from his widow and four children after his death in a London military hospital?
2. If so, why?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. The Board of Pension Commissioners reports that the late Lt.-Col. W. P. Malone was not at any time in receipt of pension, and that as the disability which resulted in his death, was not attributable to military service his dependents are not entitled to pension.

2. Answered by No. 1.

SOLDIERS' LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. MILLAR:

1. How many returned soldiers have been salvaged by the Soldiers' Land Settlement Board year by year since the inception of the Soldiers' Land Settlement scheme?
2. What sums, if any, have been collected by the Board from said soldiers after they have abandoned the land and engaged in other employment?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

1. No separate record of soldier settlers who have been "salvaged" is maintained. The number of "adjustment" cases which includes "salvage" due to death, recurrence of physical disability, abandonment, etc., and also those cases where properties have been transferred to other returned soldiers, and cases where settlers have assigned their interest to civilians, is, year by year, as follows:

Since the inception of the scheme to December 31, 1920, 1,153; 1921 (calendar year), 1,114; 1922 (calendar year), 826.

2. No record available.

LAKE TRANSPORT INVESTIGATION

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

4. Was W. T. R. Preston requested by the Government to undertake an investigation in the cost of lake transport or into any subject connected with transport of freight on the Great Lakes?
2. Did Mr. Preston make such investigation? If so, when?
3. Has Mr. Preston been paid for such investigation?
4. If not, is he to be paid for the same, and how much?
5. Why was Mr. Preston's report not made public?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. He was paid at the rate of $15 per day for each day employed, and per diem allowance of $15 in addition to his actual transportation expenses.

[Mr. Graham.]

5. The preliminary enquette was for the information of the ministry. The investigation will be continued by a royal commission consisting of S. J. McLean, Assistant Chairman, Board of Railway Commissioners; Levi Thomson of Qu'Appelle, Sask., and Brig.-Gen. L. T. Tremblay, a member of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. When completed the report will be submitted to parliament.

COMPENSATION FOR DESTROYED CATTLE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What compensation is allowed for cattle destroyed under the accredited herd system: (a) for pure-breds, (b) for grades?
2. Does the law apply only to pure-bred herds?
3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to extend the regulations so as to include herds composed entirely of grade cattle?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. (*a*) Pure bred cattle: maximum valuation $200, maximum compensation (⅔ of maximum valuation) $133.33.

(*b*) Grade cattle: maximum valuation $60, maximum compensation (⅔ of maximum valuation) $40.

2. No. Herds accepted under the accredited herd plan may contain any number of grade cattle, but in addition there must be at least ten pure-bred registered animals, one of which must be a bull.

3. No. I might add that these answers, while strictly correct, do not give all the information. In addition to the pure-bred herds that are taken under the accredited herd system, compensation is paid for certain municipal herds and also for grade cattle under what is known as the restricted area system of compensation.

TORONTO VIADUCT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the commitments of the Grand Trunk Railway as set out in the Viaduct Agreement for the erection of a Viaduct in Toronto dated 1913, towards which the city, the C.P.R., and the G.T.R. were to contribute one-third each of the capital cost?
2. Did a deputation wait on the Government in the spring of 1922, urging the carrying out of this agreement and the opening of the new Union Station in Toronto, and what will be done by the Government to give effect to the viaduct agreement?
3. Will the Government, as requested by the deputation, use its best efforts to get a settlement of this long standing question in the public interest?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The board of directors of the Canadian National Railways will deal with any commitments of previous managements.

2. Yes.

3. It is hoped that negotiations with respect to terminal arrangements at Toronto,

the possible use of the new Union Station there, and related matters will shortly be inaugurated by the Canadian National Railways' management.

EIGHT HOUR LAW CONFERENCE

Mr. NEILL:

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government towards calling a conference of all the provinces on the eight hour law recommended by Article 427 of the Treaty of Versailles?

2. If any invitation was issued by the Federal authorities what was the response from the different provinces?

3. What further action is contemplated by the Government towards getting the provinces together on this matter?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The answer to this question has been prepared, but the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), I believe, desires to have it withheld for the present in order that he may change the question, or for some other reason.

Question stands.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Has the Government received an interim or other report from the Royal Commission appointed nearly a year ago to inquire into and report on matters concerning Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: I may answer this question orally. No interim report has been received so far, but one is expected shortly.

GRAND TRUNK COMMITMENTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the capital commitments of the Grand Trunk Railway in various parts of Canada for new terminals and capital expenditures in various places as provided by agreements made by this railway before it was absorbed into the National Railway System?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to expend $4,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Railways for grade separation at Detroit, and is the following despatch substantially correct to the *Toronto Globe*?

"Detroit, January 12.—Negotiations of twenty years standing between the city and the Grand Trunk Railway were completed to-day when the Council gave tentative approval to a $4,000,000 grade separation programme presented by John W. Reid, city engineer."

3. If so, what amount will Canada be asked to provide for this work?

4. What amount of money will Canada have to furnish for the use of the Grand Trunk System for the new $100,000,000 passenger terminal at Chicago to replace the Dearborn Street structure recently destroyed by fire?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Such matters will be dealt with by the board and management of Canadian National Railways:

2 and 3. Grade separation at Detroit will involve an expenditure of $4,600,000, spread over a ten-year period. The Grand Trunk Railway will be responsible for approximately $3,000,000 and the city of Detroit for the remaining $1,600,000.

4. The terminal in question is used by the Grand Trunk Railway which, with four other railways, own the holding company—the Chicago and Western Indiana Railroad Company. No definite action in regard to a new station is expected for several years. Meanwhile, published estimates of possible cost are mere guesses. Should a new structure finally be decided on, it should be financially self-sustaining.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

CIVIL SERVICE STATISTICS

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. What was the total number of employees in the inside Civil Service on the 31st March in each year since 1900 to the last nine months of 1922, inclusive?

2. What was the total amount paid in salaries (any bonus included) each year ending 31st March from 1900 to 1922 inclusive?

3. What was the total number of employees and salaries (including any bonus) paid them in each year from 1900 to 1922 inclusive in the following Departments:—

Public Works, Customs, Post Office, Interior, with Immigration, Militia and Defence, Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, External Affairs, Justice, Railways and Canals, Secretary of State, Trade and Commerce, Finance, Labour?

RAILWAY STATISTICS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of revenue, freight and passenger traffic originating on the different divisions of the Grand Trunk Railway in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and the earnings therefrom?

2. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of revenue, freight and passenger traffic originating on the Grand Trunk Railway in the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, and Hamilton, and the earnings therefrom?

3. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of freight moving in less than carload lots from the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton on the Grand Trunk Railway, and the earnings therefrom?

4. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the number of way freight trains operated, their mileage and earnings, from the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton on the Grand Trunk Railway?

5. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of revenue, freight and passenger traffic originating on the different divisions of the Canadian National Railways in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and the earnings therefrom?

6. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of revenue, freight and passenger traffic originating on the Canadian National Railways in the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, and Hamilton, and the earnings therefrom?

7. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the amount of freight moving in less than carload lots from the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton on the Canadian National Railways, and the earnings therefrom?

8. During the last completed annual accounting period what was the number of way freight trains operated, their mileage and earnings, from the cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton, on the Canadian National Railways?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

LINDSAY MARKET SCALES

Mr. THURSTON:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Department of Inland Revenue, any officer of the said department, or any other department of the government, and the scale inspector at Lindsay, Ontario, or any other person or persons, relative to the Lindsay Market Scales or Lindsay Market Clerk and District Inspector F. D. Diamond of Belleville or Senior Inspector G. H. Howson, of Peterboro.

NOVA SCOTIA STATUTE, 1922

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all memoranda, opinions, letters, reports and other documents, including reports to Council and Orders in Council, relating to any Nova Scotia statute in 1922.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of all memorandums, opinions and reports made by different Ministers of Justice or their deputies, from January 1, 1904, to date, on the question of disallowance of provincial legislation and disallowance of provincial acts and laying down the principles which justify the exercise of the provincial acts.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a return giving a list of all appointments made or nominations to appointments made by the Civil Service Commission since January 1, 1922, with the names of the persons appointed or nominated in all cases where such appointments or nominations have not been followed by the appointee or person nominated actually taking the position, also showing in each case who is occupying the position which the appointee of the commission is not occupying, and also showing the instances where the appointee of the commission was a returned soldier.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, writings, telegrams, and other documents passing from the governement or the Canadian National Railways since August 1, 1922, having to do with the taking up of rails on the Hudson's Bay Railway?

CATTLE TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, writings, documents, and as well a complete statement of regulations and conditions and full arrangements entered into between representatives of Canada and representatives of Great Britain in respect of the admission of Canadian store cattle and Canadian breeding cattle into Great Britain.

[Mr. Graham.]

LACK OF CONFIDENCE VOTE

PROPOSED AS NECESSARY TO FORCE GOVERNMENT RESIGNATION

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government, unless followed by a vote of lack of confidence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it might be truly said that this resolution is for the good and welfare of the House. As the hon. members of this House will notice, it deals with a situation in which every individual member is to some extent interested, some more and some less. I heard an hon. member of this House quote an American statesman a few days ago, to the effect that we were not dealing with a theory but with a condition. My resolution does not deal with any theory but with an actual condition; and I am disposed to think that if there is any objection offered to the passing of this resolution it will have to be offered on theoretical grounds, for I believe it would be difficult to maintain by argument that there is anything of re democratic value to be gained by the continuance of the practice against which this resolution declares. The condition with which we are dealing is that in the process of development our system of government has finally come to be government by a cabinet. Here it will be unnecessary, I hope, to explain that I am not making any reference to the present government or the present cabinet; I am dealing with the system of governmen and the practices appertaining thereto. Parliament has lost its old supremacy, if indeed it ever really was supreme. The course of our constitutional development has been one leading from an absolute autocracy on to that measure of democracy which we now enjoy, some may argue that parliament is as supreme to-day as it has ever been, which if true, would simply prove that parliament has yet to attain its supremacy, for certain it is that we have now government by cabinet.

When we consider the development of our constitutional system, it is not to be wondered at if we find there are still influences of autocracy present, for every bit of the freedom which we now enjoy has been slowly and laboriously wrenched from autocracy. Indeed, it is clear that it would be difficult for us to be completely rid of those influences. Parliament to-day, I maintain, is dominated by the cabinet through the party caucus, and much of our boasted democratic liberty is pure theory. Theoretically, the Cabinet is responsible to parliament, and parliament, in turn, is

responsible to the people. The actual condition, however, is that the cabinet is responsible to those who appoint it, and as the cabinet brings forward its policies and ensures support of them by a pre-arranged majority, it is not in any real sense responsible to parliament. Of course, parliament is allowed to discuss the policies of the cabinet, but an effective majority has been arranged for. The policies of the cabinet have been already drawn up, they are outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and will be carried through in the manner and to the extent desired by the cabinet, provided that the majority party is strong enough numerically to outvote the rest of parliament.

It is contended, that such a party, namely, the majority or government party, represents the voice of parliament because it is a majority. Again theoretically, this is perfectly true; but practically it is not true. A mechanical, mathematical majority may not represent the voice of parliament. Under the conditions that exist to-day members of the majority party may be compelled to vote contrary to their best thoughts and their declared principles. A system which puts a member of parliament in that position is defective both from the point of view of the mentality and the morality of parliament. This practice of cabinet control by threat of election has a tendency to confuse the issues upon which members are called upon to decide, and it has the effect of placing them in a position which to say the least is at times very uncomfortable and very embarrassing.

But, it may be asked, what magic power has the cabinet over the majority or government party so as to ensure that its measures will be upheld at all times. That magic power is exercised by confusing the issues which may be brought before parliament with the life of the administration, so that the government party is left with the alternative of supporting the issue or saving the administration, and it is only natural if the desire to save the administration should take precedence in the minds of most members of a government party. It is commonly understood to be the practice in Canada that if a government is defeated on a matter of policy, or on a measure considered by the administration to be of importance, that such defeat is tantamount to a vote of no confidence, and that the resignation of the government should follow. Not only is this so, but a government may at any time declare an issue to be a vote of no confidence. That declaration has the effect of a whip—not the party whip, but the real shillalah held over the heads of all the government supporters—the possibility of defeat and the bringing on of a general election. But it has the effect also usually of defeating the measure, no matter what merit there may be in the measure, because in such a case the salvation of the government is considered first by the majority party and the measure afterwards. So really while the government party may vote against a very good measure in order to save the government, their action is no indication of what they really think about that measure.

If the majority party had been free to vote upon such issues as have been declared by governments to imply no confidence, it is very likely that in most cases those issues would have received majorities. But in every case I believe in the history of the Canadian parliament when the government has treated such a vote as tantamount to a vote of non-confidence the issue has been defeated. That there is no instance so far as I am able to find—I am subject to correction of course—in our parliamentary records of a government having been defeated under such circumstances, tends only to prove two things. It proves, in the first place, that the governments of the past have always had a fairly safe majority; and it proves further that the majority party has given the life of the government first consideration.

Now, this practice of confusing an issue with the life of the government is not a mere formality such as we have in the ceremonials incident to the opening of parliament, though the practice is equally as far out of date as is the ceremonial feature—perhaps those ceremonials are not altogether useless as they represent a tableau of an important and glorious period of history. But this is of greater importance in so far as the members of this House are concerned, and in so far also as the country is concerned, because it has a very real and immediate and, I think I might also say, a pernicious influence. It is superfluous to recall the various steps which have been taken to bring parliament to this practice. There is no doubt that at one time this system served the purpose of those who introduced it, and there is little doubt that other methods might have done equally well to secure the aims desired had any one thought of them. To-day it is used chiefly to keep governments in office. It is used also for the purpose of defeating measures which the people's representatives may desire, but which for some reason or other the cabinet does not want.

This practice is not at all an aid to responsible government, as some would have it, indeed, it is rather a hindrance to that desirable end, for we find that by this practice

the principle of responsible government has been inverted. To-day the individual members of the government party are responsible to the Cabinet instead of the Cabinet being responsible to the individual members of the party. What chance has the courageous individual, who can still think clearly even under threats of a general election between the merits of a government measure and the defeat of the government, and who is prepared to stand up for the principle in which he believes—what political future in a party has such an individual? He is really held responsible to this Cabinet for his action on the vote, instead of the Cabinet being held responsible to him for their action when he votes. That, I maintain, is an inversion of the principle of responsible government.

I want to turn briefly to a few instances in the history of the Canadian parliament in which this practice has been seen in action; and I am going to take the most recent instances so as to be within the memory of hon. members of this House. I shall first refer to a resolution which was introduced when Sir Robert Borden was in power, embodying a proposal to discontinue the granting of titles in Canada. According to page 2364 of Hansard of May 21, 1918, Sir. Robert Borden said, referring to the proposal contained in the resolution:

> I can only say, so far as I am concerned, that if the House does not propose to accept the course which I have asked them frankly and with much respect to take, I should consider that I am relieved from my duty of carrying on any longer the government of this country, and I should ask His Excellency the Governor General to seek other advisers.

I knew personally a number of members of the government party of that day, and am convinced that they were just as anxious for the abolition of titles in Canada as the hon. member who moved the resolution was, yet I find that they voted with the government against the resolution in which they believed. There we have a concrete example of this practice. One might, of course, comment upon the attitude of the government in associating the trivial matter of a motion regarding titles with the defeat of the administration; but that is not a point to be considered here. The fact is that by confusing the issue of the abolition of titles in Canada with the life of the government, those who supported the abolition of titles voted against their principle in order to protect the administration. That was the situation then, and it is often found to be the situation even to-day. Hon. members who, forced under such conditions to vote against their principles to save the government have to meet their irate constituents and explain the phenomenal change of mind which they so suddenly experienced. Which one of us has not had the—I was going to say opportunity, but that is not the word—experience of hearing a politician trying vainly to explain why he was driven from his acknowledged principles and forced to do something entirely different.

The next instance to which I wish to refer is that which had to do with the amendments moved to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne at the present session. You will remember that when the amendments were moved, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) declared that no self-respecting government could possibly accept them. The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) moved an amendment to the amendment, in which, I may point out, he was expressing the opinions of the Minister of Finance as set forth last session. Speaking on the budget last year, the Minister of Finance said this:

> I must to-day present two thoughts which are of paramount importance. The first is as to the need, the deep and earnest need, of economy. That means that we must appeal both to members of Parliament and to the people to pass what I may call self-denying ordinances. They must not expect all the things which in the good old days they got so readily.

The amendment to the amendment as submitted by the hon. member for Calgary West was as follows:

> That this House views with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt, and urges Your Excellency's advisers to exert every possible effort to economize in the expenditure and administration of government, and to lessen the burden of federal taxation which bears so heavily on the people of Canada.

With regard to the amendment, I wish to read a resolution moved by the present Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and seconded by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in 1920:

> That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff, substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

The following is the amendment of this session to the Address in reply to the Speech from

the Throne, which was regarded as constituting a motion of want of confidence in the government:

That in view of the increased burden of taxation and of the hardship which many of the people suffer from this burden, and the unrest and dissatisfaction arising therefrom, and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to reduce the cost of production, and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of parliament, the House is of the opinion that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance.

(1) Diminishing the very high cost of production, which presses so severely on the primary producers of the country at this time;

(2) Reducing the cost of living to the great masses of the common people, many of whom are being forced out of the country by the prevailing economic conditions.

This amendment is the same as the resolution moved by the present Minister of Finance in 1920, and there is no excuse that I can see for the government party voting for it a couple of years ago and voting against it to-day. It may be presumed that both these resolutions embody the viewpoint of the Liberal party upon the questions with which they deal. If so, how did it happen that hon. members opposite voted against that very proposal a few days ago? The Minister of Finance declared that that resolution, which was really his own resolution that he moved two years ago, must be taken as a vote of no confidence. He indicated that no self-respecting government could take it otherwise. My humble opinion is that the government would have been really more self-respecting if it had accepted these amendments. Of course, I could not presume to tell the hon. Minister of Finance what he should and should not do as a parliamentarian, but that was my humble opinion. However, the hon. gentleman did declare that the resolution moved by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and also the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), constituted motions of no confidence, and that complicated the situation so much for the members of the party that they found themselves on the horns of a dilemma, and most of them stuck on the horns. The fact is, we know as well as we can know anything with respect to anybody, that there are a great number of hon. members on the other side of the House who do believe in the reduction of the tariff, and who under different circumstances would vote for such a resolution; yet only one of them remembered his principles on that occasion, and all the rest voted with the government I am not blaming any hon. gentleman on the other side for voting with the government, I am not insinuating that their votes were any less honourable than mine was. Indeed, I believe that they voted just as I did, weighing these issues in their own minds as best they could. I am not speaking against the actions of the hon. members on that particular occasion: I am speaking against the practice, the system, which forces them into this unfair and embarrassing situation—I believe that hon. members of this House will agree with me that this is a very undesirable position in which to be placed.

I notice that the opposition made a good deal of capital out of the dilemma of the government in connection with the amendments quoted, but there was really no need for them to do so, for I am quite certain that the opposition would do likewise on a similar occasion— I know it has done so before. I am quite sure the Progressives will do the same if only they get the opportunity, and I believe the Labour party would do the same under the present system. It is pretty well accepted, by sociologists at all events, that the generality of humanity under similar conditions will act in pretty much the same way. So, what I am trying to correct by this resolution is a parliamentary practice which embarrasses the members of parliament, and particularly the members of the government party, by confusing the issue under discussion with the life of the administration, and thus forcing hon. members at times to vote against their own ideas and their own principles.

4 p.m.

Mr. McQUARRIE: May I be permitted a question? If this resolution passes, what is to prevent the government from considering any particular motion as a want of confidence motion in the government, and acting accordingly? What would prevent the Minister of Finance, for instance, whom my hon. friend has mentioned, from making a similar statement to the House on another occasion? What is to prevent the government from advising the whips that they will consider a certain motion as a want of confidence motion? Then, what good can follow the passing of this resolution?

Mr. IRVINE: I think the hon. member has misunderstood the resolution. If I have got his question correctly, the resolution will prohibit the very possibility which he anticipates.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In what way?

Mr. IRVINE: In this way. If this resolution is carried, it will not be left in the hands of the government to say when the

government shall be defeated. That power will be in parliament. At the present time the Cabinet has the decision as to whether a resolution shall or shall not be considered as a want of confidence motion. We want to take that from the hands of the Cabinet and leave the decision with parliament.

Mr. McQUARRIE: One further question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Of course, the question can only be allowed with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor. Do I understand that the hon. member is willing?

Mr. IRVINE: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would the hon. member tie up the government so that it could not hand in its resignation if it saw fit at any time?

Mr. IRVINE: I do not know anything that can prevent any government or any member of any government from resigning at any time they wish to do so. They may do so now, singly or in a body, and they may do so after such a resolution as this passes; but I scarcely anticipate a stampede of that character if the resolution should pass.

I believe the practice against which this resolution declares should be abandoned because it is humiliating to the representatives of the people. In instances such as I have given they find themselves forced at times to abandon the principles under which they have been elected; and being forced thus to abandon their principles, they are considered in the public mind as being untrue and unfaithful servants of the people. Good men in this way find themselves robbed of their good characters in the eyes of the public. I do not think it is amiss to emphasize here a fact that we have all met with, that the politician in Canada has a very low status indeed in the estimation of the public, and it is the present practice that has helped more than anything else to undermine the confidence of the people in their representatives. I think it should be part of our duty as members of this House to raise the status of parliamentarians, that we may be as noted in the coming years for standing firm to our principles and true to our word, as we have been noted in the past for forgetting about them in such instances as I have just given to the House.

But there is another side to this question that is as bad or even worse than the personal side. By this practice now prevailing, bad issues may be passed in order to save an otherwise very good government, and on the other hand, a good issue may be defeated to save a bad administration. By confusing these two things, namely the issue before the House and the fitness of the administration to govern, the members of parliament are often placed in a position where they must either defeat the measure in which they believe, or defeat the government. But even if a good measure were passed to save a good government, that would not balance the sheet. We had better put governments in a position where they do not need to be saved, and that is the purpose of this resolution. The life of the administration and the merits of legislative proposals should not be confused. If the administration is to be responsible to parliament, it should allow parliament a free mind to come to a conclusion on resolutions, or bills without embarrassment of any kind whatever. I believe a reasonable, clean, energetic, efficient and courageous administration has nothing to fear from a Canadian parliament. Parliament, however, does have something to fear from the supremacy of the cabinet. I believe that a bill brought in by the cabinet should not be considered in any way different from a bill brought in by a private member. But such is not the case as things are now. Here, then, is a protection which I would invite you anti-protectionists to consider. Here is a practice by which a cabinet protects itself by its very threats to carry through what legislation it may wish to promote, or defeat what legislation it might desire to defeat. That is a protective wall which it might be in our interests to-day to break down by the passing of this resolution. I urge the passing of this resolution in the interests of every member of this House. We are all interested, and we are all concerned. It is true, those of us who happen to sit in the so-called opposition benches are not so directly affected by a vote of no confidence as the hon. members on the other side. But still we have to consider it too. I do not know whether it would have been a very wise thing for this parliament to have decided to bring on an election on the last issue on which we voted. We had to consider that in connection with the issue, for it is not only the government that is affected, but everybody is affected.

Look at it from another point of view. I do not believe hon. members on this side of the House, from the left wing of the opposition down this far at least, are particularly anxious to defeat either this government or any other government. I believe their attitude as expressed is one of co-operation. Personally, I do not wish to defeat any govern-

ment. I want to help every government to do the best they can. I want to vote for the government when I think they ought to be voted for, but I do not want to be called upon to vote for the government when that means voting against something that I want to vote for. But until the present practice is changed I may be called upon, and every other hon. member may be called upon, to vote against the government that they do not want to defeat, in order to save a principle or to vote for a measure in which they have declared their belief. That is one of the points I would ask hon. members on the government side to consider. I believe the passing of this resolution would have the effect of stabilizing governments. We are living in a time when government majorities are not as large as they used to be, and their tendency seems to be to grow smaller, which leaves the life of an administration more precarious than heretofore. It would be better, I think, for all concerned, if Cabinets would look for a majority on the issue rather than counting heads before the issue is proposed. If hon. members will review the history of the Manitoba government in the last session or two they will find that, because it failed to take the short practical step which this resolution suggests it was in a position where it could not do any business for the people. It was afraid to move for fear it would be defeated. The consequence was that ultimately it had to be voted out of power. On the other hand, the province of Alberta, and Nova Scotia I believe also, passed resolutions similar to the one which I am here introducing, and, so far, I have heard only praise of their action. I have heard members of the Alberta legislature speak of the new freedom which they feel when they are voting on a measure, because they feel they are not voting to oust a government nor to keep one in power.

Again, this proposal will discourage parties from seeking power as an aim. While the present practice continues, parties will seek to build up a power for themselves, because they know that they will not be able to do anything unless they have assurance in advance of sufficient support. And so, whether it is an opposition party or a new party, or a group if you like, most of them look forward to the time when they will have power, when they will command enough support to carry the legislation which they desire. I suggest this is not democratic. Indeed it is very undesirable that any group or class should have power in parliament. Some of the hon. members on the government side demurred last year when I said that the present government represented a class. I said that, not by way of criticism, but merely as a fact,—they do represent a class; and they have built up a power by that class to serve that class. I believe that the other party represents a class. I believe that the new party represents a class. I do not think it would be wise for this House to encourage classes to build up their strength with a view to obtaining power in this House. I look forward rather to the co-operative spirit in parliament. And let me say here, as I have said in my riding during the summer, that in my opinion more real respect for parliament has been shown by the present Cabinet than by any other Cabinet in recent Canadian history. But I believe that this is due as much to the fact that we have a different alignment of groups in this House, as to the democratic intentions of the Cabinet itself. However, I hope that the hon. members of this House will see the value of this resolution, first of all in leaving each member, whether in the government party or in any other party, free to consider every measure that is brought before this House on its own merits and to vote upon it according to his own intelligence or according to the desires of his constituents.

I have tried to personally outline the condition as it exists in our parliamentary practice at the present time, and have tried to show how embarrassing and how unfair it is to individual members especially on the government side. I have tried to show that good legislation might be defeated by this practice, or bad legislation might be enacted in the interests of the administration. I ask hon. members, then in their own interests, in the interest of parliament, and in the interest of progressive development of our constitutional system of government, to free themselves by voting for this resolution.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): The principle involved in the resolution before the House, Mr. Speaker, appears to me as worthy of serious consideration, and more especially is that the fact when, as we have been informed, the legislators of Alberta and the legislators of Nova Scotia have adopted similar resolutions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has my hon. friend copies of the resolutions to which he refers, and would he give them to the House?

Mr. SHAW: I regret to say, I have not. It is well established that executive government in this country rests upon two vital and essential principles: First, the selection of a select committee from the Privy Council, called the Cabinet, all members of which are, theoretically, at least, aligned together and

agreeable to a definite political platform, and second, there is a very definite and clear responsibility of the Cabinet for its actions to the wishes of a majority of the House of Commons. There was a time, indeed not so many years ago, when the Cabinet was something less of an executive body than it is now, more particularly confining itself then to administrative functions. The Cabinet in these latter days has become the very mainspring of government. Upon its efficient functioning largely depend the welfare, prosperity and contentment of our people. There is no doubt that in the exercise of every power and in the performance of every duty, the Cabinet is amenable and answerable to parliament. The Cabinet must admit, as it does admit, its responsibility to parliament for every administrative act and every legislative proposal. It similarly follows, that lacking the confidence of the membership of a parliament, the Cabinet must, of necessity, resign or ask for a dissolution of parliament. What is the accepted constitutional principle or practice in connection with these matters? It has sometimes been urged that when a ministry suffers a defeat in supply or on any other subject, it should forthwith resign or request a dissolution of parliament. There are a number of instances in which that view has been accepted. There are other cases in which that view has not been accepted. It is a singular fact that Canadian parliamentary records are particularly barren of incidents which might illustrate the problem at present before us; but on the other hand, the English practice has many instances, indeed, many of which are very illuminating, and I propose to take just a few moments of the time of the House for the purpose of giving some of the illustrations which have occurred, perhaps within the last hundred and fifty years, indicating the constitutional principle and its variation from time to time.

In the year 1741, Sir Robert Walpole declared that his excise scheme was of the greatest importance and indispensable for meeting the particular exigencies of the time. Despite the defeat of his scheme, he did not resign.

William Pitt took office in December, 1783. From that time until the month of March following, his government was in a minority some thirteen or fourteen times. Some of the votes passed against his government were as follows. One was an address for an administration having the confidence of the House and of the public. Another was a resolution asking for the removal of the ministers. A government bill, the East India bill, was defeated, and a resolution was presented by the House to His Majesty, asking that the services of that ministry be discontinued. Despite all these resolutions in that period of some two or three months, Pitt did not resign.

About the year 1828, Lord Liverpool's government was decisively beaten on the question of continuing the property tax, a defeat on a proposal to supply some £12,000,000 of revenue. There was no resignation in that case, and no attempt to force a resignation of the government. The same government opposed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, which was considered a matter of state policy and a very vital reform. The resolution carried, but the government did not resign.

The Earl Grey administration was defeated on two occasions in the year 1831, first on a motion to reduce the membership of the House, and second, on a question of an adjournment. Earl Grey advised dissolution, not only that, but he secured it. But reputable historians point to the fact that if Earl Grey had not been so impulsive, the House would have agreed to an Address to the King against dissolution.

Sir Robert Peel suffered many defeats during the term of his office, beginning in 1834. Might I point to a very interesting incident? There was moved to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in the year 1835, an amendment expressing the regret of the House that more progress had not been made in certain important reforms. The amendment was carried, but Sir Robert Peel informed the House that he did not intend to resign. His government was, however, on numerous occasions, subsequently defeated, and he ultimately resigned.

Melbourne's administration began in 1835, and during the six years of its history, it was defeated in the House of Commons some fifty-eight different times. It did not resign until 1841, when Sir Robert Peel moved a vote of want of confidence, which was carried.

Lord Derby, in 1852, having an admitted minority in the House, quoted Sir Robert Peel in these words:

> I hold there is nothing unconstitutional in the post I fill and in the fulfilment of my duty to persevere in the discharge of those duties to which my Sovereign has called me in defiance of the majority that is against me upon any abstract question, and in the defiance of any declaration of the House of Commons that I ought to bring forward a particular question and settle it in a particular manner. I shall perform my duty until the House shall, by its vote, refuse its sanction to some measure of importance which I think necessary to submit to its consideration.

His administration was subsequently defeated on its financial policy; but leading opponents of the government held the view that such defeat did not warrant a resignation. His administration was defeated again in 1858 on its financial policy, and Mr. Disraeli, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer in that government, used these words:

> Ever since the commencement of the session, the government has found itself frequently in the minority and that too in many instances on questions of no mean importance, but they have overlooked these matters, and they consider a vote on the second reading of the reform bill to be a censure upon the government which virtually deprived them of all authority. They advised the Queen to dissolve Parliament.

In 1865, under the premiership of Disraeli, the government suffered, at least, three serious defeats. Mr. Disraeli requested dissolution, but his request was not agreed to. Mr. Gladstone at that time denied the right of a minister to inflict penal dissolution on the country. He argued that there were two conditions necessary to justify an appeal to the country by a government whose existence is menaced by an adverse vote in the Commons. Firstly, he said that there should be an adequate cause of public policy; secondly, that there should be a rational prospect of a reversal of a vote of the House. He denied the propriety of a dissolution merely to determine a question concerning the administration of the party in office.

In 1873, Mr. Gladstone was himself defeated on the Irish University Education Bill, and he desired to resign. His resignation was opposed by Mr. Disraeli. During the period of the Gladstone government of that time the administration was defeated three times within one week on important motions, but did not resign.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Were they government measures?

Mr. SHAW: Yes. May I, take the liberty of quoting a reference made by Mr. Balfour to the action of Mr. Gladstone? He says:

> Mr. Gladstone was defeated on a motion which he declared vital to the life of his government, and he consented nevertheless to resume office in the very House of Commons which had so treated him. Whether his reasons were good or bad I will not pretend to say; but I may parenthetically remark that, in my judgment, the three great cases in which a ministry had resigned, have not been able to induce their opponents to take office, and have then resumed office themselves, have alweys been—I will not use such strong words as disastrous or discreditable—but certainly have been unfortunate, and do not hold out much inducement to their successors to follow the same course. Lord Melbourne, who resumed office after the Bedchamber controversy, as it was called, in 1839, did, I think, nothing but harm to himself, his ministers, and his party. Sir Robert Peel, under circumstances which I admit are wholly different, resumed office in 1845, and by so doing destroyed the Tory party for more than twenty years.
>
> Nor do I beleive that anybody looking back upon the decision at which Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues arrived in 1873 would think that so far as they are concerned that course either was one which deserves the flattery of imitation.

I would direct the attention of the House to another incident which occurred in the year 1894. In that case an amendment was moved to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The amendment was moved by Mr. Labouchere, and it proposed that certain restrictions should be applied by the Commons with reference to the action of the House of Lords. In moving that amendment he spoke as follows:

> No one could complain that this would be a vote of want of confidence. As he understood it, a vote of want of confidence would be if it were proposed to strike out any particular point on which their minds—

Referring to the ministry, of course,—

> —were bent, or to add anything with which they did not themselves agree. Surely it was mere vanity and red-tapeism to say, "We do not agree with you, but we think the moment ill-chosen—we do not like to have our beautiful Address interfered with, and we will therefore vote against you."

In another place he said:

> To look upon this as a vote of want of confidence was as though a slave owner, raving at a philanthropist who was seeking to strike off the chains of his slave, were to represent that the efforts of the philanthropist amounted to a vote of want of confidence.

The amendment was carried by the House and formed part of the Address. The government, strange to relate, voted against their own motion, and after its defeat they brought in a subsequent Address, which appeared to meet the desires of the House, and which was carried. The next incident of which I have a note is that in connection with the so-called cordite vote of 1891. Lord Rosebery's government was in power, and an amendment was proposed in supply that the salary of the Secretary of War, I think, should be reduced by the sum of £100.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Was it not a money vote for the purchase of cordite?

Mr. SHAW: Perhaps. At all events, the amendment carried and Lord Rosebery resigned. Now, Lord Rosebery's action in resigning as a result of that vote met with hostile criticism not only in the House but to a great extent in the country. Mr. Gladstone himself described it as entirely pusillanimous. I might remark in passing, in this connection, that no vote of want of confidence followed the action of parliament in carrying the amendment.

The next incident to which I shall refer arose in 1905. John Redmond moved in supply that certain estimates be reduced and his motion carried. Mr. A. J. Balfour, who was then leader of the government, used these words some few days afterwards as indicating the position which his government proposed to take:

> Now I think it is evident from this brief, and perhaps too rapid, survey of recent constitutional history that the only divisions which, taken by themselves, and in isolation from the general circumstances of the time, from the feeling of the parties in the House, form the question of union in the cabinet—the only parliamentary issues which, taken in isolation from these attendant circumstances, have always been regarded as conclusive are those in which there has been a trial of strength between the parties with all the circumstances of notice and other attendant incidents required to make it clear that the issue to be decided is one of "confidence" or "no confidence".

Further on he says:

> I think that is the whole truth with regard to votes taken in this House considered in their isolation. But I quite admit that there are circumstances in which you cannot take a vote in its isolation. You have to take it with all its attendant circumstances, and a government if it is conscious that it cannot carry on the business of the House, may be perfectly justified in taking a vote which, under different circumstances, it would regard with relative indifference as the formal occasion of its termination of office.

With all respect, I suggest that this last statement of Mr. Balfour indicates, perhaps, the status of this matter at the present time. There have been incidents subsequent to that, but they are of more or less minor importance. Now, having ascertained, in the words of Mr. Balfour, the generally accepted rule, what is the effect of the proposed resolution before the House It seems to me it may be put shortly in this way: that it simply transfers, from the Cabinet to parliament, the responsibility of determining whether or not an adverse vote, together with the attendant circumstances, is such as to justify the government in resigning or in seeking dissolution. I think it simply means the transference of responsibility, and the question for the House to determine, then, would be whether or not such a transference of responsibility is desirable. Is not the House of Commons as a body in a better position to determine a question of that character? Not only do its members come from all parts of the country, not only are they larger in number than the government, but they have a better idea of the public pulse than the Cabinet could have; and it seems to me that in the last analysis they would give, generally speaking, a truer verdict than the government could give on a matter of that kind.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Would not the fear of an election put them in a less independent position than the government?

Mr. SHAW: I think not. I see no reason why the prospect of an election should act as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is very powerful sometimes.

Mr. SHAW: I defer to the judgment of my hon. friend in that regard. In the second place, so far as the membership of the House itself is concerned, the member is now very frequently placed in a position where he cannot disagree with a government measure without imperilling the life of the government. He knows not what particular measure may be considered as vital and important and a vote against which will be considered by the government as a vote of want of confidence. The adoption of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) will, it seems to me, allow members to escape that embarrassing situation where frequently they vote against their convictions and, perhaps, in many cases, against the interests of their constituents.

Under our present system private members lose much of their independence of thought and much of their freedom of action. Not only will this suggested change be beneficial in so far as the membership of the House is concerned, but it seems to me that oppositions whose real function is that of constructive criticism will realize that it is useless to seek to embarrass a government by any snap decision. Further, I think the ministry itself will benefit as the result of this proposed change. The constant fear of defeat of a government measure, with the resultant loss of prestige, tends to timidity on the part of the Cabinet both as to its administrative acts and its legislative proposals, with the inevitable consequence of governmental inaction, and particularly is this so where a government holds office by a slim majority.

It seems to me therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of our constitutional practice, that the proposed resolution is in harmony with our developing political institutions, and will assist in an increasing release from partisanship in the consideration of our national affairs.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all express to the hon. member who has moved this resolution (Mr. Irvine) my appreciation not only of the thoughtful manner in which he has dealt with this important subject, but also of his generous reference to the government in its relation to the House. I wish to assure him that so far as this government is concerned he will, I believe, always have reason to feel that the consideration

which we realize is owing to hon. members with respect to every question that comes before them is something which will be continued throughout its tenure of office.

The resolution which my hon. friend has introduced is perhaps as important as any which can be brought forward in this House, inasmuch as it has to do with what is really the corner stone of our constitutional structure—I mean the responsibility of the ministry to parliament. Our present constitution and parliamentary practice are not the result of any sudden arrangement effected without mature and deliberate consideration: they come to us with all their attendant features as perhaps the greatest inheritance which the peoples of British descent hold. Britain has been rightly called the Mother of Parliaments, and at Westminister, as nowhere else in the world, there has been worked out a parliamentary practice which tends to preserve liberty and freedom as no other parliamentary practice even begins to do. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think we should approach any change—I use the term "any change" advisedly—in parliamentary practice with the utmost caution. Customs which have stood the test of years, which have been found in different parliamentary assemblies to be of advantage, not for five or ten or twenty years, but for a hundred years or more, are customs which must have much to support them, and we should move carefully and very slowly in any effort to alter them, or to substitute something in their stead.

May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this of all times is a period in the world's history when we should be particularly careful about adopting innovations? It is an age of unrest in many parts of the world, and customs and practices which have been found to serve mankind well have been thrown overboard in some quarters of the globe. With what result? In those countries where men have dealt lightly with their accepted constitutions and methods of procedure, we find today not orderly development but in some cases chaos in an extreme form. One has but to contrast the conditions as they exist today in some of the legislative bodies in Europe with what they were before the recent war to appreciate why great caution and great care is needed in accepting any proposals which make for a radical change in parliamentary procedure.

It might be expected, as the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) has just said, that the government would be the first to welcome this resolution. And possibly a government that has the very slender majority which this government has might be expected to be among the first to desire to accept it. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government, unless followed by a vote of lack of confidence.

When one considers that the present administration has behind it a majority of possibly but one or two over that of the other parties in the House, one might readily assume that the government would welcome any kind of change which would justify it, in case of the defeat of some measure before the House, in holding on to office and refusing to go to the country. Were we to give our support to this resolution, the first criticism that would be levelled against us would be that we had accepted it because we had at last found some means whereby we could retain office in the face of an adverse vote. That, Mr. Speaker, would be a most unfortunate situation, it seems to me, for the country to permit any government to get itself into.

My hon. friend who has introduced the resolution spoke about autocracy and democracy. He said that our present system of cabinet government lends itself to autocracy on the part of Cabinets. May I ask my hon. friend: what is the one check by parliament on possible autocracy by a Cabinet other than that when a government brings in a measure, and is defeated, the government must regard itself as no longer possessing the confidence of the House? My hon. friend is helping autocracy rather than furthering democracy in government when he leaves it open to an administration, once it has been shown by the votes of the members of the House that it no longer enjoys their confidence, still to retain office. It gives an autocratic government a second chance for its life. To my way of thinking, in these days when we wish to have democratic principles prevail in matters of government, the very first chance to put an autocratic government out of power, is the chance to seize; it should never be let go by. That is the position we take in regard to this resolution.

The reason that the practice has prevailed in British government that a ministry must be supported by the people's representatives, or otherwise go back to the people, is that such a practice is the most effective in keeping a ministry true to those principles which are the ones the people wish to have regarded in legislation.

Now, may I say to my hon. friend that I fear his resolution, well intended as it is, would have an effect entirely different to that which he believes it would have? It is in

the interests of the government in any country that every precaution should be taken to see that a ministry in bringing down legislation does so only after the most careful deliberate and mature thought, and that in presenting their legislation to parliament they present only legislation which they believe to be necessary in the country's interests. Permit the ministry to use its own judgment in the matter of whether or not it shall resign upon its legislation being defeated, and it will soon begin to introduce all kinds of legislation without very much thought. You open the door to the introduction of measure after measure that is half-baked, once the ministry know that if defeated on particular measures it may, by skirmishing about and by conferences here and there with different members of the House, get itself re-established in a position where it can continue to carry on. That would be much against the interests of good legislation; it would tend to make a ministry not more careful, but possibly indifferent, with respect to some of the measures it might bring before the House.

There are, after all, times and places for every thing. There are times when confidence in an administration should be expressed, and when any contrary attitude should have serious consequences. One of those times is on the consideration of government measures. Our parliamentary practice, which, as I have already mentioned, is the result of wide experience extending over many years, has fixed certain times and certain places for the expression of confidence, or the reverse, in a ministry. My hon. friend mentioned three instances, I think, which he regarded as supporting his resolution. The first was the attitude of the government of Sir Robert Borden in the matter of titles, he said in this connection that he thought in some way the members of parliament had been precluded from freely expressing their views on that subject. But I ask my hon. friend, what was the view that the parliament of Sir Robert Borden's day took on this very matter of titles? It was the parliament of that day that adopted a resolution abolishing titles altogether. The members of parliament were not prevented from expressing their views on the subject of titles. They had ample opportunity to do so, but there was a time and place for a resolution of the kind. When it was brought in at the appropriate time and at the right place, the resolution carried, notwithstanding the fact that the government had at another time felt that the adoption of such a course with reference to a government measure would have placed it in a false position in view of a stand it had previously taken or pledges or promises it may have made. The government has a knowledge of its obligations which others cannot begin to have. I do not know what the motives of the government of Sir Robert Borden were in making an issue of the question as they did, but I do know this: the fact that they did take that stand in regard to titles helped to defeat the Tory party at the last election; it was one of the things which helped to show the existence of that very condition of autocracy to which my hon. friend has referred. It helped to reveal something more—the servility of the following that the Prime Minister of that day had; and these two things coupled with a like set of circumstances on the part of the administration that succeeded it, account in part for the defeat at the polls of the late administration.

There was in virtue of the government's attitude towards a government measure no denial of the right of any individual member to give expression to his views, nor as the facts prove was the power taken from parliament to do the very thing my hon. friend says they ought to have done in such a case, namely, abolish titles altogether.

Take the other instances to which my hon. friend has referred, the amendments to the Address. One has but to reflect for a moment to see that in view of the limited duration of parliament it is desirable that matters of great public concern should be dealt with at appropriate times and seasons; that if amendments of all kinds are to be considered in order on all occasions, the time of the members, the time of the country, may be used to very little effect in the interests of the people as a whole. I cannot but believe that that is one of the reasons why under the British practice it has generally been maintained that an amendment to the Address must be considered in the nature of a motion of want of confidence in the administration. The Address is presented at the very opening of parliament. It is in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is considered before hon. members have had opportunity to obtain all the information they should have before they express what may or may not be in the nature of want of confidence in the administration. Take the two amendments to which my hon. friend has just referred. One of them related to the question of economy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that had the hon. member who moved that amendment waited until the government had presented to parliament the estimates for the present year, he and other hon. members of this House would have been in a better position to express themselves on the question as

to whether or not the government was seeking to effect economies. Yet before the estimates are brought down; before, under our parliamentary procedure, the government had had any opportunity to lay before hon. members of the House a statement of what its expenditures were likely to be, hon. members were asked, through the amendment introduced, to express themselves in a manner which seemed to imply that the government had not been doing its utmost in the matter of effecting economies.

Take the other resolution that was moved. At the time of the presentation of that motion hon. members were not aware of what the government's policy in respect to trade matters was likely to be. They were informed in the Address that certain trade conventions which had been adopted would be presented to parliament, and it was to be assumed that those treaties would have some relation to questions of trade and duties. More than that, it is known by everyone that there is a time particularly set apart for the discussion of matters pertaining to tariff, and that is when the budget is brought down. Why, then, should a debate be precipitated on tariff matters before parliament has before it in the regular way the information which it ought to have in passing upon a matter of the kind? Furthermore, it is open to any hon. member, when the House is being moved into committee of supply, to introduce a resolution to discuss the various subjects to which I have referred. If the question were one of taking away the right of hon. members of the House to a full expression of their views on all matters, I would support my hon. friend in any measure which would increase the freedom of debate. But where our procedure affords ample opportunity to hon. members on appropriate occasions to bring to the attention of the House and of the country matters of great public concern, then I think we are wiser to pause and endeavour to discover the reasons which have made our parliamentary practice what it is, before introducing innovations which tend to strike at the very heart of ministerial responsibility.

May I say a further word, Mr. Speaker, in regard to what my hon. friend has said on the subject of party caucuses? Here again we notice a tendency which has become all too prevalent in recent years, that of finding fault with old customs and methods of doing public business. The caucus in the minds of some people today is supposed to be a very wicked kind of thing. In some way, it is assumed that, through this instrument the cabinet can do what it wishes with its followers, but many of those who have been strongest in condemning the party caucus so-called have been among the first, I have noticed, to recognize that they can get nowhere in understanding the views of their own following until they have a caucus themselves and discuss questions before its members.

Now what is a parliamentary caucus, when one comes down to it? It is nothing more than a gathering of a certain number of members of parliament. In a case of a government caucus it is a bringing together of the majority of members in the House of Commons supporting the government. It is the means whereby a government can ascertain through its following what the views and opinions of the public, as represented by the various constituencies may be. It is not a means of over-riding parliament. It is a means of discovering the will of the people through their representatives in a manner which cannot be done under the formal procedure which is required in this chamber. That is what a party caucus amounts to. A government ought to seek continually to give expression to the public will. A government has to be careful in the matter of the legislation it brings into parliament, to be sure that it is in accord with the public will. How can that best be ascertained? Wait until the legislation is brought down in parliament and put on the Table; or by a conference with the government's own following, if there is any doubt one way or the other in regard to any phases of the legislation? After all, what a government has to keep before it, if it is to be worthy of the name of a government, is first of all the support it will receive in the country for the measures it introduces; secondly, the support it will receive in parliament. The government should continually endeavour to bring in legislation which it feels is in accordance with the needs and desires of the people at large, but there may well be occasions where a government may be obliged to have a further conference with its own following to ascertain whether or not the particular views which it is about to present in the form of legislation are to all intents and purposes in accordance with the wishes of the people, as they understand them. That is in the interests of democracy. That is not taking away any rights from the people's representatives in parliament. It is simply coming into closer consultation with the people's representatives in a manner that permits of the greatest freedom of expression on their part.

May I say this to hon. members of this House? I cannot imagine a more intolerable situation for the government; I cannot imagine anything better calculated to destroy confidence in an administration throughout the country, than that a government should come to parliament with legislation which it is prepared to stand up and fight for, and still permit the slightest doubt as to its securing from parliament what it believes to be necessary in the public interest. Failing this it should be prepared to take its appeal from parliament to the country. A Cabinet has carefully to consider all aspects of public questions before it introduces any legislation. My hon. friend says that to all intents and purposes a government measure should be the same as a private bill. Well, then, may I ask him, why have any Cabinet at all? Why not let us have a Soviet at once, because that is what it amounts to; no head whatever, no directing agency, anyone free to get up and propose any measure with just such knowledge as he may have, free to spring it on the House at any moment, and, with such eloquence as he can muster, carry it through if possible. I do not know what will happen to the legislation of the country if we proceed in that way. Government measures are not brought down lightly. They are the result of long and careful consideration. Government measures are brought down in the light of carefully matured policy, and an administration that brings down its legislation in any other way should not be entitled to expect from parliament a second opportunity once it meets with defeat on a matter which it is prepared to say to the House it regards as all important in the public interest.

5 p.m.

There are other aspects of this question to which I would like to refer, but I think perhaps I have said enough to indicate the point of view of the administration on this resolution. I might, however, mention one or two points that I have made a note of lest it might be thought I was passing them over.

My hon. friend says that without the adoption of his resolution bad legislation might be passed to save a good administration, and good legislation defeated to save a bad administration. There is a passage that my hon. friend will recognize and remember—"By their fruits ye shall know them," and the only way you can tell whether an administration is good or bad is by what it does. I cannot well imagine a good administration bringing in bad legislation or a bad administration bringing in good legislation. I think you must judge an administration in large measure by the class of legislation which it brings in.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

My hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) cited a number of instances where governments had not resigned when they were defeated. Well, that I think ought to be an answer, to all intents and purposes, to what my hon. friend has in view in this resolution. He wants the administration to have some freedom. The cases that have been cited are the exceptions which prove the rule. What my hon. friend by his resolution seeks is to lay down a general principle, not an exception. I can conceive of times where, owing to unforseen circumstances, a thin House, or some minor phase in legislation, or for some special reason not generally understood at the time but which, once explained, is easily understood, it would be unwise for a government, if it suffered defeat under such circumstances to regard defeat as a vote of want of confidence demanding resignation or a request for a dissolution. Circumstances such as those would have to be considered each on its merits, but they should be considered, not as the rule, but as the exception to the rule, and in my opinion ought very seldom to be considered. More than that, the more slender a ministry's following, the more necessary I believe it to be that the ministry should have a full sense of its responsibility to the people's representatives and to that larger public outside the halls of parliament whom they represent.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask a question? If there were three parties of approximately equal strength, and only one of them was represented in the Cabinet, what would be the situation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The position to my mind is exactly the same whether there are three parties or thirty. A government that cannot bring together a group of men, no matter where they are taken from, sufficiently strong to command the confidence of those who compose a parliament has no right to exist. How is public business to be carried on in a manner which will inspire confidence in the country unless a ministry is able to say to the public: With our knowledge of affairs, acquired as only a ministry can acquire it, we believe such and such legislation necessary for the country; we think this or that measure absolutely essential to meet a situation we are face to face with to-day; we give our reasons, give them publicly on the floor of parliament, and if our reasons are not accepted, we shall appeal to those from whom our authority is derived and ask them, if they are unable to give us their support, to put someone else in our place. The

idea that the ministry should be in any way restricted in its appeal to the people at any time is the very antithesis of democracy. The whole effort manifest in the evolution of government has been to bring the ministry to the point where, if for any reason whatever, it ceases to hold the confidence of parliament it will be obliged to go to the people. Once you take away that safeguard, you have substituted possibilities of autocracy for what is after all the strongest factor in the maintenance of democratic principles of government. May I say this to my hon. friend,—and say it as the result of such experience as I have thus far been permitted to have in the management of parliamentary affairs,—that I should not wish to have anything to do with a government which I did not believe had the confidence of the people. I should not wish to belong to a government that would introduce measures which it did not regard as essential to good government and to the needs of the people, and I should not wish to belong to a government, nor would I think of retaining in a Cabinet for a day, which, bringing into parliament a measure which it believed to be in the public interest, which it was prepared to say was in the public interest, would think of continuing in office after a vote of want of confidence was expressed by a refusal by the House of Commons to pass legislation deemed essential by its directing head. That is the position we take as a government, and we take it in the interest of democratic government, in the interests of government by the people, and as a means of maintaining responsible government, which, as I said in beginning these few remarks is the corner stone of our whole constitutional structure.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I have been particularly interested in the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on this resolution. He has, in fact, given a speech which can be justly and appropriately applied to a resolution on proportional representation, and I was particularly pleased to hear his words when he said, "In this age of disturbance we should be particularly careful about adopting innovations". Last year this House had a debate on proportional representation in which I took some part, and the Prime Minister also took a part, and how he would be able to harmonize his arguments to-day upon this motion on the theory of responsibility of Cabinet to parliament with the motion which was made last year will only be disclosed when the new motion on proportional representation is introduced into the House some time in the near future. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is of a kind of which it can be properly said that it is good in theory but poor in practice, and I say so because the whole structure of the constitution is based on the responsibility of the Cabinet to parliament, and any who have given a study to that question must realize that just so soon as we take the responsibility from the Cabinet we revert to another system of government which is not the British system, but which is more nearly analogous to the system which has been adopted in the United States and in France, where the responsibility of the executive is direct to the president and not to parliament.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask if the hon. member considers this resolution takes the responsibility from parliament? If so, in what way does it do so?

Mr. LADNER: This resolution, in my judgment, has the effect in practice of a dissipation of cabinet responsibility, because all a cabinet would need to do, instead of taking the high plane which the Prime Minister has suggested and studying carefully the problems which are to be presented to parliament, would be to go in a haphazard way without consideration, and sometimes perhaps without regard to the best interests of the people, and place the matter before parliament, and say afterwards, "Well, in any event, it is the members' fault, and not the Cabinet's fault." When you come to work out a practice of that kind you are going almost as far back as the time of Charles I. when cabinet responsibility rested directly with the sovereign, and when, as a result of the famous Cabal, it was taken from the sovereign and placed directly upon parliament. A similar situtation existed, if my recollection serves me right, as late as 1842, when the cabinet responsibility in Canada was direct to the Governor General, and afterwards the responsibility was direct to parliament. In short, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the Cabinet to parliament is the keystone of our system of government. It has developed over a long period of time. It has been practised in Great Britain and in many of the dominions, and it has been proven to be the most practical method by which the will of the majority of the people can be expressed in governmental policy and in legislation. Ours has proven to be the flexible constitution, as opposed to the non-flexible or rigid constitution, such as we have in the United States, and just as soon as we take from the Cabinet that responsibility which it should have for

all the measures which it undertakes and give it to the members at large, just so soon do we depart from the principle of government which has been laid down after years and years of practice and experience and has been found to be the soundest of all democracies in the world. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this innovation and the resolution which has been introduced.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I have tried to approach this question with an open mind, and I must confess that the speeches of the last two hon. members seemed to me to be very far from convincing. May I present the situation as I see it in a very homely illustration? A good many hon. members here will have had the experience in times past of hiring men to do certain work, and they will have gone to those men at times and asked them to do certain jobs in a certain way. Now, possibly on such an occasion, the hired man will throw up his hands and say, "Well, if my way doesn't suit you, get somebody else." I do not think that attitude is a creditable attitude. It is an attitude that any man might take, that some men, a good many men possibly, do take; but it reflects no credit, as I see it, upon any man who engages to do a job, to resent criticism. He has a right to ask his employer at such a time "Does this criticism mean that you wish me to quit?—I want to know"; and he has a right to an answer. But he has no right as I see it, if he is an honourable right-thinking man, to quit because there is a little criticism, or even more than a little criticism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that little illustration suggests to me the question of the relationship which exists between the electorate, this House of representatives, and the Cabinet. Theoretically, I know, the Cabinet is chosen by the Prime Minister, by the leader of a so-called majority, section or party, at the request of the King's representative. Theoretically the Cabinet is responsible to the King, or the King's representative; but I think we shall all agree that at the present time, such is largely, if not wholly, a fiction, and that parliament, representing the people, is in the position of master and not servant of the Cabinet. I take it that the Cabinet is asked to look after our executive business, our administration, the business affairs of this country, by and under this parliament; that this parliament is for the time being judge and master; and that going back another step, the people are the judges whether or not this parliament holds the Cabinet properly responsible for the discharge of its duties.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke about this being a time when we should be very careful as to innovations. That is—what shall I say?—a time-honoured plea, yet not, I think, honoured by time; but a plea often advanced at such a time as this on behalf of the status quo. In the city of Winnipeg a few years ago we saw something happen which, as I see it, was a very admirable example of the foolishness of that policy. If there is a time when innovation, carefully considered, is desirable, it is at a time of unrest. Any other policy leads only to social explosions and not to social progress. The rigidity of our institutions is always a source of danger, and in my opinion one of the features of the British constitution which is of tremendous importance is its flexibility, its adaptability to changing conditions. Surely, the world moves! In fact, I heard it said once, and, I think, said with a great deal of propriety—"there is nothing changeless in the world but change." If conditions are constantly changing, then we must adapt ourselves to those changing conditions.

As I understand the resolution before the House, it is but an expression of the best practice under conditions as they exist at the present time. Even in Great Britain, as was shown by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), for many years it has been a very common practice for governments not to take any particular judgment of the House on a specific issue as a vote of no confidence, and it seems to me that, looking at the matter from a commonsense standpoint, the British practice is right. It is particularly necessary at the present time to take cognizance of conditions prevailing. We have now a situation which is very different from what it was a few years ago. We have three very considerable groups in this House, and we have not yet evolved a system of representation in the Cabinet from more than one group. We have no coalition government here, nor have we yet developed a system or method of selecting cabinet ministers out of different groups. If the proportion was somewhat different from what it is at the present time, we would have a minority government. Let us suppose for example, that the government is represented by about one-third of the members of this House, and also that the two other groups constitute one-third each of the membership. How is this policy of cabinet responsibility going to work out under such conditions? We are face to face with a condition, not a theory, and I maintain that the passing of this resolution, the acceptance of it as a general principle, while it could

not possibly compel a government to keep office if the government did not wish to do so, still would liberate them and all the members in the House from a most embarrassing, unfair bondage which exists at the present time.

It was said a few minutes ago that we must judge an administration by the legislation which it brings down. That is absolutely true; but good servants sometimes make mistakes, and if, as I said a few moments ago, a hired man should refuse to work at all because he was criticised for making one or two mistakes, he would not be, in my opinion, in a proper frame of mind. A good administration may make mistakes. Why should they, at any time, say to this House: "Now, this is our policy; you can take it or not; if you do not vote this thing through, we are going to quit the job." They may be simply making a mistake; there may be nothing sinister or malevolent on the part of the administration. While I think all respect and consideration should be given to government measures, it does not follow that every measure is given the greatest consideration by the Cabinet. If such was the case, what would be the purpose of this House to discuss these questions? If a government has all knowledge, and can always decide wisely on all questions, why then have any body superior to the government, to pass upon government measures to criticise, to ask questions, and all that sort of thing? I do not think the argument advanced in that case is valid.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the government also advanced the opinion that this change which we are proposing would increase rather than decrease the danger of autocracy. I cannot feel that that is so at all. It seems to me that the difficulty which the right hon. gentleman conjured up is met by the provision in the latter part of the resolution requiring a specific vote of confidence or no confidence in the government. Supposing a government brings down a measure, and says: "We believe this is a very important measure; we commend it to your consideration." And supposing it is given consideration by the House and it is turned down. The government has a right to say then: "Does this mean that you wish us to resign?" The government has a perfect right to do that; in fact, it ought to do it, and then it will get its answer as to what this House decides it should do. In my opinion, the difficulties and dangers of greater autocracy are met by the requiring of a specific vote of want of confidence after a government defeat.

Nor do I think that such a change as is proposed would, in the natural course of events, lead a ministry to be careless as to what it brought before the House. I felt when that point was raised that there was really very little in it. Surely a self-respecting and competent ministry would not, because it was liberated from a difficult position, bring down for the consideration of the House all kinds of questions regardless of whether they were worth considering or not. To suppose that would be to assume that the government had very little sense. No assemblage of people, I take it, would make a practice of doing that sort of thing. Now, it seems to me that this question was pretty forcibly presented to the House the other day by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and I want to read one little quotation he gave. Referring to the two amendments that were presented on that occasion he figuratively held up his hands in horror at the impropriety of the action which was then proposed, and he quoted Tennyson as follows:

> A land of settled government,
> A land of just and old renown,
> Where Freedom slowly broadens down
> From precedent to precedent.

Everyone here, I think, will subscribe to that; it is what we want. But we do not want stagnation. We want freedom to broaden down, and this is the time when this particular step in the broadening down, or rather the broadening out, of freedom ought to be taken. The Minister of Finance, I think, answered his own objection very properly just a few minutes earlier when he quoted another extract, which I shall read to the House, and which I think is exceedingly pertinent:

> New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth.
> They must upward still, and onward,
> Who would keep abreast of truth.

Conditions are changing, and I maintain that this is the next step, not a revolutionary step that would produce chaos or insurrection or anything of that kind, but something that would free us from a very humiliating, disagreeable and embarrassing kind of bondage. I think, Sir, that some support can be secured for the case which we are presenting from the attitude of the government last year. Every hon. member here, will recall the debate on the oleomargarine question. The Prime Minister, I think, stated, when that matter was submitted to the House, that the government was divided and had no policy. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was apparently stricken with horror that suggestion, but to me it seemed a very proper and very desirable attitude on the part of the government. In presenting the problem to the House in that way the government

asked for an expression of opinion, which it received, and subsequently it brought down a bill to embody that opinion in legislation.

Mr. LADNER: Did the government carry out that expression of opinion?

Mr. GOOD: I think it did. There was some criticism when the bill was brought down by reason of the fact that it was only for one year; but apart from that I think the government did carry out the opinion expressed by the House on that occasion. At that time a very sharp exchange of compliments took place between the right hon. gentleman who leads the Conservative party and several other members of the House. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall just read a part of that colloquy. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) spoke in part as follows:

> I do not quite hold the same view that my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition does in his criticism of the government for failing to accept full responsibility and bring down its measure. I think the position taken by the government in asking the judgment of the House on this question, as it did a few weeks ago, was a fair and a very defensible position. If that were done a little more frequently in parliament—
>
> Mr. Meighen: We would get into this mess more frequently, would we not?
>
> Mr. Crerar: No, I do not think so at all. I think we would have better results. My criticism of the government in this case is that once the judgment of parliament was taken they did not implement that judgment to the full and make this measure permanent.

I shall not read the next few sentences, but a little further on the hon. member for Marquette is reported as follows:

> That is all very well, but if the view of my hon. friend is held to the letter, it simply means that a dozen gentlemen composing the government of this country will decide in cabinet council what is good for the country, and then come to parliament and say, you must take this or turn us out.
>
> Mr. Casgrain: Toryism.
>
> Mr. Meighen: That is right.

Now, the situation last year was very interesting to me. I may say that a great many things that have happened here have seemed to me, as a new member, rather absurd. Possibly I could get used to them if I were here long enough; I dare say people can get used to anything. But if we are to interpret history and human life correctly, it seems to me that we must beware of being tied down to conventions. I am not a hare-brained fanatic. I do not want to see startling and very rapid changes in legislation or constitutional practice. But I do think that we are in constant danger of keeping the lid screwed down too tightly on free speech, on matters of constitutional change, and on everything that encourages or promotes change. And the effect of that will be upheavals and explosions.

Let me give another illustration which seems to me to fit the case under discussion at the present moment. There comes a time in the development of every fertile egg in the hatching process when the imprisoned chick begins to break the shell and to emerge. If the chick did not break the shell at a certain period in its development it would die; and it is just as natural for the shell to be broken at a certain stage as for any other change to take place in the organic world. Our customs are very often something like the shell that surrounds the chick—we have to break them or we will die. It was said many years ago, as all hon. members know, that the new wine would burst the old wine-skins. I think that in this chamber at the present time there is a good deal of new wine trying to burst the old skins—old customs which tie us down, cripple and embarrass us and, as far as I can see, do us no good whatever.

I take it that there are two ways in which an administration can carry on. One is by having a solid, and what tends to become a servile, majority behind it. In that way a group of men can ram down the throats of their followers and the country any policy they choose. I think we do not have to look very far back in our history to see something of that sort. The other method is for the government to conform its policy, not only before it brings that policy down but afterwards, to the will of the elected representatives, and through them to the will of the people. I see nothing in that attitude which would indicate any lack of self-respect on the part of a government. In fact, it seems to me that it indicates an attitude the very reverse. I know it has been maintained by many that the self-respect of this parliament would be taken away if a constitutional check were placed upon it such as might operate through the optional referendum; but, Sir, I do not believe that that is so. We admit that we are here subject to the surveillance and guidance of the electorate, because every four or five years we go back to the fountain-head of power and ask for further instructions and for a fresh mandate. Now, we do not consider that we demean ourselves because we do that. Nor would we, I take it, be any more lacking in self-respect if we were subject to a continuous oversight by the people, which we might have through such a device as the optional referendum. So that the attitude of a government in coming to

this House, as the present administration did last year in connection with the oleomargarine question, and asking for instructions, and then carrying out those instructions. would not, I think, indicate lack of self-respect. For my part, I would esteem a man or a group of men much more highly who adopted that attitude rather than the other attitude of: "Well, if you don't like it we'll quit".

Attention has been drawn already, Mr. Speaker, to the serious danger of confused or blended issues. I wish to point out again, and to emphasize as much as I can, the tremendous danger which resides in that fact. In all our general elections we have, most unfortunately for this country, a great variety of issues confused or blended. In some places one issue is uppermost, in some places another; and the result is that very rarely are questions considered on their merits. Now, I maintain that anything we can do to disentangle issues, to consider and decide every issue on its own merits, is a step towards better legislation and a truer democracy. But when the fate of an administration is linked up with the acceptance or rejection of a particular policy, I think it is highly unfortunate. It has been maintained, of course, that no harm has resulted by following what has been the general practice in this country; but I submit that a great deal of harm has been done. In fact, I am inclined to think that if we could read the hearts of hon. members opposite we would realize that a great deal of harm was done not long ago by their acceptance of an obligation which no doubt compelled many of them to choose what they took to be the lesser of two evils, and to maintain the government in office at all costs, even at the sacrifice of their own principles.

While I would disagree with very little of what the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said by way of general comment on constitutional practice, at the same time I do not think that his remarks were entirely relevant, nor did they constitute any really valid argument against the adoption of this principle. If all parties in this House could only see their way clear to adopt it, I am convinced that we would all feel a great burden taken off our shoulders. Last year I recall that on the budget vote some hon. members were extremely embarrassed by a conflict between their own opinions and what they thought was their duty in regard to the specific situation that faced them. Surely we can get away from that. Surely we are not so tied to custom but what if it is binding and galling we cannot change the custom to give us freedom and relief. And if we made the proposed change, and it did not work well, we should still be at liberty to restore the present practice. Therefore, taking all things into consideration, I feel that this is a very, very necessary step towards the liberation of all hon. members, and I shall heartily support the resolution.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I should not have taken part in this debate, but during its course it has occurred to me that there is presented an aspect of very great importance to a third party in this House. I was somewhat amazed to hear the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) express his attachment for things that are antique. I do not know that it becomes him as a Liberal prime minister to have that sentimental attachment to practices and customs by virtue of their ancient character. It seems to me that he presented no argument that can be considered valid by such a House as this that has come to be what it is through the gradual elimination of things antique and their replacement by others that are modern and more in keeping with our present day thought and action.

With respect to his deprecation of adopting any innovation at the present time in view of world conditions and the very uncertain state of our civilization, well, I modestly put it up to him, assuming that he had reference to Russia: Is the condition of things in Russia due to innovation, or is it due to the resistance of innovation? Does he not think that reasonable concession to progress would have had a very marked influence upon the progress of events in Russia? Every right thinking man believes that it would; it was the unreasoning, blind opposition to reasonable improvements that brought Russia to the condition she finds herself in to-day. It is a well known statement of a famous British philosopher that perverse resistance to reasonable innovation is one of the chief incitements to revolution; it always has been and always will be.

Now with respect to the argument regarding responsible government, that is one of the phrases that it is very easy to conjure with, because it has become part of the mosaic of our British parliamentary stock of ideas. "Responsible government,"—what does it mean? Reflect upon it for a minute. Originally —I put it to you—did it not mean the supremacy of parliament? Is that not what it means in the first place? I prefer to look at it in that light. I prefer to do away with that slippery phrase, "responsible government", it

has no place in rational argument, because it immediately gives rise to many phases of meaning that you can conjure with and that you can use to obscure the purpose of a debate like this. The original idea behind responsible government was simply the supremacy of parliament, and I think that that is the idea we have before us at the present time—the supremacy of this House, not the supremacy of any part of it; not the supremacy of the government or of the governmental party, but the supremacy of this body of elected representatives of the people. That is the idea that we have to hold before us.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend a question? How does he make out that it is in any way interfering with the supremacy of parliament to give parliament the right at any and all times to turn the ministry out of office?

Mr. BIRD: I agree that parliament ought to maintain its right to turn the ministry out of office, but it ought also to have the right to say whether a minister shall resign office or not. I mean that parliament ought to be the court of last resort in all instances, on all questions. Originally, as I understand it, responsible government applied to administration only; it meant that a government should be responsible to the House for its acts of administration, and had no reference at all to any transaction that took place within the House itself. That was a very reasonable view, as things were in times past. I hold that the Prime Minister's view of responsible government is out of harmony with the supremacy of parliament as we conceive it, because it simply means that the Cabinet is responsible not to parliament, but to itself. The Prime Minister resents the suggestion that the responsibility of the Cabinet to itself should be interefered with in any way and seems to maintain that the Cabinet should decide all questions that come up, and that nobody else should influence its decision.

Our contention is that the supremacy of this House is the supremacy of its majority—not of the majority of the Liberal party in power at the present time; not of the majority of the present cabinet, but of the majority of voices on the floor of the House. The liberties of the people cannot be preserved in any other way. This cabinet supremacy, which is altogether out of harmony with parliament's supremacy, is a thing of latter-day growth. We have seen, by slow development, the powers of parliament filched from our hand. I noted especially last session some expressions of the Prime Minister himself which indicated that he was sensible of that condition—some very remarkable expressions, as I thought, which showed also that the Prime Minister was a good deal better than his creed. His expressions on that occasion indicated his belief that an unhealthy kind of power had come to reside within cabinets, and he intimated that with a view of remedying the condition he was going to see that the Cabinet acted in future more as a committee of the House than it had done in the past. But how is it going to act as a committee of the House if it does not consult the House, if it does not extend to all sections in the House the right to be consulted—the latter, by the way, being a very famous phrase in the history of our constitution.

As I said at the outset, the really important aspect of this discussion is its bearing upon the third party in the House. We came here last year as a third party, important in point of numbers, and important, too, in respect to the impulse that sent us here—an impulse, which. I conceive, has not estranged it from the forward-looking members of the House, whatever party they belong to. Apart altogether from the sectional matters that we have to bring before you, you will recognize that behind us there is a true democratic impulse. Well, coming here last session we found that a place had by no means been prepared for us, and that when we naturally sought free discussion on many questions we found ourselves trammelled, our hands tied. In the budget debate we saw that come to a head when the third party was tied hand and foot in respect to a free expression of opinion upon matters which were important to the members of that party and to their constituents. That sort of thing is intolerable, and I say that if the Prime Minister and his Cabinet turn down this resolution, it is up to them to see that a greater degree of hospitality is extended toward this third party, this new factor in the parliament of Canada. They should see that we are given greater freedom of expression, that we are not trammelled in any way, in the matter of presenting to the House those things that we are sent here to lay before it.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not think that it is more in accordance with democracy that he should have the right, if he does not agree with the government, to move a resolution which could result in the defeat of the government, rather than that the way should be opened to the moving of all sorts of academic resolutions which would mean nothing?

Mr. BIRD: I do not know whether I understand the question aright, but it seems to express what I am contending for—that we should have the right to free expression of opinion. We are the court of final appeal on all questions.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, to my mind the attitude taken by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is in accordance with all precedents of parliamentary government in the British Empire. If I were on the opposite side of the House and opposing the government, I should regard it as in the best interests of the country, and would consider that I had been given ample opportunity to express my views, if the defeat of a government bill or resolution was regarded by the administration as a vote of want of confidence. If the government cannot carry its legislation through, if the majority of the members of the House are opposed to a government bill or resolution, then that is a matter of want of confidence; that has been the practice in every country where British parliamentary usages have prevailed.

So that I claim that in spite of the present condition of things, in spite of the different groups in this country, it behooves us to consider well before we alter anything which is in accord with British parliamentary institutions. I do not believe it is in the best interests of this country for my hon. friends opposite to get up and move all sorts of academic resolutions, or to have them try and defeat government measures without taking the necessary consequences.. If the right hon. gentleman who leads the government cannot command a majority of the members of the House, then I think that in accordance with British parliamentary institutions and British practice it is his duty to resign and go to the country and let the people decide. We are sick and tired of hearing academic questions discussed. We want realities, and my hon. friend and his friends opposite would be well advised to advocate something that is in accord with British parliamentary institutions and with parliamentary practice in this country, instead of constantly bringing up precedents which exist only as a figment of their own imagination.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine). At the same time I really do not apprehend that if the resolution were to pass we would immediately be precipitated into a condition of chaos, or anything resembling the unfortunate plight of Russia to-day. I am disposed to think the resolution might pass without anything more disastrous happening than the declaration of a mistaken principle, a principle that the experience of years has shown not to be to the advantage of democracy. I do not think Canada is liable to be plunged into chaos because of such an assertion as this obtaining the approval of parliament. Indeed, even had one of the amendments to the Address or both been passed, and the government consequently suffered defeat, I was really inclined to doubt—and as the nights and days have passed since that time, my doubts have been intensified—whether this Dominion would as a consequence be smouldering in the fires of revolution or even of despair, such as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) threatened us with the other night. My reasons for opposing the resolution are by no means of so startling or determined a character as that. The resolution in its words says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government unless followed by a vote of lack of confidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even should the resolution pass, I really do not think even any difference in the present practice would then obtain. The government is at liberty to resign any minute. The government is ultimately the sole judge of what shall be sufficient or insufficient cause for its continuance or discontinuance in office; nor does the hon. member for Calgary suggest that a government in this regard should be finally restrained at all. In answer to the very pertinent inquiry of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) the mover said: "No, I would not suggest the rights of a government to resign should be abbreviated. I am quite prepared that these rights shall remain just as ample as they are to-day." Even should the resolution, as it is understood by its sponsor, carry, a government could then take any vote of the House as a vote of want of confidence and retire. Its liberty of action in that regard would not be restrained in the least.

Then I am asked: What would be the consequence of the resolution carrying? Well, it would simply be a declaration by the House that the government would be wrong—even though it had quite a constitutional right—it would be wrong in exercising liberty of ac-

tion, unless an adverse vote were followed by another vote declaring want of confidence. I am not prepared to subscribe to that declaration. I do not think such a declaration would have any appreciable effect on the action of a government at all, but I am not prepared to subscribe to an assertion that a government would be wrong in exercising its undoubted right of resignation and determining for itself when a vote in parliament was such that it made it in the public interest not wise for the government to continue. Why do I say so? Hon. members to my left argue that this suggestion is merely an expansion of democratic principles, merely an elaboration of democratic right, namely for parliament to declare when a government is morally right in exercising its liberty of resignation and when it is morally wrong. Is that really an expansion of democratic right? I am inclined to think the contrary.

In this regard, I come to the similar conclusion to that of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), though I must say that I did not understand the process by which he arrived at his conclusion. I come to my opinion, I think, by a much more direct method, not quite the same opinion either, because if the conclusion that a government's right of resignation should be ample, unrestrained by any declaration of parliament; if the conclusion is that a government should always exercise that right, and resign as stated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), when it is defeated on its own measure in this House, if that is to be the invariable course, and if such a conclusion is Toryism, then really I must be allowed to subtract from the Toryism of the Prime Minister in expressing my own. I think this an extreme statement of the situation.

The history of the British parliament is illuminating. It has been well reviewed by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw); but I wondered, as he spoke, if he did not realize that the tendency of the last century and a quarter had been entirely away from the conclusion embodied in this resolution, rather than approximating to it. A century and a quarter ago, this theory much more resembled the practice of Parliament than it does to-day. Then, that is to say, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, it was considered quite the constitutional right of a government to continue in office year after year, although on vital measures it met repeatedly with an adverse vote of the people's representatives. But that was in days when the direct answerability of the House of Commons and of the government to the people of the country was in no way as well established, in no way as perfected as that answerability is to-day.

Such a course could never be tolerated in a British parliament at this time. I do not say that it would not be tolerated in a British parliament that a government may suffer defeat and still judge that that defeat is not of a character to warrant its resignation. Even yet that is possible; but the ambit of cases in which that is possible is far more restricted now than it was in the days of Pitt, Walpole, Grey or Peel. What was considered right for those statesmen would, in the days of Asquith, Lloyd George and Bonar Law, be considered a practical usurpation of power. The tendency all through the century and a quarter has been to restrict the privileges of government in this regard, to restrict its right to hold on to office after the general principles of its policy, after its legislative proposals in essence have met with an adverse vote of the House of Commons. To pass this resolution, however well intended it may be, would be not to advance the measure of democratic power and control, but very perceptibly to contract and diminish it.

I stated that there had survived even to the present time—and I think it will always survive—the doctrine that a government is not required, merely because of an adverse vote, under certain limited circumstances, to take that vote as a want of confidence and to retire. In the last thirty years, there have been in the British House of Commons four cases where an adverse vote has been taken on measures of more or less consequence, in one or two cases mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary West, of considerable consequence. But in three or four cases, the government saw fit not to retire; in the one case, it saw fit to retire. Nevertheless, in the three cases, there were circumstances present which were of an important character and which, undoubtedly, detracted from the obligation of the government to take the vote as a want of confidence.

Every case must be judged in the light of the circumstances that surround it, and I would mention some of the pertinent circumstances as these: First of all, the importance of the measure; that is to say: Does it form an integral part of public policy of the government, or does it not? If it is merely incidental, then that would be a factor to take into account and would tend to lead a government not to take an adverse vote as necessarily fatal to tenure of office. But that alone would not be the only factor. A gov-

ernment would also have to inquire how far that particular piece of legislation, or that adverse vote, perhaps, on a resolution from the other side, affected the commitment of the government to the people of the country, upon which commitment it was returned to office. That would be a fundamental factor as well.

Another factor would be this: How long has the government been in office? If a government is newly returned with a strong and popular majority, then it would not be affected by as light considerations as might be regarded of moment under other circumstances. Still, a fourth factor would be this: How far do indications within parliament and beyond parliament reveal the support of the government in the popular mind? If, by the evidence of by-elections, if by what other evidences might be prominent, a government felt that it was losing popular support, then it would not take so important an adverse vote in parliament to justify its accepting that vote as want of confidence and resigning. All these things must be taken into account; but the tendency of the years has been to restrict the right of government to hang on to office rather than to amplify that right in the presence and under the mandate of an adverse vote of parliament.

As the Prime Minister, however, was speaking, and as he pictured a rather chaotic and dismal future for us if this resolution should pass, I could not help but think how appropriate, perhaps how embarrassing to his followers, that speech would have been just a few months before when the Minister of Militia and Defence, (Mr. Graham) came before this House with his estimates for his department. When the Prime Minister was stating how carefully a government reviewed its proposals before they were submitted to the House of Commons, how thoroughly the needs of the country were canvassed, how deliberate were all those considerations and all that premeditation, how final was the conclusion when the government came before the House of Commons and presented its proposals there, and how those proposals had to be supported or the government was bound to retire or be guilty of autocracy, that awful crime, I wondered how that speech would have sounded last session, had it been made just following the submission of the Minister of Militia and Defence to the rebellious mandate of a few of his followers behind.

I remember how, last session, the government declared that it had considered its proposals with the utmost finality, how it had reviewed the condition of the country and had come to the conclusion that if those militia estimates were reduced at all, then they were below the margin of safety in Canada and the government could not take the responsibility. But within just a few short days the Minister of Militia came and he said: "I have decided to reduce these estimates; I have decided to drop about one million dollars from the margin of safety for Canada." How appropriate the speech of the Prime Minister to-night would have sounded had he risen to answer his Minister of Militia and Defence on that occasion. It would have been more appropriate and more to the point than it is in answer to the Address and the motion of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine). There the government declared that was vital; there it declared it stood and had to stand for the safety of the Dominion. Could anything be more vital than that? But having stood there, it dropped away and did so in order to accommodate itself to the wishes of a mutinous section behind. There was a case where the government should have stood, if ever such a case existed in the parliament of Canada. There is a case where this government receded and surrendered.

I do not subscribe to the viewpoint, I might say to the general theory or principle that seems to animate certain hon. gentlemen in this House. I do not for a moment challenge the sincerity of their attitude; in fact I know that their viewpoint is the viewpoint of the majority, at least it was, of those they represent, for this very principle has been under consideration at popular assemblies of their followers through this country many a time, and I think it has usually received approval. I do not subscribe to the viewpoint that the government of Canada is in the nature of a hired servant whose only duty is to obey the directions, the orders, the mandates of the representatives in parliament who support it, of parliament as a whole, and of the populace of the country. I do not subscribe to the theory that the government is in the relation of a hired man to this House. I do not believe in the hired man theory at all; I did not believe it when I was in office and I do not change my belief when in opposition. Such a theory is entirely at variance with the whole idea of constitutional government. The government is in no sense the hired man of the House of Commons; it is not a committee of the House of Commons. We had that theory brought forward last session, and these words came from the mouth of the Prime Minister, although we did not hear much to that effect this afternoon. The fact is that the theory is wrong; it is not British at all. I repeat, a government is not a committee of the House of Commons: it is the responsible

body of officers of the King in this country. The duty of the government is to lead public policy, domestic and foreign. The government must submit their proposals to the people's representatives and must abide by the verdict of those representatives, favourable or unfavourable, whatever it may be. And a country that is accursed with a government that has not within itself the power of leadership, of showing what the right road is in the light of information that only a government can have, is going to suffer in the race in this world. It is not going to enjoy what it ought to enjoy; it is not going to get the service it ought to get from the government that leads it. A government must submit legislative proposals and must take the leadership, because it is in a position to take leadership; and those who hold the theory that leadership can be taken by the rank and file are opposed to a principle which it seems to me has been vindicated by the march of centuries, of ages. Those in authority must lead. The British constitutional practice has led to this result. While they lead, they may be checked, they may be directed, they may be hurled from power as the penalty of failure. But failure to lead is just as great a failure as any other. The government is answerable for its legislative proposals to this House in just precisely the same way as it is answerable for its administrative acts; it is responsible for the one as it is responsible for the other. It is charged with the responsibility of initiating both, and the government that fails in either respect does not do its duty by the people of the country which it is supposed to lead.

Now, I do not deny for a moment that some of the difficulties which hon. gentlemen to my left have expatiated upon to-day do arise as a consequence of that practice. I do not deny at all that times arise when members of this House have to decide between the support of a measure, on which perhaps the balance of influence, in their own minds, say, would be favourable, and voting against it, when they know that a vote against that measure is a vote of want of confidence in the administration. I know that the consequence is that the question of confidence comes into the question of the merits of the specific proposal or the specific legislation. If that is confusion, then to that degree there is confusion. But that we must abide by. There is no way by which that can be surmounted, except at a cost that would be far greater than any possible results of confusion which hon. gentlemen may have in mind. If a government could come into the House and, either through one of its own members or through a private member, propose a course of fundamental public policy going to the very root of the prosperity of the country, going perhaps to the very root of our national destiny, and then, having been defeated upon that and having found that it does not meet with the favour of the House, say, "Very well, we will wait a few weeks and come back again with another proposal and see whether it will not meet with approval at the hands of parliament; after we have tested the situation we will come again,"—if that could be done, I say, then the moral authority of government would be gone. If that could be done no government could command any respect. There are times, on matters of minor consequence, where perhaps it is justifiable for an administration to leave to the general vote of parliament, without the lead of government, the direction of its course. But necessarily that must be in regard to a matter of minor consequence; and necessarily, also, it must be rare. For if even that were to occur frequently—and I am making no reference to the present administration, because so far they have not done it frequently—if the government were to come frequently to parliament and say, "Upon this subject we cannot unite, upon this subject we have no opinion, we will leave it to you and will act merely as your messengers and carry out whatever you say, because we have no opinion to offer ourselves," then, I repeat, the moral authority of government throughout the country would be impaired day by day. And no government could long last in this Dominion or in any other British country that frequently submitted itself to the exigencies of situations such as that. Occasionally, I say, it is possible.

Let us for a moment just review the ocasion last session when it did occur. The government had no united view on the question of the admission of oleomargarine into this country. Consequently, they said to parliament, "We cannot unite; we have no opinion as a government. You discuss it now and decide what you want and we will carry out your wishes, whatever they may be." Parliament discussed the matter and decided on the permanent admission of oleomargarine into the country. The government found that they could not accept that decision. A division in the government made it impossible to carry out the recommendation. What did they do? They came and said, "We promised to carry out your wishes but we cannot. However, if you will meet us half way we will meet you and admit oleomargarine for twelve months."

And we had the spectacle in the House of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) standing in his place, the sponsor of a measure which he described in his own classical language as a rotten old bill. Now, that was a consequence of one of the departures from the constitutional principle. Let these instances be rare; and especially, I suggest, let them be rare on the part of the present administration. For any moral authority which it may have enjoyed a year ago is very seriously reduced just now. Do not let that moral authority be prejudiced by failure to unite on important measures of any character. Let the government show to the country that it is united and that it can advance opinions that are government opinions and policies that are government policies. The more we follow that course the more we shall lead to the result where there shall be the most immediate answerability of government to parliament. And that, as I understand it, is the perfection of British institutions.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this debate, because I imagine that the arguments from this part of the House have been pretty well presented. But I almost felt compelled to express my appreciation of the very mild and generous criticism which we have had to-night from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I must compliment him upon his changed attitude; I hope he will continue as he is doing. If he does, I can assure him we will reciprocate. I am not at all afraid of the consequences that are likely to ensue if the proposal now submitted to the House is accepted. I was reading to-night an article in the Manitoba Free Press, when we offered that amendment to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) pointed out to us the dire consequences that would ensue should that amendment be carried. Nevertheless we persisted, and I find to-night when I take up the most influential paper in the three prairie provinces that it has nothing but praise for our action and declares that we have once again demonstrated to the country that there are only two parties in this House: the party that sits in this quarter of the chamber and the members of the other parties scattered on both sides of the house. Sometimes I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, if there is a reason for our existence, but as the days go by I feel pretty sure that we are exercising a good influence on the government of this country.

I do not know that I have felt exactly pleased with our position in many instances. Some people imagine that to hold the balance of power is a good position to occupy in this House. I am not one of those. I do not want to occupy a position where we must simply sit and wait and throw our influence on one side or on the other as it pleases us. I do not believe that that makes for the best system of government. I should like the privilege and opportunity of having at least some share in formulating the principles and ideas that shall come before this House, and I cannot but believe that the move we are now taking is in that direction.

The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said that you cannot prevent a government from resigning. I do not think any one has ever entertained an idea of that kind. We are perfectly aware of the fact that the government can resign any day they choose. But that is a different thing altogether to what is contemplated by this resolution. Very recently in this House we were called upon to decide between voting with the government or forcing an election upon an issue, not of national importance, but in some respects almost trivial.

Now, we are sometimes twitted with being afraid of precipitating an election. I want to put the House right upon that matter without further delay. I take up the newspapers now and then that are not very friendly towards members in this part of the House and I find they indulge in rather cheap talk about our being afraid to go back to our constituencies to fight an election, and consequently the government is quite sure of our support at all times. I want to tell hon. members that in no part of the House are the members so sure of their seats as those in this section. On the amendment to the Address—

Mr. STEVENS: You divided.

Mr. FORKE: I could go back to the constituency of Brandon, Mr. Speaker, and probably I would get an acclamation. So I hope our opponents will not waste any more time twitting us with being afraid of another election, because we are pretty nearly sure of the ground we are taking. The hon. gentleman to my right (Mr. Stevens) says we are divided. Well, he and his friends are never divided. That is one virtue they have, anyway, they are unanimous.

Now, as to parliamentary government. I listened with a good deal of admiration to the speech of the Prime Minister. He went

back a long way into British parliamentary history, for of course the British constitution and parliamentary practice play a large part in all these discussions. The right hon. leader of the Opposition also went back into British parliamentary history. I quite agree with them to a great extent. I am a great admirer of British institutions. But at the same time we are moving forward day by day, and new conditions demand new methods. I took the following extract from Lowell's Government of England, to be found at page 80:

> No serious changes in the structure of the cabinet are probable so long as parliamentary government retains the present form; and it is too early to speculate on the changes that may occur if the parliamentary system itself becomes modified under the pressure of political parties acting in a democratic country.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that that time has arrived, that we are living under new conditions, and that we must carry on our parliamentary institutions under new conditions. The British parliamentary practice has been founded on the two-party system. In this House we now have three parties. I know there have been third and fourth parties in the British House of Commons, but they never exercised any large influence on the government, certainly nothing to the same degree that this party exercises upon the government in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FORKE: I am a very modest man. I repeat again, new conditions require new methods. Reference has been made to the British parliamentary system. I do not know but what that system has been breaking down for almost half a generation now, and we see at times an almost chaotic condition prevailing in the Mother of Parliaments. I believe that one of the tragedies of our modern system of government is the lessening of the people's faith in parliamentary institutions. Why has this occurred? Simply because cabinets, through custom, have become autocratic, forcing their policies through parliament with the help of an obedient majority, so that parliamentary government has largely become a farce. I believe that a great deal of credit is due to the Prime Minister for some of the methods he adopted last year, and it would not do any harm if he proceeded further along the same path this year. I for one would be quite ready to give assistance and advice in many cases—again I speak with all modesty, Sir,—before the government committed itself irretrievably to any measure upon which there may be a difference of opinion. That, I believe, would be true parliamentary government.

I have no fear if this resolution should be given effect to: on the contrary, I believe that government will move along a great deal more smoothly and in the better interests of the country. In conclusion, Sir, let me say that I do not want to hear any more of those taunts that we are afraid to vote against the government for fear there should be a dissolution of parliament.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter contained in the resolution is somewhat circumscribed, and there is very little new that one can say regarding it. However, the discussion has been quite interesting and should do considerable good. But that discussion having taken place, I venture to submit to the House that little benefit could come from forcing a vote upon the resolution.

The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr Shaw) I think stated the constitutional question very well this afternoon; but I do not think he spoke in support of the resolution. Every argument he adduced, every parliamentary precedent that he referred to, was evidently and obviously in support of the position taken by hon. gentlemen who oppose him. Some hon. members opposite have insinuated that to oppose this resolution is to be unprogressive and that such opposition would disclose an illiberal tendency. On the contrary, I assert that the adoption of this resolution would be unprogressive and reactionary in its effect.

The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) has referred to the fact that parliamentary practice is always developing new phases. This is quite true. That being so, why attempt to circumscribe and make rigid parliamentary practice by the adoption of a set formula and expect it to be applicable to-day, to-morrow, and afterwards? That is not characteristic of parliamentary practice under British institutions, and I believe we will make sounder progress by following the old paths than by attempting to lay down procedure to guide future parliaments.

The actions of the legislatures of Alberta and Nova Scotia have been referred to. I deny the right of Alberta to establish parliamentary precedents which we must follow. I really do not know what action that legislature did take. My attention was called this afternoon by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who sits beside me, to the fact that on the occasion of the first motion, similar to that which we are now considering, being made in the legislature of Alberta it was ruled out of order; possibly it was later adopted. I cannot recall the circumstances

under which the Nova Scotia legislature adopted, as it is alleged, a similar resolution. Academic resolutions get us nowhere when we are discussing serious questions. The arguments advanced in these legislatures may have been weak or irrelevant, and it is hardly to the point to cite the action of these legislatures in support of arguments on behalf of the motion now before the House.

I quite agree with the position taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) regarding the argument advanced this afternoon that legislators are not in the position of hired servants; it is time we abandoned that theory. I think it is regrettable that hon. gentlemen opposite in the Progressive party, who, I admit, contribute a great deal to the public life of this country and to progressive legislation and progressive ideas, display a disposition to be guided too much by the dicta and the resolutions of commercial or occupational organizations in their several constituencies. It will be unfortunate for this country or for parliament if members of parliament feel that they are bound by the academic resolutions passed by bodies within their constituencies upon the various questions coming before us from time to time for consideration.

Reference has also been made to the two amendments which were moved upon the consideration of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I did not speak upon that occasion, but I do not hesitate now to say that the first amendment was clearly a vote of want of confidence in the government. I hardly know what to say about the sub-amendment of the member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). I do not impute to him any improper motives; it was his absolute right to make the motion. But after all, it was no more than a pious wink, or a yawn, or a purposeless gesture. I do not see how he could have expected the House to support it. Still, in the abstract one would not have liked to condemn it; the hon. member was merely asserting something that everyone believed in. I think the point was taken that the Speech from the Throne did make reference to the question of economy in public expenditure.

Some hon. gentlemen this afternoon attempted to give expression to the view that because in this parliament we have several groups, parliamentary practice will have to be changed. If the group system persists, and if in any parliament the government party constituted a minority of the House, that is, were not equal in numbers to the opposing groups—and we were desirous of having settled, well-ordered, continuous government, some changes in our constitution might be necessary. I have often thought there is a good deal to be said in favour of a fixed period of parliament, such as obtains in the United States and in France. If the electors should in the future decide that the two historic parties have to be abandoned and that we are to have in parliament four or five or six groups, it is quite conceivable that the constitution would have to be amended in order to ensure some degree of permanence in the government charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the country. However, I do not think it is necessary to consider that just at the present moment.

There is not much reason, Mr. Speaker, for a lengthy debate upon this resolution, still less for a vote upon it, because it is merely declaratory of that which is now parliamentary practice here and in Great Britain. I understood the right hon. leader of the Opposition to take that position, and I think he was right. If that is so, then a discussion of the issue is purposeless.

I have already stated that in my judgment it would be a mistake to attempt to lay down any rigid formula for the guidance of parliament so far as its practice is concerned. We would find that unsatisfactory. From day to day things would be occurring that could not be squared with this formula; so I think it is wiser to deal with questions of parliamentary practice in their concrete form as they arise. Now, the resolution says:

> That in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government.

Nobody can challenge that statement; the member for Calgary West cited ample authority this afternoon in support of it I have never heard anything to the contrary asserted in this parliament; it has always been the practice here. Perhaps in this country we have construed it a little too narrowly, and frequently governments have not extended to their supporters quite the measure of freedom that they might well have done. I think that in England they are a little broader in their interpretation of this parliamentary practice. However, the portion of the resolution that I have read is now the accepted parliamentary practice in this country, and there is nothing to be gained by reasserting or implementing it or supporting it further by a vote of parliament. If the government were defeated to-night, it would not necessarily follow that they would resign. Parliament would hardly expect that to follow; the country would not expect it. The

question of whether or not the government should resign would depend upon the importance of the resolution and a great many other considerations; it could be properly decided only upon a full consideration of all the attending facts.

The constitutional position, I think, was well put by the Hon. Mr. Balfour in the statement quoted by the hon. member for Calgary West, and I would like briefly to refer to it again. Mr. Balfour was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the time, with a parliamentary majority of seventy. His government was defeated on a vote which had some relation to Irish issues, and the opposition naturally called upon him to resign. He made a review of the constitutional history of the question, and after referring to the precedents he concluded as follows:

> Now I think it is evident from this brief, and perhaps too rapid, survey of recent constitutional history that the only divisions which, taken by themselves, and in isolation from the general circumstances of the time, from the feeling of the Parties in the House, from the question of union in the cabinet—the only parliamentary issues which, taken in isolation from thse attendant circumstancs, have always been regarded as conclusive are those in which there has been a trial of strength between the parties with all the circumstances of notice and other attendant incidents required to make it clear that the issue to be decided is one of "confidence" or "no confidence". A case which I have just alluded to in another connection shows how rigidly this rule has been drawn; because, while it is the ordinary view—and I think, broadly speaking, the sound view—that a hostile vote on the Address is regarded as a vote of censure and is supposed to be fatal to the government, I have just reminded the House that such a hostile vote was actually given in 1904 on the Address, and all that the then leader of the House and the then Prime Minister did was to reintroduce the Address in a somewhat abbreviated form.

The substance of the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Balfour which I have just quoted to the House means that only under exceptional circumstances, where the issue has been clear-cut between the parties, is the resignation of a government contemplated under obtaining British parliamentary practice, and that is what this resolution in its former part asserts, namely:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government.

All the authority which my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) quoted this afternoon was in support of that position, which I say is the prevailing parliamentary practice.

The resolution, however, goes on to say, "unless followed by a vote of lack of confidence." Clearly that is the parliamentary practice to-day. It could not be otherwise. If a government is defeated upon a measure and declines to resign, there is only one method by which its opponents can force the issue, and that is by immediately moving a vote of want of confidence. That is what happened in the case which Mr. Balfour was discussing in 1905. Some hon. gentleman put on the order paper a notice of motion of want of confidence in the government, after its defeat. Mr. Balfour, however, anticipated that by moving the adjournment of the debate after he had made the statement from which I have just quoted; it was the same thing, of course. I again say that when a government meets with an adverse vote in parliament, if it does not of its own volition resign, if it does not itself regard the circumstances as of sufficient importance to justify its immediate resignation, and if the contrary view obtains among its opponents, it is the duty of those opposing the government immediately to move a vote of want of confidence. So, therefore, I say that this resolution is merely declaratory of what is the present sound parliamentary practice in this country and Great Britain. I further say that it would be a great mistake on our part to attempt to make an inflexible rule regarding such matters. Parliamentary practice, as every hon. gentleman knows, is a growth, a development, and I think we shall best meet the needs of our time and of the future by allowing the practice of our parliament to grow and develop in the future as it has in the past.

I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have enunciated the proposition that after all it is the government, the executive of this country that is best able to judge how it should interpret an adverse vote in parliament. But this resolution, in effect, says that if a government after an adverse vote secures a vote of confidence, it should not resign. That is not sound parliamentary practice. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman in that same debate took the position that because a government happens to have a parliamentary majority, it does not follow that it should retain office. It is quite obvious that selfish interests, personal interests, might induce members of parliament to disregard what was obviously a public opinion adverse to the government in office. But if this were the rigid and inflexible rule it would be very difficult to say whether an administration was acting improperly if, after having secured a vote of confidence from parliament, it should still retain office. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman replied to Mr. Balfour in the debate from which I have quoted, and discussing the precedents referred to by him, he said in part:

Some of them are of an important character, and some are of no importance at all; and they depend, as he himself had to admit, upon the circumstances in which they occurred as well as upon the merits. I will say at once that this was no ordinary occasion of the defeat of a government. The right hon. gentleman has endeavoured to make light of the indication of the feeling of the country afforded by the by-elections. He has done so on many occasions before; and the attitude he has taken is this—that as long as he was not deprived of the support of his friends in the House, he considered that he was entitled to retain office, notwithstanding any amount of by-elections or other indications of a change of popular feeling. In that he takes up what I believe to be an entirely unconstitutional position. It is common for us to say, and it is true constitutionally, that the Minister of the Crown in this country is selected and appointed because he is the man who commands a majority in the House of Commons. But what does that mean? It means that the command of the majority of the House represents the feeling of the country. The moment the House of Commons get out of touch and harmony with the country then that plea for retaining office dissolves; and the right hon. Gentleman has no right to entrench himself behind the confidence and support of his friends here after it is known to all mankind and to himself, as well as to any of them, that he has lost the confidence of the country.

I think that is a sound position. It does not follow, it should not follow, that because a government is able to secure the
9 p.m. passage of a vote of confidence in parliament, it should therefore retain office.

In conclusion, I wish to say that there is nothing particularly new in this resolution. It merely asserts what is the parliamentary practice at the moment; but apparently it seeks to make rigid this practice, and to establish it as a permanent and fixed parliamentary rule, instead of practice. I think it would be a great misfortune for parliament to adopt this resolution.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have but a few words to add to the present debate. This resolution is of the utmost importance. Its aim, indeed, is to amend a parliamentary practice by introducing means of lessening or removing altogether the responsibility of the government. I am entirely opposed to this resolution. I do not need, Sir, to invoke principles which are well known to the members of this House. The government must have the confidence of parliament and especially of the House of Commons. The government cannot conduct the public affairs of the country the moment confidence is withdrawn from it. The means which are at the disposal of the House to signify to the government that it no more enjoys that confidence, are as follows: First, a motion of non-confidence; secondly, the rejection of legistion brought down by the government and on which the government insists, and, lastly the adoption by this House of legislation, against the will and consent of the government. These are the recognized principles of parliamentary practice and procedure. What does this resolution contain? We are told that the rejection of a government motion should not be considered sufficient to bring about the resignation of the Cabinet, unless it is followed by a vote of non-confidence. It is therefore evident that, if this resolution was adopted, we should be departing from principles established for ever so long in our parliamentary practice and by which it is recognized that, if a government bill is thrown out by the House, the government must retire. Therefore, I contend that this resolution should certainly not be adopted.

Some members who spoke on this resolution have stated that times have changed, that we should adopt new methods to meet the present needs, and they alluded to the existence of three parties in this House: the Government, the Opposition and the third party, the Progressives. They contend that owing to this third party our parliamentary procedure should be modified and that a new constitution should be given us. I answer: No.

It is not only in this country that different parties exist in parliament. The British House, for ever so long, has been divided into many parties. Yet, did they think it proper to amend parliamentary practice and procedure? No more in England than here was it thought proper to change the existing state of things to suit more than two parties, and following in the footsteps of England, Canada will not undertake this innovation and destroy those ancient customs that we have cherished for centuries and that we must preciously maintain in our country.

Moreover, it was argued that if we introduced in our parliamentary practice the change proposed in this resolution, it would help the members to initiate resolutions and give, so to speak, new life to the administration of this country. Are the members, Sir, of the opposition—in fact of any opposition whatever—deprived of the opportunity of discussing and opposing the measures brought down in this House? I contend that they have that privilege much more so than the partisans of the government, for it is much easier to criticize than to praise a sound measure. Those who form part of the opposition can certainly not contend that they are deprived of the right to consider and discuss any proposed legislation. Under

the present parliamentary practice, the opposition has not only the privilege of debating the proposed government measures, but also has the right to propose amendments which under certain conditions may be accepted by the government. I have here Mignault's hand-book on Parliamentary Procedure, and I find the following quotation at page 147:—

> Up to a certain stage the government may accept certain amendments that the House has approved, even contrary to its wishes, but you cannot force it to sanction motions which would change the nature of an important measure; under such circumstances its duty would be to beg leave to withdraw the measure or resign.

That is evident and it has been in almost continuous practice ever since the existence of our parliament, that the opposition, criticizing a government measure, may force the latter to include amendments which are in the interest of sound legislation; however, these amendments must not go to the extent of changing the nature of the proposed legislation, because if so, the amendments proposed by the opposition would evidently amount to a vote of lack of confidence.

The present debate on the important question of government responsibility recalls to my mind another period of our history. I think we should watch with a jealous eye over the prerogatives which were then obtained by our forefathers. If I glance over the past, during the first days of Union government, when parliament met at Kingston, in 1841, I come across parliamentarians—and they were of our race—like the Vigers and the Morins, who joined the reformists of Ontario to demand from the Draper government, an acknowledgement of the principle of government responsibility.

It is due to their untiring efforts and just claims, that the Draper government found itself forced to resign and to make way for these illustrious men, Baldwin and Lafontaine, who secured for us responsible government.

Some of the reasons brought forth by these statesmen are as follows:

> The immediate advisers of the representative of the Crown must enjoy at all times the confidence of the representatives of the people, so as to maintain between the different branches of the legislature the harmony so necessary to peace and the security of the public, whose well understood wishes and interests must be the rule of the government of this province.

Such were the contentions put forward in 1841, during the first period of Union government, and these contentions were in favour of responsible government.

Monuments to Baldwin and Lafontaine have been erected close to here and the visitor has but to walk around this building to admire those who obtained for us responsible government. This resolution stands in the way of this responsibility and I am therefore opposed to it.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): I think that probably I cannot add anything to the debate which has taken place, but one or two things have struck me. It makes a difference whether you are in the government or out of it, which way you look at these things. A man that is a sworn adviser of His Majesty, with all the responsibility he has to carry as to what that advice shall be, cannot lightly pass that responsibility on to another. On the other hand, the man that is not in the government has in his sphere, a full responsibility just as far-reaching as that of a member of the government and—I say this in all kindness—he ought to be prepared, no matter what the consequences may be, to accept that full measure of responsibility in every vote that he gives. If the result be the defeat of a government, then let the government be defeated. But it rests with the member himself to take that responsibility and, if this resolution passes, I submit that any member who desired to make himself popular in his constituency, could do so and escape the responsibility that ought to be his if the consequences of that vote meant the defeat of the government.

I agree with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that a government itself must largely decide whether a vote is of sufficient magnitude or importance to justify that government in resigning; but if a majority of the members of parliament vote against the government that indicates that it has not the confidence of parliament, no matter what may be said by the member who moves the resolution or members who vote in favour of it. To declare to the House that a motion is not a want of confidence motion does not make it so. The government, in a large measure, must decide that for itself.

Another point that has struck me is this. On this continent there are two distinct forms of government which we can contrast. In the United States, the members of the cabinet do not sit in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Their cabinet is a distinct and separate body, whose members do not appear in congress to propose or to defend their measures. We have, we think, the advantage in that respect, in that the members of a government in Canada must have a place in one House or the other to explain the legislation or to defend the

measures of the government. If we are going to depart from that, then we must accept the other form of government. To my mind, there is no happy medium such as is proposed by hon. gentlemen in this resolution. We have always prided ourselves in this country on the fact that our people could have their views put into force more quickly than could be done in the United States. If the sentiment of the country changes one year after an election, the members of parliament can vote out the government, and the people can at once elect a parliament from which will be selected a government, the views of which will be in harmony with the views of the people.

There is, in the world, no system by which the views of the people can so quickly be put into action in a parliamentary sense as the old British system. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that if we are going to depart from that system, the only other practical alternative is to have a fixed parliamentary term. Then, no matter whether government measures are defeated or not, that government stays in power until its term expires. I am not in favour of that; I believe in the old British system under which nobody has suffered, but under which as the years go by, improvements have constantly been taking place which have proved beneficial to the people. You ask me: How are the people of Canada under our system of government enabled to get their views represented so quickly in a parliamentary election? Only in one way, and that is when parliament ceases to believe in the government in power and its policy, and by a majority vote puts that government out. We cannot well say that it is practical for a government to maintain the respect even of parliament, much less of the country, if every three or four days, government policies should be voted down in the House. It would be government in name but not government at all in reality. It would be merely a combination of men, acting within their rights, getting together each day, or on stated occasions, or whenever they felt like it, springing some motion to which everybody in the world might agree on some other occasion, and placing the government in a minority. I appeal to hon. gentlemen who are in favour of this motion —if they were in the government, would they like to attempt to carry on government under such circumstances? Members of the government would be advisers of His Majesty, the King, but they would have to wait until somebody advised them what to say. I see no real, practical value in this resolution, although, of course, every member has a right to move any resolution he likes. I do not think I am a Tory.

Mr. FORKE: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to be one; I would not like to be considered one; but what has been good enough for the Mother of Parliaments is good enough for the Dominion of Canada, and unless we propose to adhere to what is obviously sane and sound parliamentary practice that when a government loses the confidence of parliament, it should resign, then we must go to the other form of government and accept that form which prevails in the United States, and by which a government does not have to resign, but has a fixed term.

Does this give parliament greater freedom? Does it follow the line of Tennyson which was quoted, I think, by two or three members about "broadening down from precedent to precedent?" I think this restricts parliament, restricts the government in a wrong sense, adversely, in this way. You place a government, that wants to be in such a position and that is not overly sensitive to its self-respect, in a position where it could hang on day after day, week after week, where it could say: "That is not a vote of want of confidence; we do not intend to resign until you absolutely kick us out." Under present circumstances, when parliament gives a majority on any serious question against the government, the government, no matter how we may argue, is expected to do something—either to ask for a dissolution of parliament or to resign. If you give a government the right to hang on day after day, week after week, and month after month, as this resolution would do, until some person gets up and says: "Well now, this is our resolution, and if we carry this, you are to go out"—I think that would be a most humiliating spectacle. There is nothing progressive in this resolution; what is new in it is of a rather retrograde character.

I want to make it clear again that I believe in the old British parliamentary system. The practice of the Mother of Parliaments upon which our constitution is based is good enough for us. We followed it for some years, and while I believe in things new I do not believe in adopting them merely because they are new, unless they are an improvement on the old. I stand for the old principle, and I believe there is only one alternative. If we abandon that principle let us adopt the term system, so that a govern-

ment may not be defeated except at such time as is indicated in the act.

Hon. C. A. STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I had hoped that some other members on the opposition side would have spoken to the motion. It is not a new one to me. It is one that we had under consideration in the legislature of Alberta some years ago, although in a form somewhat modified as compared to the resolution presented here to-day. The motion considered in the Alberta legislature provided that on all matters except those pertaining to finance the government were not to consider themselves defeated unless on a vote of want of confidence. On that occasion the motion was defeated. Subsequently it came up in the House under a new government, and the motion was carried, the premier, the attorney general and the minister of agriculture refusing to vote. That in itself is an innovation. Formerly it was the duty of every member in the legislature to record his vote. That is not now compulsory if the member does not feel it incumbent upon him to vote. That, however, is not what I particularly wish to speak of to-night. What I want to point out especially is that if we are to have constitutional government in Canada —and I think we are all agreed that we want constitutional government in this country, and that we want to preserve that government in its entirety—we should be taking a rather grave step if we supported a resolution of this character.

It is not, nor would the government so look upon it, a serious thing to have hon. gentlement opposite vote against a policy or a principle introduced by the administration. That would not be considered a serious matter at all. But the resolution clearly points to another aspect of the question, namely, the affording of full freedom—because, after all, that is what is behind the resolution—for the supporters of the government to vote against a government policy. And in no other way could the government be defeated. Now, a great deal has been said by my Progressive friends with respect to caucus and the evils of caucus. But under responsible government we shall always have to have a caucus; and, indeed, my hon. friends themselves resort to the caucus for the purpose of discussing matters of importance to them as a party in this House. And they will always have to do that. Any party that wishes to present a united front upon matters that are of importance to the House and to the country will of necessity have to get together and discuss them. Therefore hon. members of the Progressive party pursue, as the old parties have pursued throughout the years, the system of calling their members together in caucus. After all the government of the day are the responsible source from which must emanate the agenda that is to be submitted to parliament for consideration; and no one will go the length of saying that in caucus all members of the party agree with the agenda submitted by the government to them. I think my hon. friends of both parties opposite will concede that matters submitted by their leaders are not always acceptable to all the members of the party to which they owe allegiance. But what is agreed to by the majority—and usually the great majority—of the members of the party in caucus is ultimately, so far as the government is concerned, the legislation submitted to the House for discussion. All I have to say, after some twelve or fourteen years of experience in public life, is that unless we are to have a somewhat chaotic condition, we must have unity of parties. Not always can we have our own way about different matters, but acting in unison we shall make the greatest progress with legislation and in the interests of the general welfare of the people. The resolution, as I see it, would to a large extent undermine the stability of government.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is inevitable. It is an utter impossibility for anything else to ensue from such a resolution. But suppose a government measure were defeated. The resolution distinctly declares that this must not be regarded of necessity as a defeat of the administration. Why, it puts the government at the mercy, perhaps, of a very few of its own members. This government has a majority of only two or three, and such a resolution might place it in such a position where it would find itself in the hands of two or three of its following upon any occasion. Now, that does not tend to stability. My hon. friends make the statement that we have a new order of things; that we have in this House three parties who have a right to be heard.

Mr. IRVINE: Four.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, it does not matter whether three or six. There is no difficulty about any party being heard. If a government is to be allowed to continue in office after having lost the confidence of the members of the House of Commons, who are the people's representatives, besides having lost the confidence of the men who are elected to support it, then in my opinion it is

in a very unattainable position; and I have simply to say, what I have said on former occasions, that any government that finds itself in that position is in duty bound to go to the Governor General and tender its resignation and appeal to the people who, after all, are the final arbiters in matters of this kind. There can be no question about that. In my opinion, far from having a democratic intent, the resolution tends in exactly the opposite direction. It seeks to allow the government to stay in office after it has lost the confidence of its own supporters—

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —until a vote of want of confidence is proposed. I cannot interpret the resolution in any other way, and so far as I am concerned I should not want to remain in office one moment after having lost the confidence of the supporters of the government or of the House itself upon any important government measure.

Something has been said this evening in regard to the government's obligation to assume full responsibility. Well, it should take responsibility. But that does not necessarily mean that the eighteen or twenty members who constitute the government of the day should take upon themselves, in an autocratic spirit, to dominate the policy of 234 odd members in the House. That, I take it, is not the spirit of responsible government. But it undoubtedly means that after consultation with their followers they have decided upon a policy, but they have not sufficient strength to carry it in the House of Commons, and they are defeated. Then they have lost the confidence of the people's representatives and they ought to resign.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly make no pretence at being a student of constitutional government, but I think I can pass a fair judgment upon the opinions of other students of the subject, and therefore I would say that if the present government never gets nearer to unanimity of opinion upon a government measure than its ministers and supporters have reached upon what they consider to be the constitutional form of government, it would be better if they entrusted matters of policy entirely to this House.

The Prime Minister tells us that this is a Bolsheviki, Sovietical proposition; the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) tells us that this is nothing more nor less than a mild declaration of a policy that has been recognized in all British history by the constitution, and therefore it is useless to vote on it because it has always been in vogue. Then another hon. member tells us that this is making straight for the United States system of government; and still another tells us that it is something else. I am beginning to wonder what this thing is anyhow. I am referring, of course, to the British constitution—that admirable thing which does not exist.

The hon. member for Halifax reminded me of that ancient school of Greek philosophers who undertook to eliminate space and motion by metaphysics. They argued thus: space looks like nothing; nothing does not exist; therefore space does not exist. Motion must have space in which to move, but if space does not exist, then motion has no place in which to move; therefore motion does not exist; and therefore neither space nor motion exists. He begins by a metaphysical process to eliminate any meaning from the resolution whatsoever, and then he concludes that it is a statement of the British constitution, and he finishes up by telling us that it is not entirely like the British constitution, because if it were the government would be bound to resign after receiving an adverse vote, which point he spent considerable time in rebutting. So I do not know if I should take his argument seriously. Obviously either the resolution or the British constitution is not understood by the hon. gentlemen who have undertaken to criticise this motion.

The hon. Prime Minister surprised and rather disappointed me with the nature and spirit of his argument. This is no time or place for change. That is the argument of the Prime Minister of a Liberal government. We are to be cautious of all innovation, because the world is filled with unrest; and we are to be careful lest a Soviet system might be born here, as we understand that one has been born somewhere else. These are unworthy arguments in connection with a matter of this kind, as the right hon. leader of the Opposition so ably pointed out.

I do not think to-day that anyone regards seriously an argument which tries to put a tag of some kind or another upon any proposition that may be put forward. There is manifestly nothing of the Soviet character about this resolution, although I am not so absolutely sure whether the Prime Minister meant that as a compliment or as a reproach. It would be perhaps calamitous for some public men if it should transpire after a few decades that the Soviet system of government is a very good system. For the present, however, I neither advocate nor defend it. This is a proposal which I understand is in

keeping with the spirit of the British constitution, and I submit that no argument has been adduced to-day to disprove it. Neither is there anything Bolsheviki about this resolution. The reason why we have so much unrest to-day to which the Prime Minister referred is because we have parliaments that are afraid to take up so-called innovations; that is the chief difficulty.

The Prime Minister centered his argument chiefly upon his defence of what he calls "responsible government." That was well characterized by one of the Progressives as a "slippery" phrase. It is an extremely slippery phrase, and it slips away from us sometimes before we can get our eyes on it to know just exactly what it looks like. But at any rate the Prime Minister would have it that we are trying to take responsibility away from parliament; whereas the meaning of the resolution is to place responsibility upon parliament. We are opposing the present system which gives all the power to the Cabinet and places responsibility rather with the Cabinet than with parliament, where it belongs. We are asking that parliament have the right to take that responsibility, which again we understand to be the practice and privilege of the British constitutional form of government.

Both the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Vanvouver South (Mr. Ladner) either misunderstood the import of the resolution in this regard, or else they both fear granting to parliament that power in reality which they both so eloquently pictured we have in theory. The Prime Minister seemed to be afraid that governments would not resign at all if we had such legislation as this. As a parliament I think we would be quite prepared to see that governments did resign if we found there was anything weak about them. But we are differentiating between a legislator and an administrator. The Prime Minister could not understand how a good administration might pass bad legislation. But a good administrator might be a very, very poor legislator, a man might be able to discharge the duties of an executive office with marked ability, yet notwithstanding this parliament might not be prepared to accept his recommendation on all matters of policy. I think we have to distinguish between these two functions, that of legislation and that of administration, whether we will or not.

The hon. member for Halifax also assured us that we of Labour and the Progressives were paying too much attention to what people are telling us through their organizations. Then he proceeded to show that all the precedents quoted by the hon. member for Calgary West prove that the kind of government this resolution proposes has always been and always will be according to the British constitution, and is in effect a declaration of our acceptance of the policy and spirit of that constitution. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, I should expect the hon. member for Halifax to vote for this resolution; otherwise he will be voting against what he terms is a statement of the British constitution. I wonder whether he recognizes that that is the position in which he placed himself when he made that declaration.

Then, the hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) thought the suggested method would be like the United States system of government; that there was no possibility of striking a happy medium between what they have and what the British constitution contemplates. He believes, he says, in the old British parliamentary system, and he goes on to say that there will be no more freedom for the individual member, no more freedom for parliament, if this resolution is adopted than is accorded under present practice. Then the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) comes and tells us that the adoption of this resolution would give so much freedom to parliament that the government would be entirely robbed of the authority which they must have under the British constitution. Now, I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of the Interior made that argument when this matter came before the Alberta legislature, he being Premier of the province at the time. But legislation asserting this principle is now on the statute books of that province, and the government has not suggested that it has lost any of its power to do efficient work of administration, nor that there has been any great upheaval as a result; on the contrary, everything seems to be moving along reasonably and satisfactorily.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) accepted the resolution as at least having some sense in it. He said there were certain practices that he deplored in connection with the present system, but suggested that by introducing such a practice as is proposed by this resolution we should be likely to bring upon ourselves more difficulties than we could get rid of. He went on to say that he opposed the motion chiefly because the principle it involved was a false or a mistaken one. But you will all notice that the right hon. leader of the Opposition came to his great faith in the present system by a contemplation of its march through the centuries. Well, he cannot speak with such confidence until at least some other proposal

has had a trial—a beginning. If it takes a march through the centuries to prove that the present system involves difficulties and mistakes, one should not speak so positively about something that has not yet been tried; because if this proposed system were to march through a couple of centuries, patterning itself in its working out, it might prove to be a very good system indeed. I am not sure, therefore, that that argument is conclusive. In fact, had that argument been applied to the British constitution we should never have had one—if, indeed, we have one now. That is, we would not have had it in practice, if those who originated our boasted constitution had required such assurance as that seemingly looked for by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I say, that if we are going to allow this thing to march through a couple of centuries, it is well nigh time we began.

Both the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Halifax agree on this: that the government is not in the position of a hired man; there is no hired manism about it. No; if there is going to be anything like the hired man about it, some of them are going to have nothing to do with government. Now, I am not so sure that that is a strong position. I think you will agree that he who is the servant of all is the greatest of all, and it is surely not too much to say that the people who pay the expenses of government, the people whose business is being managed in this parliament, should have something to do about it. I think the highest position of the government, whether it wants to recognize it or not, is analogous to that of a hired man. And if the hired man is not distinguished enough for the comparison, I would substitute the architect, and say that the government is, in relation to the people or to parliament, what an architect is to a job.

Mr. McMASTER: But the architect tries to boss the job.

Mr. IRVINE: When the architect tries to boss the job; when he tries to make the cost more than the man who is building can pay, or to put in more rooms than the builder wants, then the architect will be fired. He is hired as an architect. It is true that the man who hires him will not presume to deal at all with the technique of architecture.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He gets his commission on the additional rooms.

Mr. IRVINE: But the architect will not be allowed to do what he pleases. If I hire an architect to prepare plans of a dwelling house for me and he draws plans of a parliament building, am I going to pay him, or am I going to make the expenditure necessary to build a parliament building, simply because my architect was fool enough to draw the plans for it? Would any member of the government pay an architect under circumstances of that kind? Would any government hire him to do their work? I do not think so. That should be the relation of government to parliament. I readily agree that as practice goes, governments are not hired men. They are not architects, neither are they a committee of parliament. But we contend that they should be as hired men, that they should be as architects, that they should be a committee of parliament. If that is not British constitution, we can make it British constitution, because we have the same powers here to make British constitution as they have had over there. We can move from precedent to precedent with the same alacrity and with the same vision that they moved in days of old. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the proposal embodied in this resolution is not part of the British constitution, there is no reason why it should not be made so by practice. If the British constitution is anything at all, it is practice; it is what has worked, and if this works it can become part of the constitution.

Now, I do not wish further to prolong the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. IRVINE: My hon. friends opposite say, "hear, hear"—and for obvious reasons. If I prolonged this debate for another half hour, as I could very easily do, I should have to review some more of the statements that my hon. friends have made, and if I did so I am not sure that it would be a great addition to the discussions of British constitutional practice.

I submit that the reasons that we have put forward on behalf of the resolution have not been successfully refuted by any hon. member who has spoken on the question. Neither the right hon. leader of the Opposition nor the right hon. Prime Minister has given us sufficient reason—nor has anybody else—for relieving parliament of part of that responsibility which rightly belongs to it. Parliament should take all the responsibility; the executive council should become the hired servant of this parliament as representatives of the people. That, I believe, is the soul and spirit of this resolution.

Mr. PUTNAM: Will the hon. member permit me a question?

Mr. IRVINE: Two, sir.

Mr. PUTNAM: This resolution contemplates that vote number two would declare that vote number one, which would ordinarily constitute a defeat of the government, was really a defeat of the government. Is there a limit in his mind to the time when or the stage at which vote number two could be invoked?

Mr. IRVINE: I am not sure that I have caught that question. I am afraid I shall have to ask my hon. friend to repeat it.

Mr. PUTNAM: I am asking the hon. member, purely for my own satisfaction, this question: We will suppose that vote number one has taken place, wherein the government is outvoted. Under the proposal contained in my hon. friend's resolution, he has the right to follow that with vote number two, in which parliament would say categorically that vote number one was a defeat of the government —that is, a want of confidence vote. In other words, is there any limit to the time in which vote number two can be invoked against the government?

Mr. IRVINE: Do I understand the hon. member to ask whether my resolution fixes the precise number of days during which the government shall hold office in the event of its being voted out by an adverse vote?

Mr. PUTNAM: I certainly did not suggest any such foolish thing. I asked if there was any limit to the time or stage in our proceedings when parliament could say to the government: Though you were outvoted some time ago and have gone on doing business in good faith since, we are now going to say that that vote taken a week or ten days ago was a vote of want of confidence.

Mr. IRVINE: There is no necessity for any such thing. In fact, it would be foolish to have any stated time so far as the vote of no confidence is concerned. That could be moved at any time, even when there was not an issue under consideration. We might discover, for instance, that the government had run off with a hundred million dollars. In that case we would immediately vote that the government resign. That is all it means. The no-confidence vote need not necessarily have any connection with the other vote at all. A government might be defeated on a measure, but we would pay no attention to that. The government would carry on, and might be defeated on some other measure, but so long as parliament felt that they were carrying on the country's business fairly efficiently, they would go on.

Mr. PUTNAM: The resolution does not contemplate a specific vote declaring that the former vote showed a want of confidence in the government?

Mr. IRVINE: Not necessarily.

Mr. BUREAU: Then why the word "followed"?

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. gentleman mean that a specific vote defeating the government is per se a want of confidence vote?

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. member mean under the present practice or under my resolution?

Mr. PUTNAM: Under the resolution.

Mr. IRVINE: This resolution simply says that the government shall continue to do the business of this country until parliament tells it not to. The defeat of a measure brought in by the government would have nothing to do with the administrative efficiency of the government, and the existence of the government would therefore be disassociated from the fate of the measure. But if the government showed inefficiency or dishonesty, or any other characteristic that did not meet with the approval of parliament, it could be voted out of power at any time, just as it could be under the present practice. There is nothing complicated about that. It is not nearly as complicated as the British North America Act giving us our constitution.

10 p.m.

Mr. PUTNAM: I do not want to take up the hon. member's time captiously, but I want to understand his purpose clearly. Am I to understand that if this resolution is put into effect in the most drastic way we can imagine, there will be no specific vote declaring that a former vote was a vote of want of confidence?

Mr. IRVINE: Why should you want that providing this resolution should be adopted as the practice of this parliament? The resolution plainly says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a defeat of a government measure should not be considered as a sufficient reason for the resignation of the government.

That is all there is to that part. The other part of the resolution means that the government may be voted out of office by parliament at any time.

Mr. EULER: That is not necessary. It is taken for granted.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Putnam) understand the re-

solution now? Nobody who has spoken on this resolution has proved that parliament is now free, that the individual member of parliament is free to vote on issues as his conscience, or his constituents, dictate. I made the charge in my opening remarks on this resolution that the present practice, by confusing the life of the administration with the issue under consideration, left a member where he did not know exactly what to do. Two principles confronted him, and sometimes he was forced to vote against a principle in which he believed to save the government to which he had given his allegiance. But if we did away with that practice so that the government would not have to resign even if it had not had a majority on a certain measure, then that member would be free, and I have a suspicion that that is the chief reason why there is so much objection to this resolution. I can understand that such a power would not readily be given up by any government, or by those who aspire to government. It might be very handy at times. I can also conceive possibilities arising when it might be very dangerous for any cabinet to have such power.

No one has refuted my argument that bad legislation, owing to this confusion of issues, might be passed in order to save a government, nor has any one tried to refute my argument that good legislation might be defeated in order to save a government. The Prime Minister speaking with regard to the incident which I quoted from the adminstration of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, tried to say that because a resolution was brought in afterwards by that government, that nullified my argument. On the contrary, it proved to the hilt that men sometimes vote against their beliefs. Let me reply to the Prime Minister in this way: All governments do not do as the government of Sir Robert Borden did, neither when a vote has been taken which has been considered a vote of no confidence, nor at other times. Here is the point to be remembered: whether the government resigns or not, it always holds over the heads of its members the threat that a general election might not be very far off, and a general election is not something that any of us is anxiously looking forward to now or at any other time, and the people generally do not want it until the expiration of the term of office. The members do not want to be defeated, and there you have the real whip that governs party majorities in standing behind government legislation.

In conclusion, I object to any government having the right to decide to go to the people just when it wants, whether it has been defeated by a vote in the House or not. That practice places in the hands of the government a great political weapon, which it does not hesitate to use. This present government might decide to go to the people to-morrow, and no one could gainsay it; but it will very likely decide to go to the people when it thinks it has a political advantage, and it will not consult with the leader of the Opposition as to the proper time, nor with the leader of the Progressives, nor with the leader of the Labour party. Only the Cabinet will be consulted, and when they think the chances are good, they will declare for a general election. That is another thing that would be wiped out by this resolution. So I urge hon. members in the interests of the glorious British constitution to vote for this resolution and free themselves from the difficulties I have outlined.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Irvine) which was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs.

Bancroft,	Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Beaubien,	Knox,
Bird,	Lewis,
Black (Huron),	Lovie,
Brethen,	Lucas,
Brown,	Macphail,
Caldwell,	McBride,
Campbell,	McConica,
Carmichael,	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Coote,	McTaggart,
Davies,	Millar,
Drummond,	Milne,
Elliott (Dundas),	Morrison,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Neill,
Evans,	Sales,
Fansher,	Sexsmith,
Findlay,	Shaw,
Forke,	Speakman,
Gardiner,	Spencer,
Garland (Bow River),	Steedsman,
Good,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Gould,	Thurston,
Humphrey,	Wallace,
Irvine,	Warner,
Kellner,	Woods,
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Woodsworth—52.

NAYS

Messieurs.

Anderson,	Carruthers,
Archambault,	Chaplin,
Arthurs,	Charters,
Baldwin,	Chevrier,
Baxter,	Clark,
Benoit,	Copp,
Binette,	d'Anjou,
Black (Yukon),	Déchêne,
Bouchard,	Delisle,
Bourassa,	Denis (Joliette),
Bowen,	Denis (St. Denis),
Bureau,	Drayton (Sir Henry),
Cardin,	Duff,

Ethier,	McMaster,
Euler,	McMurray,
Fafard,	McQuarrie,
Finn,	Martell,
Fontaine,	Maybee,
Forrester,	Meighen,
Fortier,	Michaud,
Fournier,	Motherwell,
Gauvreau,	Munro,
Gendron,	Murdock,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Ouimet,
Graham,	Papineau,
Grimmer,	Pelletier,
Hammell,	Power,
Hanson,	Preston,
Hughes,	Putnam,
Hunt,	Rankin,
Jacobs,	Raymond,
Johnston (Last Mountain),	Robb,
Jones,	Roberge,
Kay,	Robichaud,
King (Kootenay),	Robitaille,
King, Mackenzie(York),	Ross (Kingston),
Kyte,	Ryckman,
Ladner,	Savard,
Lanctôt,	Séguin,
Lapointe,	Sinclair (Queens,P.E.I.),
Léger,	Spence,
Lovett,	Stevens,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Stewart (Argenteuil),
MacKelvie,	Stewart (Leeds),
Mackinnon,	Stork,
MacLaren,	Sutherland,
Maclean (Halifax),	Thompson,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),	Tobin,
McIsaac,	Trahan,
McKay,	White,
McKenzie,	Wilson—103.
McKillop,	

GREAT LAKES DISARMAMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, writings, correspondence, documents, etc., of any kind, passing between the government of Canada and the government of the United States relative to the Great Lakes Disarmament question.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government would have no possible objection whatever to bringing down the papers asked for were the negotiations completed. But I think my right hon. friend will hardly press for the papers when I tell him that some of the matters contained in them are at present being considered by the United States authorities and that it would not be in the public interest to have them laid on the Table at present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I gathered from a statement, apparently given to the press on the 30th December, that famous anniversary paean of praise, that the treaty was already negotiated. If the statement given the press was wrong, or if the Canadian Press got it wrong from the government, I am ready of course to accept my right hon. friend's statement. Certainly, I do not think the papers should be brought down in the course of the negotiations.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear my right hon. friend use the word "apparently". There was no such statement given to the press.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is somewhat late to have the press corrected, but better late than never.

CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING CANADIAN RAILWAYS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York) moved:

1. For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, or other writings of any kind since December 31st, 1921, passing between (a) members of the government or officials of the departments of the government and the Canadian National Railway Company or Canadian Northern Railway Company or any other railway company owned by Canada or any of their officials; (b) members of parliament and the Canadian National Railway Company or Canadian Northern Railway Company or any other railway owned by Canada or any of their officials.

2. A copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, or writings of any kind between members of the government or officials of the government and the late directors of the Canadian National Railway Company relative to the resignation of such directors.

3. A copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, or writings of any kind between members of the government or officials of the government and the late directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company relative to the resignation of such directors.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): It would take considerable time to get the returns asked for, the details of which, perhaps, my hon. friend has not fully considered. With regard to paragraphs 2 and 3 there would be no objection, but to get the information asked for in sub-section "b" of paragraph 1 would mean going into the files from every road master up to the highest official. It would take a good many weeks to do this and would cost a good deal of money. My hon. friend might confine his question to something more definite.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We certainly do not want the government to go to road-masters or do anything of that kind. From our experience the return would not be very long.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot agree with that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So far as I know, there was very little correspondence before the date referred to. It is only for the year. I do not want my friend, of course, to refer to the section men and similar grades; his officers are quite sufficient.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand my hon. friend will allow the use of the word "offi-

cers" instead of officials. I understand from his explanation that he does not mean to go down the line.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be covered by using the words, "officers and directors," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion will be amended by using the words "officers and directors" instead of the word 'officials."

Motion as amended agreed to.

SHIPPING AND RAILWAY STRIKES 1922

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, and other writings relating to the strikes of workers in shipping, railway and other crafts in 1922 and also for copy of the opinion of the Department of Justice given in relation to the conduct of either employers or employees affected by such strikes.

He said: Before this motion is put, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) draws my attention to the fact that the words "and other crafts," will make a great deal of work in connection with this order. I have no objection to the return being limited to strikes in shipping and railway crafts, striking out the words "and other." I understand that that meets the objections he raises.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in that case I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that although there were strikes in other crafts there were not any in the shipping or railway crafts that I recall at the moment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then we will let the motion stand. Perhaps we can arrange as to the papers required.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion stands.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT 1915

Hon. Mr. STEVENS moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a select committee of this House be appointed with instructions to conduct an enquiry into the operation of the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, having particular reference to the sales tax and its difficulties of administration and collection and alleged inequities, with power to summon witnesses, to call for documents and information from government departments and to report its findings or recommendations, from time to time, to the House.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs): May I ask my hon. friend to let that motion stand. It covers the operation of the special War Revenue Act since 1915. We might get together and try to limit its rather large scope.

Mr. STEVENS: I am quite willing to let it stand for the time being.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion stands.

TREATY WITH AUSTRALIA

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved:

For a copy of the treaty referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement to the press of December 29th last as having been concluded between the government of Canada and the government of Australia.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sure I do not know what my right hon. friend refers to when he speaks of a statement having been given by me to the press. Any statements to the press I have usually given in writing in a form in which they could be quoted. I have not gone to the trouble which my right hon. friend has apparently gone to of searching all the newspaper files to see what they contain. I must confess he seems driven to a far point when he is obliged to look for a flaw in the government from what may appear in some press report. I have, however, looked up the Ottawa papers, and I find that the Citizen and the Journal each have articles somewhat similar, and yet so dissimilar as to make it perfectly apparent that whoever wrote the two articles used what they thought appropriate and proper to put into them. Certainly they contain nothing to indicate any statement made by the government.

I mention this because my right hon. friend has one motion referring to Australia, another to Belgium, another to Great Lakes Disarmament, and another to the Lake of the Woods levels. He makes mention in one motion of treaties having been concluded. I find the report in the Ottawa Citizen is in this form:

Reviewing the work of the government during the past year, treaties have been concluded with France, Italy, Belgium and Australia, and negotiations are now proceeding with Spain.

Possibly that is the statement my right hon. friend has in mind. On the other hand, the Ottawa Journal mentions that:

Treaties have been arranged—

not concluded.

—with France and Australia for the betterment of trade conditions between the Dominion and those countries, and other treaties seeking the widening of markets in other directions are in course of negotiation.

I have no doubt at all that if my right hon. friend wishes to search through the press to find some little comment that he can bring to bear upon the work of the administration, he will find plenty to serve his purpose, but I do submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is somewhat beneath the dignity of the leader of a great political party to come to

this House and ask for a return in virtue of a general statement which bears no evidence of having been issued in any official way by the administration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I will not debate with the Prime Minister on the subject of dignity. It is one on which he talks much. I will allow my own record to stand in that regard. The statement appeared not only in the Ottawa newspapers, but in almost all the Canadian papers. While it is not exactly the same in all, it is very similar in each and bears every evidence of having been given verbatim or of having been inspired by the Prime Minister. It was an attempt on the 30th of December—on the 29th, appearing in the issue of the 30th—to catalogue the various achievements of the government for the purpose of impressing the country with its activity on behalf of the nation. That was the plain purpose of the article. No one could read it in the press without coming to the conclusion that it had received its inspiration, if not, indeed, it is ipsissima verba, from the government itself. There is a little difference between the wording taken down by one and that taken down by the other; that is to say, there is a little left out of one that is in the other, but in all the statement appears that a treaty has been arranged with Australia. I do not know myself the difference between arranging a treaty and concluding a treaty. If a treaty has been arranged with Australia, this House ought to know what the arrangement is; that is all I am asking for. If no treaty has been arranged with Australia, the House should be told, and I do submit that no statement should be given to the press, whether a written statement or merely an inspired statement, leading the country to think that such a treaty has been arranged when no such treaty has been arranged.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In view of what I have just said, I must take exception to my right hon. friend's remark that no statement should be given to the press that a treaty has been arranged or concluded. I have told him that no such statement was given to the press.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said "inspired".

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, if my right hon. friend is going to fall back on the use of such words as "inspired," I am quite prepared to leave the matter in the judgment of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not fall back on it; that is the word I used—either given or inspired. It is very hard indeed to think that this would appear in all the press of the country if there was no source whatever for the information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will give my right hon. friend the source, I will tell him exactly what occurred. I was asked by representatives of the press what progress the government had made in the matter of negotiating trade treaties, and I stated that a treaty had been come to with France, that we were negotiating with Australia, that we were also endeavouring to negotiate with Belgium and Spain, that we were negotiating with Italy and hoped to be successful there. I mentioned four or five countries with which the government was negotiating, I did not say anything about finally concluding these treaties, or that they had been concluded. Day after day representatives of the press were asking me if the treaties had been concluded, and the reply I invariably gave to them—and I think every representative of the press concerned will bear me out—was that as soon as a treaty had been concluded announcement would be made to parliament and a statement given to the public. I never stated to the press at any time that any treaty had been concluded if the arrangements with respect to that treaty had not actually been brought to a conclusion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Apparently the press has universally got it wrong. I am ready to accept the Prime Minister's statement in that regard, adding only once more that as this statement was spread all over the Dominion, the public should have been set right at once. Nor have I catalogued here all that the statement refers to; there are other things referred to in it as accomplished which have not been accomplished either.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion dropped?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Motion dropped.

TREATY WITH BELGIUM

On the motion of Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of the treaty referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement to the press of December 29th last as having been concluded between the government of Canada and the government of Belgium.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the same thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been nothing negotiated there? If that is the case it will be dropped.

Motion dropped.

GREAT LAKES DISARMAMENT

Mr. MEIGHEN moved:

For a copy of the treaty referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement to the press of December 29th last as having been negotiated by his administration between the government of Canada and the governement of the United States looking to settlement of the Great Lakes disarmament question.

He said: Well, the Prime Minister stated that nothing had been negotiated there, but there has been no statement yet in regard to No. 36, with regard to control of waters in the Lake of the Woods area.

Motion dropped.

LAKE OF THE WOODS—CONTROL OF WATERS

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, writings, correspondence, documents of any kind passing between the government of Canada and the government of the United States relative to the control of the waters in the Lake of the Woods area.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There are some papers with respect to control of water in the Lake of the Woods area which there is no objection to bringing down. There are others, however, relating to the same subject which are matters at present under consideration as between the two governments and which it would be unwise to bring down. If my right hon. friend leaves the motion in the form in which it is drafted, to include all papers relative to the control of the waters in the Lake of the Woods area, I would feel it to be in the public interest that these papers should not be brought down until the transactions are finally consummated between the two governments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course every motion that passes is subject to the reservation that any document that is confidential will not be included. But I really understood that negotiations in this regard had been concluded; in fact I think they were concluded before the late government left office. For myself I have never understood the delay in putting into treaty form the consensus adidem that had been arrived at between the two governments. However, if the motion passes I will not expect documents to be brought down that still constitute the subject of negotiation—if, unfortunately, negotiations are still pending; I thought they had been concluded.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let it stand.

Motion stands.

LAKE OF THE WOODS—NATIONAL LEVELS

On motion of Mr. Meighen:

For a copy of the treaty referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement to the press of December 29th last as having been negotiated by his administration between the government of Canada and the government of the United States looking to settlement of the Lake of the Woods National Levels.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Dropped.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the same words apply that apply to the others.

Motion dropped.

LAKE TRANSPORT CONDITIONS

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, writings, telegrams and other documents authorizing investigation into conditions or costs of Lake Transport by W. T. R. Preston, and for a copy of Mr. Preston's report.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As my hon. friend doubtless knows, the subject matter dealt with in this motion has been referred by the government to a royal commission for investigation. Before that commission had been appointed the government had a special inquiry made to ascertain whether the grounds for investigation by royal commission were as substantial as the government had been given reason to believe they were. Naturally, this preliminary investigation did not involve the hearing of sworn testimony, and I think it would be inadvisable to bring down the report prepared for the government as a guide to its determining whether or not a royal commission should be appointed—not, at least, until after the commission has had a chance of investigating the matters referred to in it. Mr. Preston is secretary of that royal commission. The information contained in his preliminary report will be placed at the disposal of the commission. I do not think it is in the interests of the public that its contents should be disclosed before there is opportunity of having the evidence which he submitted in that form taken under oath before the commission itself.

Mr. BAXTER: A short time ago the Prime Minister rather emphatically endorsed a certain constitutional principle. I think involved in that principle is the idea that the House is entitled to all possible information with regard to the way in which government is carried on, and I think this House is fairly entitled to know whether what Mr. Preston discovered justified the appointment of a

royal commission. The commission itself will never discover that fact. It is quite impossible for members on this side of the House or for private members on that side of the House or for the public to pass any judgment upon the correctness of that act unless they have this material laid before them. I do not see that it will in any way prejudice any action the commission may take, and I would ask the Prime Minister if that report is to be a sealed book to this House and the public.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government will be only too glad to make public Mr. Preston's report at the right time, but I think my hon. friend, if he reflects for a moment, will agree with me that while there are charges in Mr. Preston's report made against certain companies which charges the government believed were substantial enough to warrant its appointing a royal commission, it would hardly be advisable that those charges should be published broadcast before there is an opportunity for the commission itself to investigate.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why should there be any charge levelled against any man until he has had an opportunity, with such protection as is afforded him by a court of law properly constituted, to defend himself against that charge?

Mr. ARTHURS: That is not the ordinary procedure.

Mr. BAXTER: You appoint a commission and their report is acted upon without any investigating commission making a preliminary inquiry. As far as making a charge against a man is concerned, many a man has to undergo a long period of examination before he can put in a defence. Sometimes a man's character seems to be irretrievably blackened before the public by the ordinary process of our courts, though he may be declared innocent eventually. It is something we have all to stand as citizens, because you cannot have everything take place at the same moment of time. What we ask now is not the investigation of some individual. We are not asking the condemnation of any individual, but we do want to know on what information, whether it is correct or not, the government proceeded in this matter. I would think we are entitled to it. I do not wish to put it in an offensive way, and I am trying not to look at it from a partisan standpoint, but I cannot see any difference in principle between this motion and a large number of returns that have been ordered by the House.

¶Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say to my hon. friend, the government will be pleased to give him the report which Mr. Preston has made at the right time. He will then be in a position to judge whether the government has acted wisely or not in having had a preliminary investigation made, and constituting a royal commission to investigate the matters brought to its attention.

11 p.m.

I mentioned only one aspect in reply to my hon. friend at first. There is another aspect. From many sources an effort has been made to obtain this report from the government by some of the parties that are appearing before the commission. Now the government does not feel that the information which has been gathered, and which will be presented to the royal commission, should be given out at this particular time. The commission itself is the best judge in that regard.

Mr. STEVENS: Will this report by Mr. Preston to the government be submitted to the royal commission If so, and presuming it refers to certain companies and individuals, will such companies and individuals have full opportunity of knowing that the commission is in possession of a report of this kind and have an opportunity to reply to it? Thirdly, I would ask, if they do not have that full opportunity, would it not tend to prejudice the commission in arriving at its conclusion to be furnished with a report making certain statements which have never been replied to by the parties affected?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can reply to my hon. friend that I have not the slightest doubt at all that Mr. Preston's report will be submitted to the commission. Indeed, I think it already has been. I am sure the every representation which that report contains will be made public by the commission itself, and the parties affected by any of the representations will have every opportunity to make their reply and to bring out whatever evidence and make whatever statements they wish to make in regard to what is alleged in the report. But I think my hon. friend will agree that to give to the parties, in advance, information of this kind is only to enable them to take advantage of a situation which it is in the public interest they should not take advantage of.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps I do not understand my right hon. friend clearly. Was I correct in thinking that he said that the publication of the report now might be taken

advantage of by what I might call the interests that are to be investigated? Is that the meaning?

Mr. BUREAU: If my right hon. friend will allow me, there is a rule of the House which provides that, when a minister of the Crown desires to lay on the Table a return which is not the subject of an order a motion for return may be opposed on the ground of public policy. Such, for instance, as that it is not in the public interest. The object of Mr. Preston's inquiry was to find out whether there was ground for an investigation by a commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was Mr. Preston appointed under the Inquiries Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was appointed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to gather information with a view to ascertaining, in the first instance, whether the government would be justified in going the length of appointing a royal commission to make this inquiry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what statutory authority there could have been for his appointment as investigator, and the payment of salary, unless it was under the Inquiries Act.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not the question I am discussing now. The question is whether it is in the public interest to disclose the report made by Mr. Preston, and the ground taken by the government is this. We desired first to know whether there was ground for an investigation, as the result of complaints made by shippers that they were not being treated properly by carriers. We did not want to go to the expense of having a commission appointed to go fishing, as was so often the case in past years, and so Mr. Preston was appointed to make a preliminary report. We have this report, and we do not think it is in the public interest, and I think my hon. friend would agree with me, that the facts on which we decided that an investigation should be held should be given to the press at this time to inflame public opinion. Their publication would, of course, give rise to a general discussion by the public. If you are going to apprehend somebody, you do not advertise that fact. You do not tell a smuggler that you are going to the magistrate to get a warrant out. The Prime Minister has already stated that when the commission makes its report, the facts upon which we saw fit to have a commission appointed will be made public and if the facts given by Mr. Preston do not justify the appointment of a commission, then will be the time to criticise.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to appear in any false position with regard to this. I have asked for information that I think the House is entitled to. If the Prime Minister is putting it on the ground that it is against the public interest to make this disclosure, I can understand that. He and his government will take the responsibility and they will be perfectly correct in that course. But what I do not understand is why the first answer should have been that the publication of the report might injure the accused, and the second answer be that to bring down this report might help the accused to get some information.

Mr. GRAHAM: Both are possible.

Mr. BAXTER: My object, as one member of this parliament, was if there are combines or irregularities going on, to help bring the facts to the light, and I want to know what is being done towards that end. If it is not in the public interest that I should know at this time, I am content to let the motion drop.

Motion dropped.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

NOVA SCOTIA—RULE OF ROAD

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, and other writings relating to the disallowance of an act of the legislature of Nova Scotia changing the Rule of the Road, and for a copy of the opinion of the Department of Justice respecting the question of disallowing such legislation.

NOVA SCOTIA STATUTE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, and other writings relating to the disallowance of a statute of the legislature of Nova Scotia, being Chapter 177 of the statutes enacted in the year 1921, and entitled "An Act to Vest Certain Lands in Victoria County in Jane E. MacNeil."

P.C. 1566

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a return showing:

1. The record of the proceedings of a sub-committee of the Privy Council appointed under P.C. 1566, May 12, 1921, to whom was referred the matter of arriving at a scale of fees charged by the government for licenses, permits, leases, etc.

2. The reports and recommendations of all department officers made to council or to any minister concerning said matter.

3. The names and offices held by all departmental officers who inquired into and reported on said subject.

4. The report recommending the scale of fees charged by the government for recording transfers and other documents under the regulations governing quartz mining claims in Yukon Territory.

JOHN L. LEWIS CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, documents, etc., passing between the Minister of Labour and John L. Lewis since the taking of office by the present Minister of Labour.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To-morrow we will take up the resolutions appearing in the name of the hon. Minister of Finance under Government Notices of Motion, relating to trade treaties, and if we conclude with those motions, we will proceed with Government Orders taking up the bills that are in the name of the Minister of Agriculture, and the resolution appearing in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Tuesday, February 13, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Report on the Agricultural Instruction Act, 1921-22.—Hon. Mr. Motherwell.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 15, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a measure to effect a readjustment of the membership of the House of Commons. In doing so, I need not remind hon. members that the government is not exercising any discretionary right, but is rather performing a constitutional duty which is imposed upon it. Under our constitution, the redistribution of the membership of the House of Commons must be made after each decennial census. There have been, since confederation, several redistributions. The first was made in 1872, the next in 1882, the next in 1892, the next in 1903, and the last redistribution was made in 1914. There have been in the interval partial redistributions for the purpose of providing for representation of territory and provinces which were not in the Dominion when confederation was originally formed. There was a partial redistribution in 1871, to give Manitoba representation, and a partial redistribution in 1887, to provide for representation of the Northwest Territories. There was a partial redistribution in 1907 to provide for representation of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, which were subsequently formed out of the Northwest Territories. In 1915, an amendment was passed to the British North America Act, relating more particularly to the province of Prince Edward Island. It was in the nature of a partial redistribution affecting that province, and added to the British North America Act as section 51a thereof the following provision:

Notwithstanding anything in this act, a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of senators representing such province.

By section 1, subsections (1) paragraph (ii) of the Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867, being 5-6 George V, Chapter 45, the representation of Prince Edward Island in the Senate was fixed at four members. The census prior to that partial redistribution would have affected the representation of Prince Edward Island to the extent of the loss of one member, but for this amendment to the act, which provided that no province shall have in the House a smaller representation than it has in the Senate.

Another partial redistribution was made to give the Yukon Territory representation in the House of Commons. The Yukon Territory obtained its right to representation under the act known as the Yukon Territory Representation Act, 1902, assented to on the 15th May of that year. The clause that relates to this matter reads:

The Yukon Territory, as that territory is defined and constituted by section 13 of, and the schedule to, chapter 41 of the statutes of 1901, shall be an electoral district and shall return one member to the House of Commons of Canada.

The Yukon Territory received its representation under the redistribution of 1903.

The time has now come when a general redistribution should be made under the last census. The sections of the British North America Act which have to do with numerical representation by provinces in the House of Commons, and which are pertinent to the present redistribution are as follows:

Section 37. The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this act, consist of 181 members, of whom 82 shall be elected for Ontario, 65 for Quebec, 19 for Nova Scotia, and 15 for New Brunswick.

Section 51. On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time, as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:

(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of sixty-five members;

(2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained);

(3) In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number;

(4) On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards;

(5) Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

Section 52. The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the Parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this act is not thereby disturbed.

I think it will be of interest to hon. members, in connection with the redistribution we are about to make, were I to incorporate in my remarks a statement showing the representation of the various provinces in this House of Commons after the several redistributions that have taken place:

Province	Census 1911 (Unit 30,819)			Census 1921 (Unit 36,283)		
	Population	Quotient based on Unit	Actual Representation	Population	Quotient based on Unit	Actual Representation
Prince Edward Island	93,728	3·04	4	88,615	2·44	4
Nova Scotia	492,338	15·95	16	523,837	14·44	14
New Brunswick	351,889	11·40	11	387,876	10·69	11
Ontario	2,527,292	81·90	82	2,933,662	80·86	82
Manitoba	461,394	14·95	15	610,118	16·82	17
Saskatchewan	492,432	15·96	16	757,510	20·88	21
Alberta	374,295	12·13	12	588,454	16·22	16
British Columbia	392,480	12·72	13	524,582	14·46	14
Quebec	2,005,776	65·00	65	2,358,412	65·00	65
Yukon	8,512	.....	1	4,157	.....	1

The representation of Prince Edward Island was increased from three to four by partial redistribution in 1915 under the amendment to the British North America Act to which I have referred.

May I say a word now with respect to the application of the recent census to the redistribution about to be effected. First of all I would point out that the Quebec Boundaries Extension Act, which was passed in 1912 and which enlarged the boundaries of the province of Quebec, contained a provision under which the population of the additional territory brought into the province was not to be counted, for the purposes of redistribution, as part of the population of the province of Quebec in determining the unit of representation in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act on that point. The Quebec Boundaries Act contains the following section:

That the population of the territory hereby added to the province of Quebec shall be excluded in ascertaining the population of the said province for the purposes of any readjustment of representation of the other provinces consequent upon any census.

Account of this provision must necessarily be taken in determining the unit of representation according to the census. The population of the province of Quebec—exclusive of the area added by the Quebec Boundaries Act of 1912—enumerated in the sixth census, June 1, 1921, numbered 2,358,412, which, divided by 65, gives a unit of representation of 36,283;—the unit was 30,819 in 1911. The quotient obtained by dividing the population of each province, except Prince Edward Island, as shown at the date of the census, by the unit 36,283 indicates, except where section 51 subsection 4 of the British North America Act applies, the number of members to which each province is entitled. The result is as follows. I shall give for sake of comparison the figures of the redistribution effected after the census of 1911 as well as the figures of the 1911 census, and the figures of the redistribution to be effected under the last census that of 1921 and the census figures themselves. The House will kindly bear with me while I put these figures on record:

GENERAL AND PARTIAL REDISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL CONSTITUENCIES

Year	No. of Constituencies	Ont.	Que.	N.S.	N.B.	Man.	B.C.	P.E.I.	N.W.T.		Yukon
1867	181	82	65	15	19	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
*1871	185	82	65	15	19	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
†1872	200	86	65	21	16	4	6	.....	.....	.....	.....
†1882	211	92	65	21	16	5	6	6	.....	.....	.....
*1887	215	92	65	21	16	5	6	6	4	.....	.....
†1892	213	92	65	20	14	7	6	5	4	.....	.....
†1903	214	86	65	18	13	10	7	4	10	.....	1
									Sask.	*Alta.*	
*1907	221	86	65	18	13	10	7	4	10	7	1
†1914	234	82	65	16	11	15	13	3	16	12	1
*1915	235	82	65	16	11	15	13	4	16	12	1

*Partial Redistribution.
†General Redistribution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did not the Prime Minister make a mistake? Has not Ontario 81 members instead of 82?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is misinformed; I am quoting figures given by the Dominion Statistician.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My right hon. friend gave the unit as 80·86 and the actual representation as 82. Should it not be 81?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is forgetting the sections of the British North America Act which bear particularly on the proportion of reduction in population of each province relative to the total population of the Dominion as between the census figures of 1921 and 1911.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right. That is the 120th section.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I shall refer to it in a moment.

Now I come to the point to which my right hon. friend referred a moment ago. Before there can be any reduction in the representation of any province the provisions of section 51, subsection 4, of the British North America Act have to be considered. Let me repeat the subsection. It is somewhat involved, but I think its meaning perhaps will become clear if I afterwards express it in different words. This is the subsection:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards.

In other words, the proportion of the population of the province to the aggregate population of the Dominion must fall below one-twentieth less than the proportion of the population of the province to the aggregate population of the Dominion at the last preceding census before a reduction in the representation of that province can result.

The application of these provisions to Ontario and Nova Scotia is shown by the following table:

The proportion which the population of each province bears to the total population of Canada:

Ontario; According to the census of	1911	.35069
	1921	.33380
Nova Scotia: According to the census of	1911	.06831
	1921	.05960

That is a decrease in proportion from 1911 to 1921 in the case of Ontario of .01689; in the case of Nova Scotia of .00871.

The ratio of decrease in population from 1911 to 1921 in proportion to 1911 in the case of Ontario was .0481, which it will be observed is a little below the one-twentieth mark, .05. Nova Scotia is .1275, which unfortunately is just above the one-twentieth proportion. In the case of Ontario the proportion is less, in the case of Nova Scotia it is greater than the one-twentieth to which the Act refers.

These figures show that under the provisions of section 51, subsection 4 of the British North America Act, no reduction should take place in the representation of Ontario, because the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada, based on the census of 1911 is ascertained at the census of 1921 to be diminished by less than one-twentieth part. The proportion for Nova Scotia, having diminished by more than one-twentieth part, the provisions of subsection 4 of section 51 do not apply, and the representation of that province must therefore be reduced in accordance with

the provisions of subsections 2 and 3 of section 51.

May I in brief form give to the House the net result of the effect of the census upon the redistribution as it will be under the legislation of this year as compared with the legislation of 1914. The unit of representation as I have already mentioned, this year is 36,283 as against 30,819 in 1914. The total membership of the House of Commons will hereafter during the next ten years be 245 as against 235 during the past ten years, or an increase, in all, of ten members.

In the case of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and the Yukon the representation will remain the same as it is at the present time, respectively 82, 65, 11, 4 and 1. In the case of British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, the representation will be increased—in the case of British Columbia by 1, from 13 to 14; in the case of Manitoba by 2, from 15 to 17; in the case of Alberta by 4, from 12 to 16; in the case of Saskatchewan by 5, from 16 to 21. In the case of Nova Scotia, unfortunately there will under the provisions of the British North America Act be a reduction of two, from 16 to 14.

I need hardly say, particularly to our friends from Nova Scotia, that in this matter of redistribution the government is not, as I mentioned at the outset, exercising any discretionary right; nor, indeed, has it any discretionary powers. It is simply obliged to accept the law as it is and to apply its provisions as set out in the act. In the application of the law it is very largely a matter simply of mathematics.

That, I think, is all I need say with reference to the representation of the several provinces so far as its numerical aspect is concerned.

I come now to the method whereby the government proposes to effect the redistribution of the various constituencies or electoral districts under the measure which is being introduced. Prior to 1903 the government of the day in introducing a redistribution bill brought down a measure which it had previously prepared in a complete form. The measure outlined the electoral districts as the government of the day had prepared them in advance. The bill was submitted to the House in that form, and as all who are familiar with Canadian political history will recall, the redistributions effected in that manner gave rise to perhaps the bitterest controversies which have taken place in this Chamber and in our public life. Too often those redistributions suggested an element of unfairness, and endeavour on the part of the government of the day to profit at the expense of its political opponents in virtue of the power that it possessed.

In 1903, under the administration of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a new principle was adopted. Sir Wilfrid brought into the House, not a bill which contained the boundaries of all the constituencies as originally drafted by the government itself, but a bill which set forth the number of members to which each province under the redistribution was entitled, leaving blank for subsequent determination the delimitations or definitions of the several constituencies to be represented. Sir Wilfrid proposed when in power what he had suggested when in opposition. He maintained that in seeking to effect a redistribution, a larger measure of satisfaction in the House and greater confidence throughout the country would result if the government invited the opposition to join with it in a committee to work out the details of redistribution. The hope was expressed that the conferences in the committee room would be carried out in such a spirit of fair play and goodwill that the bill could be brought back to the House of Commons and passed without contention or dispute. The adoption of that principle by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1903 had beneficial results, so much so that when the government of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden had occasion in 1914 to introduce a redistribution measure, Sir Robert followed the principle that Sir Wilfrid had adopted and invited the opposition to name members on a committeee to join with the government members in determining the boundaries of the constituencies which were to be arranged under the redistribution. We propose to follow the example set by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and later followed by Sir Robert Borden, and I think in doing so we shall meet what my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), when speaking on the Address, said he hoped the government would do, namely, have the details of the redistribution measure worked out by a joint committee of hon. members of this House.

The bill which I am about to introduce sets forth the number of members to which each province is entitled under the redistribution and makes provision for the division of the province and the territory into electoral districts as provided in a schedule to the act. The schedule to the act, however, is being introduced, so far as this bill in its present form is concerned, in blank. It is the purpose of the government, if hon. gentlemen op-

posite will meet us in the same spirit in which we approach the matter, to refer this bill after the second reading to a committee on which there will be representatives of the three parties at present comprising this House, the committee to have power to work out the details of the redistribution. Except for the changes in wording and figures which are necessary as a consequence of the census, the bill that I am about to present is to all intents and purposes the same in form and wording as the bill which was introduced in 1914, which in itself was a copy of the bill introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1903. Its provisions are not long, and as I have observed that on previous occasions the bill has been read in its entirety at the time of its introduction. I will venture to read its provisions. They are as follows:

An act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons. Whereas the results of the census of 1921 necessitate a readjustment of the representation in the House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, and the other statutes in that behalf; Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. This act may be cited as The Representation Act, 1923.

2. The House of Commons shall consist of two hundred and forty-five members, of whom eighty-two shall be elected for the province of Ontario, sixty-five for the province of Quebec, fourteen for the province of Nova Scotia, eleven for the province of New Brunswick, seventeen for the province of Manitoba, fourteen for the province of British Columbia, four for the province of Prince Edward Island, twenty-one for the province of Saskatchewan, sixteen for the province of Alberta, and one for the Yukon Territory.

3. The said provinces and territory respectively shall, for the purposes of election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts, and be represented as provided in the schedule to this act.

4. Every city, town, village, township, parish or place, or part thereof, lying within the territorial limits of any electoral district, and not specifically included in any other electoral district by the said schedule, shall be and be taken to be part of the electoral district in which it is so locally situate.

5. Wherever in the said schedule any word or expression is used to denote the name of any territorial division, such word or expression shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be construed as indicating such territorial division as it exists and is bounded at the date of the passing of this act.

6. Wherever in the said schedule a municipality or place is wrongly referred to as a city, or a town, or a village, but there is within the territorial limits of the electoral district, in the description of which the reference occurs, a municipality or place of the same name which is a city, or a town, or a village, but is not of the class,—city, town or village, as the case may be,—specified in the schedule, the reference shall be taken to be that municipality or place.

7. This act shall take effect only upon the dissolution of the present Parliament.

I have nothing further to add, Mr. Speaker, except to emphasize what I have already said, that in adopting this method of working out the details of redistribution the government has in view but the one object of bringing about a measure of redistribution which will be regarded in this House and throughout the country as eminently fair and just. I believe that all parties, working together in a joint committee, having the common object of arriving at a fair and equitable basis of redistribution, should be able to send back to this House a bill which it will be possible for us to accept without controversy or discussion; a bill that will meet with the general approval of all hon. members, a bill that will help to inspire throughout the country a greater measure of confidence in our parliamentary institutions because of a realization of the accuracy and justice of the foundations on which they rest.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT

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

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday, the 13th of February instant, it stand adjourned until Thursday, the 15th instant.

Motion agreed to.

COMBINES AND THE COAL SITUATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, it was stated in the Speech from the Throne that a bill would be submitted to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers from undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade by combines, monopolies, trusts, or mergers. I have information from the city of Montreal that there is an extreme situation there at the present time with regard to coal. The coal situation is bad in all our cities, but the Montreal papers say that $25 per ton is being charged there for coal in small lots, and that one householder was unable to obtain coal though he had offered $35 per ton. The suffering among certain sections of the populace has been great. I should like to ask whether the measure that is being introduced will protect consumers during this present season, when protection is so much needed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): That will depend very largely upon the length of time that it takes to get the measure through the House. The government will endeavour to expedite it, and perhaps my hon. friend will help us.

THE BANK ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Some few months ago the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the farming interests of Canada, held a meeting and passed a resolution calling on the government to appoint a commission to inquire into banking matters in Canada, and particularly into the merits or demerits of the Commonwealth system of banking in Australia, and the Federal Reserve banking system in the United States, with a view to the possible embodiment of their good points in the Canadian banking system. I should like to know, in the first place, whether the government have received such a communication from the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and if so, what action has been taken, or what the attitude of the government is at the present time in connection with this matter.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I think the communication was received in due course from the Canadian Council of Agriculture. The view of the government is that the decennial revision of the Bank Act should be taken up, and at a very early date we hope to introduce a bill to revise the Bank Act. We shall then, with the consent of the House, ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce with a view to being fully investigated. That committee will then have the opportunity of receiving suggestions from any quarter bearing in any way upon the banking system of the country.

THE FINANCE ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the government purpose any legislation affecting the Finance Act?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I think at a later stage it will probably be necessary. The Finance Act is not necessarily associated with the Bank Act, but it has some relation to it. My impression is that it will be desirable to continue the Finance Act in whole or in part, but that is a matter which can arise a little later.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide,—

1. That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Corporation of the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, hereinafter called "the Corporation," such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of five million dollars, as are required to enable the Corporation to carry on the construction of such terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the Port of Vancouver.

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these Resolutions the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances shall be deemed to be money required to construct and to be part of the cost of construction of the said terminal facilities, and such interest may by paid out of the said sum of five million dollars.

3. That the Corporation shall submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for approval, monthly applications for such advances, with statements showing total expenditure on different items in detail, and upon approval, authority for the payment of the amount applied for may be granted by the Governor in Council.

4. That the Corporation shall, upon any advances being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the Corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half-yearly at the rate of five per centum per annum.

5. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these Resolutions shall be payable by the Corporation out of all its property, assets, tolls, rates, dues, penalties and other sources of revenue and income whatsoever, and shall rank as a charge thereon and have precedence in regard to payment next after the payments provided for in Section 27 of Chapter 54 of the Statutes of 1913.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish at once to approve the minister's action and to congratulate him upon his sound business sense in continuing the harbour development work at the port at Vancouver. I think, however, the committee ought to be made aware of one or two matters in connection with this work in order to appreciate the wisdom of this move.

It will be remembered that a similar bill was passed about three or four years ago, and I think that the House will be interested to know that the Board of Harbour Commissioners for the port of Vancouver has provided for the interest on these bonds, and has provided also a sinking fund for their retirement at maturity. It might be interesting to know also that this sinking fund has been properly kept up, and that if the same policy that has been followed by the Vancouver Harbour Board up to this year is continued, the bonds will be met and retired.

This is a loan by the federal government to the harbour commissioners. It is not an item of public works. It does not come out of the general funds of the country to

be spent in the usual way; but it is a loan properly provided for and secured, and it will be repaid.

I would ask the minister to be good enough to give to the committee a brief explanation as to how this money will be expended. If I remember correctly, the harbour board on the previous occasion submitted their plans and proposals to the government, and after they had been approved, the money was expended on a definite programme.

I also wish to make reference to a very important matter, one which I am sure will be of interest and which has already been referred to by a number of the hon. members from the western prairie provinces, and that is, the total inadequacy of the facilities at the port of Vancouver for handling grain from the prairie provinces. I think it was in the year 1913, or 1914, that an elevator was constructed. No grain moved that way for several years, and there was a question in the minds of some whether or not the previous government had acted wisely in constructing this elevator. But there was a definite reason why the elevator was not used, and I think it will be well to make a brief explanation on that point, and also to point out the requirements at the present time. The reason the elevator was not used to any great extent was simply this—that owing to the war there was no tonnage on the Pacific; practically all the tonnage, with very few exceptions, was taken over from the Pacific ocean to the Atlantic for war purposes, so that there were no shipping facilities. On the conclusion of war, however, and with the readjustment of tonnage after the war, grain commenced to go westward and in the last two years there has been an increasing flow of grain in that direction. Last year, owing to the congestion at the port of Vancouver, a permit or embargo system had to be inaugurated at Edmonton and Calgary. That is, cars were not allowed to go forward unless the elevator was clear, and there was opportunity to handle the cars and transfer their contents to the shipping. Now, this meant that there was difficulty in handling wheat by that route. There was another difficulty, and that was in handling damaged, smutty or tough wheat. There were no facilities at the coast at that time for cleaning, drying and treating damaged grain. Very often bins would be occupied with grain more or less damaged in one form or another, thus curtailing the capacity for storage. Provision has been made to remedy this by the installation of cleaning and drying plants in connection with the elevator. This year—and this is what I wish to point out particularly to the minister, and I know I am appealing to sympathetic ears—there was such a flow of wheat directed to the Pacific coast, arising from purely sound, economic reasons, that the congestion was not only marked but became quite startling, and again they had to inaugurate the embargo system and only ship grain that way by permit. Up to about a week ago nearly eleven million bushels of grain had been shipped by the Pacific route, and had there been storage capacity sufficient to handle what was offered there the amount would easily have been doubled. That route, as we know, is open the year round, and upon the closing of the eastern route there would be a continuously increasing amount flowing westward.

Another point I wish to make is this: Doubt has arisen in the past as to the wisdom of installing extended facilities there, and this question has presented itself—that the facilities would only be used during the closed season. I would draw the attention of the committee, and of the minister, to the fact that right from the opening of the grain season, that is, right from the commencement of threshing operations on the prairies, grain has flowed westward, thus fully demonstrating that the route had certain definite advantages to all the sections of the prairies lying westward of a line drawn approximately between Prince Albert and Regina. What I wish to call the attention of the minister to is this: At a very moderate cost the existing elevator could be increased in capacity by about two million bushels, the present capacity being 1,250,000 bushels. The working house, the conveyors, and the other paraphernalia necessary to handle grain effectively and rapidly are all there. By the increase of the storage capacity by, say, another two million bushels we could meet, in a slight degree at least, the congestion which occurred this year and last year. I do not know whether the minister contemplates to do that work out of this $5,000,000. I understand that the elevator which originally was built by the government, under the Grain Commission or Department of Trade and Commerce, has been turned over to the harbour board for operation, and, indeed, I believe, for ownership, by them. The harbour board, I understand, pay a certain sum into the exchequer for this transfer. If the minister would be good enough, when he is speaking, to explain the exact state of this elevator at the present time, and the intention in regard to the increasing of its capacity, we would appreciate that information.

4 p.m.

Before I sit down I would further draw attention to this—that we are just about completing a large pier, one of the best on the continent, called, I think, the Ballantyne pier. That pier will be completed, I should judge, this season. Unfortunately there is no elevator provided for in connection with that pier. I am not offering my opinion in any arbitrary fashion, but after consulting with some of the best qualified advisers on the subject the suggestion is made that another elevator might be constructed, adjacent to this pier, which would add very much materially to the grain handling facilities without too much cost. That is to say, you have the pier and there will be at least four first-class deep-water berths, so that a very large portion of the cost has already been provided for, and all that would be necessary would be the construction of the elevator itself. If the government would construct another elevator equal in capacity to the enlarged existing elevator it would supply a very excellent facility, I think, for the handling of grain. That, of course, does not interfere with the establishment in that port of other elevators by private interests if they so desire. I believe that one or two private concerns are at present contemplating establishing elevators there, but the establishment of government elevators exercises a very wholesome influence on the grain handling business. A port perhaps wholly under the control of private grain handling concerns might give some cause for complaint by way of charges of monopoly, imaginary at least if not real, but with the existence of government elevators, such as I have mentioned, such complaints would be very largely obviated.

We have, of course another subject which will be discussed under another resolution and I do not wish to interject that matter here. That is, the question of the adverse freight rates. All I intend to say in that regard here is, that in spite of this adverse rate from the prairies to the coast of approximately seven cents a bushel we have been able to handle grain by that route, giving to the shipper an advantage over the eastern route, on some occasions, of as high as six and seven cents a bushel; that is, to those shippers from the western part of the prairie provinces. This is a distinct and real advantage to the producers of grain on the prairies. It is an advantage that they are entitled to, and I think this parliament is now ready to recognize that fact and is prepared to support the government in any reasonable effort to give that advantage to the producer on the prairies. As the discussion proceeds, other points may arise, but that is all I wish to say at this moment in connection with the resolution.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad, indeed, that the resolution which I have the honour to introduce commends itself to the support of my hon. friend. As he said, prior to a very short time ago there was very little grain going through Vancouver,—prior to 1921, I do not think there was any. In 1921, a little over one million bushels was shipped via Vancouver, and in 1922, the quantity so shipped was 14,000,000 bushels. In the first days of January of this year, there were orders for upwards of 5,000,000 bushels of wheat to be shipped through Vancouver. It is in order to meet these requirements and to give better facilities and larger accommodation—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the hon. gentleman not wrong as to the year? I understand there was a substantial traffic in 1920.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My information is that it started in 1921.

Mr. CLARK: Can the minister state how many bushels altogether were shipped prior to the end of July, 1921?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot give those figures now, but I shall be pleased to give them to my hon. friend when the bill comes up for second reading.

Mr. MANION: How much of the 14,000,000 bushels went to the Orient and how much to Europe?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not that information, either.

Mr. STEVENS: I think I could assist the minister for a moment. I am not sure of the exact figures, and in my figures I quote rather seasonal than calendar year shipments, to which latter the minister is now referring. Last shipping season, that is about a year ago, about one-half went to the Orient and about one-half to Europe, chiefly to the United Kingdom. This shipping season, say from September to January, less than one-half went to the Orient; but in the month of December, a large number of contracts were entered into for oriental shipment, and these, perhaps, would bring the ratio of later months up to approximately 50 per cent.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All this shows that from now on, increasing quantities of grain will find their way through Vancouver, and it is, therefore, necessary and important that more facilities should be provided there, especially in the way of further elevator accommodation.

The Vancouver Harbour Commission was organized in 1913. In 1919, this parliament

authorized advances to be made to the commissioners to an amount of $5,000,000, and I think this country is entitled to know what has been done with that money. First, an amount of $300,000 was paid to redeem bonds which had been issued by the harbour commissioners. Then they acquired property for the site of the pier to which my hon. friend has referred, called the Ballantyne pier, for an amount of $672,900. Other expenditures included:

Repairing foundations and dredging, berthing and turning basin for the main pier	$ 512,095
Work to December 31, 1922, on construction of pier and sheds	2,814,871
Engineering and contingencies	121,583
Development of other harbour property and acquisition of plant and tools for harbour work	35,319
Interest during construction charged to capital account	68,032

This makes a total expenditure of $4,524,800. There remains a balance of $475,200 available for future expenditures from this loan of 1919. The Ballantyne pier is not altogether completed, and a further amount of $1,760,765 will be required to complete it—that is, in addition to the $475,200 which remains of the loan of $5,000,000. As to what will be done to increase elevator accommodation, the commissioners have engaged the services of an expert, Mr. Rolph, of the J. S. Metcalf Company, of Montreal, who is studying the question with them presently in order to take the best course, and especially the most speedy course, for the handling of grain,—if possible, the next crop. What is proposed now—but it is not definite—is that the present elevator, which has a capacity of 1,250,000 bushels, should be enlarged by an extension which would give a further capacity of 500,000 bushels, or a total capacity of 1,750,000 bushels. That would cost $400,000. Then, another elevator would be built at the place suggested by my hon. friend, on Ballantyne pier, this elevator to have a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels and to be built at a cost of $2,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Could the minister at this point say what the existing elevator cost?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Between $800,000 and $900,000. The other works which would be constructed with the money which would be advanced to the commissioners are as follows:

Log booming ground	$171,000
Marine ferry terminal	155,375
Ballantyne stage yards	76,000
Railway equipment	81,000
Strips of land adjacent present Government elevator	50,000
Lumber assembling wharf	190,000
Grenville Island Harbour	27,000
Overhead approach to Ballantyne pier	65,000
Contingencies	23,860

As to the financial condition of the harbour, I might say that it is excellent, indeed, and I have no doubt that within a very short time the Vancouver Harbour Board will be self-sustaining and that interest will be paid to the government on all the money which may be advanced to the commission.

Mr. LADNER: Is it not a fact that last year's operations disclosed a profit above operating expenses of some $38,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The receipts last year amounted to $423,307.98 while the expenditures totalled $131,240.75. While there was an increase in the revenue of $82,370.10 over that of the previous year; the increase for the year of receipts over expenditures on revenue account amounts to $292,067.23. The expenditure on revenue account showed a decrease of $34,123.16. This is certainly creditable and shows that the traffic in the harbour, which I have no doubt will continue to increase, entitles the harbour commission of Vancouver to the help which this parliament and the government intend to give them.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Do I understand that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure of some $290,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, last year.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That being so, why should the interest be paid out of capital?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under the law authorizing the loan of $5,000,000 the interest is considered a part of the loan.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But, if the surplus earnings were sufficient to pay the interest on the guaranteed advances, why were those earnings not applied to that purpose? It would not appear to be necessary to add interest account to capital expenditure.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The commission took advantage of the provision of the statute, that, during the period of construction of the works the interest payable on debentures in respect of such construction shall be deemed to be money required to enable the corporation to carry on that construction and pay for part of the construction thereof. It is therefore provided that the interest may be paid out of the $5,000,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I understand that there is authority for paying the interest during the period of construction. But where there was a surplus of earnings sufficient to pay the interest there would not appear to be any reason for paying that interest out of capital. The showing, I admit, is an exceedingly good one, and I merely wish to know why the interest should be paid out of capital under the circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not the interest paid during construction, on the moneys invested in the harbour, that is charged to capital? That, of course, does not need to be taken into account in the annual returns. The interest after that is taken into account is paid and there is still a surplus for last year's operations.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right. We are still in the period of construction.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But the authority to pay interest out of capital during the period of construction does not necessarily require that it shall be charged to capital, if the public works in the meanwhile are earning interest, as apparently they were in this case.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will agree that in all works of this kind, during the period that the building or construction is under way, the interest is always added to the capital cost.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Usually.

Mr. STEVENS: In this case we are constructing a very large pier, which is not yet earning anything. It is not yet completed; it will probably be completed this coming year. During the period of construction, necessarily and in all fairness, the interest is added to the capital cost of construction. The moment that pier is completed and put into use and is producing revenue, then the interest will come out of the earnings of the port. I may add, to supplement what the minister has said, that the earnings of the port have been derived from tonnage dues and dues upon cargoes, as well as from charges for foreshore leases and other things of that nature. The object of the commission in the past has been to establish a strong financial position, which I think they have shown they have succeeded in doing. But it would be wholly unfair to ask them, before the completion of the pier, to pay the interest on its capital cost out of the revenue produced from other sources in the harbour.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That, of course, offers some explanation. Does my hon. friend know whether a large proportion of the net earnings came from other sources?

Mr. STEVENS: All of it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): None from the pier under construction.

Mr. STEVENS: None from the pier at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That makes a difference.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the figures I gave I stated that the sum of $4,524,800 had been advanced to the commissioners out of the loan of $5,000,000. In that amount is included the sum of $68,032 for interest during construction charged to capital account. We are supposed to have given them back that amount for purposes of construction, and it is deducted from the $5,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The interest on the harbour proper—that is, on the constructed part —is not added to capital; it is paid out of earnings?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. Now, while I do not know that I have anything to add, I might say this much. I should be obliged to the members of the committee if they would try to expedite the passing of this legislation in order that the works may be undertaken as soon as possible, and that at least a part of the proposed added accommodation may be open for the traffic of the next season's crop.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I hope my questions will not leave the impression that I am opposed to the expenditure, although I do think that hereafter, when large expenditures are contemplated in public harbours, they should be very closely examined. I know from experience in my own province that local interests are very insistent in making very large and unwarranted capital expenditures in harbours, and in many cases they turn out entirely useless and unjustifiable. It is very gratifying indeed to learn that at the present moment the port corporation of Vancouver is in a flourishing condition financially; and it is equally gratifying to hear the minister give the committee the assurance that he anticipates that that port will be able to earn sufficient to pay the interest upon the advances which the government proposes to guarantee under the legislation contemplated. I think it would be well, however, for the minister to indicate to the committee what are the esti-

mated earnings of the port after the projected expenditures are completed. Is it possible to make any estimate, or have the officers of the department made any? I suppose it is quite possible that the very things that have happened in the East can well happen on the Pacific coast. Persons resident in Vancouver may have a very vivid imagination of port developments that are not very likely to materialize in the early future, and I think the minister should be extremely careful, before authorizing these expenditures, to ascertain that there is a reasonable certainty of interest being earned upon the loan.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I do not find myself in opposition to this proposed loan, although I cannot say that I am heartily in sympathy with the method of raising the money. Possibly it is safe enough for the government to advance five million dollars to the Vancouver harbour commissioners, presuming that they are a responsible body and that the money will be repaid. But, in addition to what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has said, it seems to me that there needs to be a reorganization of the Vancouver harbour commissioners so that we may be reasonably sure of a continuous development of the harbour. I do not speak in this way with the idea of opposing the loan, because I happen to come from a section of the country that will benefit very materially from the development of the Vancouver route. I live in the centre prairie province, Saskatchewan, which is the greatest wheat producing province in the Dominion. In 1921 we produced over two hundred million bushels of wheat, and I am not sure but that our 1922 crop exceeded that figure. I live in Kindersley, about forty miles east of the eastern boundary of Alberta, and during the past year a great deal of grain grown in the vicinity has been shipped via Vancouver. We might wonder why that is the case. Our trouble on the prairies is, not that we cannot grow grain, not that the land is not good enough to grow grain, not that the people out there have not faith in their country; we have faith in our country, we know we can produce the grain, but what we are up against is inadequate transportation facilities—these are not as good as they should be. Heretofore the bulk of our grain has been going via Fort William and Montreal to the European market. That route is fairly well established, but it is only a summer route; at least in the winter time not a very large amount of our grain can be moved. And it cannot be moved very cheaply by that route. It so happens that from where I reside we can ship grain westward and save considerable money. From Kindersley to Vancouver the rate is 17 2-5 cents per bushel, from Vancouver to Liverpool 22 cents, making a total charge of 39 2-5 cents per bushel. Now take the rate the other way. From Kindersley to Fort William the rate is 15 3-5 cents per bushel, from Fort William to Montreal by water 20 cents, by rail 21 cents—we will take the cheaper rate—from Montreal to the European market 12 cents per bushel; making a total of 47 3-5 cents per bushel. The difference represents a saving of 8 1-5 cents for every bushel of grain shipped from Kindersley via Vancouver. Is it any wonder that the farmers of western Saskatchewan prefer to ship their grain via Vancouver? During the past season a great many cars were shipped from my home town and from towns immediately west.

I have no doubt as to the future of the Vancouver route, if the harbour commissioners there are as energetic as the harbour commissioners of Montreal, for instance. There is just a query in my mind—and possibly in the course of the debate it will be answered—as to why, seeing that the Panama canal was completed in 1915, it has taken seven years for the Vancouver people to have sufficient faith in their harbour to make agitation for its development. Possibly they are beginning to become progressive in their ideas. If such is the case, Mr. Chairman, within another seven years we may hope to see progressive representatives from Vancouver.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interrupt my hon. friend? The elevator to which I referred a few moments ago has been constructed and standing in Vancouver since 1914.

Mr. ROBB: Since 1916.

Mr. STEVENS: It was completed in 1916. I explained a few moments ago the reasons why grain did not move that way at an earlier date. First, there was no surety that the route would be a successful one; secondly, the Panama canal was blocked for a year and a half; thirdly, there was no tonnage available on the Pacific until about eighteen months after the conclusion of the war. My hon. friend will remember, if he reflects a moment, that for over a year after the war, until August 1920, tonnage was fully occupied on the short Atlantic route bringing troops back. In 1920 we started to ship wheat or grain through the Vancouver route. In 1921 more grain was flowing that way than we could handle because of the lack of facilities, the elevator being used to capacity. And the same condition obtained last year.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Thank you. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that our hopes for progressive representatives from Vancouver are not very good. Now, there is perhaps one other point that might be mentioned. While the application for this loan is made to the Dominion authority, and while I have every hope that it will go through, yet in my opinion it would be preferable if the citizens of Vancouver and British Columbia and the western half of the prairie provinces contributed the major portion of the money necessary to develop these harbour facilities. Possibly that course will be followed along with the present procedure.

One other point. This is the first application that has been made, I believe, for a development that is going to continue. Now, I wonder if this is only the first "bite" and if there are many more applications to follow. When the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) was eulogizing the beauties of northern British Columbia and pointing out the advantages of the fine harbour of Prince Rupert, he took occasion to remind us that the prospects of shipping grain from the prairie provinces were never better than by the port of Prince Rupert. Are we to expect that a board of harbour commissioners will be organized at Prince Rupert and an application made here for another five million dollars to develop that port?—and then possibly in the near future another loan of five million dollars asked for the further development of Vancouver harbour? Will the good work continue in this way? If such is the case, I for one would not be very strongly in favour of lavishly expending Dominion money or loaning it out with the likelihood of not getting it back in the near future. I would rather favour the citizens of the interested cities and provinces getting together and contributing the money—I am sure it would be forthcoming in that western country—and so developing the ports of Vancouver and Prince Rupert and opening up for the prairie provinces further outlets for their grain.

Mr. MacLAREN: I take this opportunity of supporting the resolution, and I do so not because I am a western man, but because the result will be to encourage business through the port of Vancouver and to assist in bringing about the carrying on of Canadian business through Canadian ports. The adoption of this resolution will be a step in that direction; it will be evidence of an effort to do what means so much for the prosperity of our country, namely, to ensure the employment of our railroads and of our seaports.

It has been stated once or twice in this discussion that grain can be exported through Vancouver during the winter season and that navigation is during that period closed in the East. Now—I was going to say, unfortunately, but rather I should say, fortunately—that is not a correct statement of the facts. At the present time grain is exported from the city of St. John, where the elevator capacity is two million and a quarter bushels, a million more than the elevator capacity at Vancouver. However, the same difficulties exist at the port of St. John that are met at the port of Vancouver; that is, there is lack of accommodation and facilities. It is not a case of creating business. The business is there, but it is being refused; it is being lost on account of the lack of accommodation. That is one reason why I am in favour of the encouragement of all ports in this Dominion that are suited to the handling of the business which presents itself. A few days ago in the port of St. John there were six steamers lying in stream awaiting to be loaded; the business was there, but the accommodation was insufficient.

There is another thing that I wish to emphasize about this business in the East, and that is that it is not closed in winter. It is true that the St. Lawrence route is closed, but the port of St. John is always open. But there is another large port through which grain is sent in streams during the winter, and that is Portland. In other words, a foreign port is handling a great deal of our Canadian export trade. In view of the fact, therefore, that we should be doing this business through our own ports, I am glad to do what I can to support Vancouver or any other Canadian port with a view to our handling this export trade to the best advantage.

Mr. LADNER: The government is to be complimented in engaging upon this national undertaking, not only because of its benefit from the point of view of a market in the United Kingdom for our western grain, but also because of the developments which are now taking place in Japan and China so far as our grain trade is concerned. I happen to be in touch with interests in Vancouver which handle more of that oriental trade, perhaps, than any other concern, and I am informed that most of it must necessarily be handled through Vancouver. The larger Japanese and Chinese concerns dealing in grain have their head offices in Seattle, and we have now reached the point where there is keen competition between United States and Canadian dealers for the markets of the Orient. I say again that the government are

to be commended for taking time by the forelock and establishing these elevator facilities in order that Canada may not be behind in the great development which is bound to come in the Orient, as she was behind when the development took place in Alaska. It is well known that on the coast at that time —and this particularly relates to Vancouver— the facilities were lacking for handling trade to the Yukon and Alaska, with the result that Seattle received a great impetus in her development. She had the facilities and was therefore able to take the trade when we had scarcely waked up to its advantages. Grain is to some extent replacing rice in the oriental diet, and as time goes on the trade and traffic in grain between Canada and Japan and China will grow more and more.

Reference has been made by one hon. member to contributions made by the people of the West for works of this kind. But I submit that this is a national undertaking, not merely an undertaking for Vancouver; the people of St. John and of Montreal are just as much interested in it as the people of Vancouver. Certain private enterprises are contemplating the construction of elevators there. As trustee of an estate I sold the first two water frontages for private elevators, and thus I have come in contact with actual dealers in grain, the men who are going to develop elevators there in order to carry on the grain business. I learned from them that it was essential that some large undertaking in the way of elevator accommodation such as is contemplated by this resolution should be carried out; that it would help private enterprise as no other method would. When grain men see the government interested in establishing a sound and permanent business in grain traffic, they themselves feel safe in going on with it. I was advised by one of these dealers that the presence of a large number of export grain dealers in the city would help not only the port itself, but also the producers of grain in the West. As the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has said, it is a fact that notwithstanding the discriminatory freight rates to which the people of British Columbia have been subjected, there is an advantage of nearly ten cents a bushel on grain going from Edmonton to Liverpool via Vancouver as compared with the rate on grain going from Edmonton to Liverpool via eastern ports. The Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) has stated that some 19,000,000 bushels of grain went through Vancouver last year. So, it is evident that with proper grain facilities there will be no blocking of the grain, and the farmer will be able to get a maximum of advantage. I am told that one of the reasons why the producers got nearly $2,000,000 less than they should have got was because of the conditions under which the grain dealers were able, by manipulating the cars and so on, to get this ten cents a bushel which really should go into the pockets of the farmers. One purpose this resolution will serve will be to eliminate those opportunities, and thereby directly contribute to the advantage of the farmer. If two hundred million bushels, which is only one-half of the grain crop of Canada, should go via Vancouver, the farmers of the prairies would have on this basis an additional revenue of something in the neighbourhood of twenty million dollars. I see some hon. gentlemen smile at that, but it is a fact. I have the data and can establish the point which I am making. There is an advantage of ten cents a bushel in favour of the Edmonton-Vancouver route to Liverpool over the Edmonton-Montreal route, and the establishment of a grain elevator will be one method of diverting that ten cents a bushel from the hands of the grain elevators into the hands of the farmers.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is my hon. friend supporting this expenditure at Vancouver on the ground that it is justified by anticipated wheat exports, or does he hope for some general port development there?

Mr. LADNER: I thought that the immediate justification had been well explained by the minister showing the actual net profits which are now produced, and not wishing to duplicate his remarks I took up another point, the development of trade. I say that it would enlarge the possibilities of oriental trade, and greatly increase the possibilities of still larger profits, and at the same time private enterprise would be encouraged to go in when the people saw the government step in whole-heartedly. The idea that this expenditure is to be a continual drain, that we are going to come back here year after year and ask for another appropriation, is quite unreasonable and quite unfair, because once you get the volume of business going through the port and the trade established, it is more than likely that private enterprise will be able to carry out what it is unable to carry out at the present time.

Mr. MILLAR: I am pleased indeed to see this western route opened up, because I believe that when we get a great deal of our grain going over the Pacific route, as well as over the Hudson Bay route, many of the

abuses now alleged of the St. Lawrence route will pass away. I know there has been very little said in the way of searching into the difficulties and perhaps the objections, and I would like to ask for a little information.

I have not been able to find out from the remarks made by the minister whether it is the policy of the government to make of the port of Vancouver a storage port or simply a transfer port. I should also like to ask what information the government has in regard to the amount of moisture that is consumed by grain passing over the Pacific route and through the Panama canal to the Old Country. I believe that a great deal of our grain that goes through Fort William in a damp condition is mixed with dry grain, and while the farmer pays for the drying, I believe that a great deal of the grain is not dried. I submit this opinion, in connection with the Pacific route. I believe that if grain is taken to the port very early in the season, and left lying there for many months before it is shipped, and passes through the Panama canal for London or Liverpool, it will be necessary to be very much more careful about the drying facilities, because a great deal of the grain that will pass readily and without much damage over the other route would not pass undamaged over the Pacific route.

Mr. STEVENS: That was thoroughly tested out on several trial trips. Scientific experts accompanied the vessels and took tests of the temperature, moisture, and everything else on the trip, and they say that there were no bad effects whatsoever.

Mr. MILLAR: I am quite well aware of that, provided the grain travels quickly to the port of Vancouver and quickly to England, but I doubt whether tests have been made of grain that has been shipped very early in the season and stored for many months before being shipped across the water. The European countries taking our grain and the grain of other countries require about twelve million bushels a week all the year round, so naturally the grain must be stored somewhere. I will not say that Calgary and Edmonton are the proper points at which to provide storage facilities. Lethbridge is mentioned by an hon. member. I think the location should be very carefully considered. Much has been said about the lack of facilities during the past season. I believe it was stated that twice the grain would have gone over that route if it had not been for the lack of facilities. I do not think I am disclosing any information I should not disclose when I say that I had a conversation with some members of the grain commission on my way east from which I gathered that a great deal if not all of the difficulty was caused by the fact that some people had space leased and had not grain, while others had grain and no space, and each class was holding up the other. That occurred also on the eastern route last season. Men who had much space leased on the Great Lakes vessels were able to sell it at a very great advance and made considerable money thereby. So you can see that there is always a difficulty of a port being held up and a blockade being caused in that way. That being the case, I would ask if it is the intention of the government to place this port under the board of harbour commissioners or under the grain commission. During this last season, I suppose, right up to the present time, it has been under the harbour board. Is it the intention of the government to continue that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The elevator is under the grain commission just now, and will be until 1st August next, when it will pass under the management of the harbour commission.

Mr. MILLAR: Let me add that the blockade to which I have referred was broken up by the grain commission taking active steps and using authority and powers that the harbour board would not have. That is one argument for placing it under the grain commission.

There is also the matter of freight rates. I believe that at the present time the freight rate is fixed on the high grade of the Canadian Pacific, while on the Canadian National the grade, I understand, is better westward than eastward. I hope the time will come when the rates from the west will be lowered. I believe that one of the reasons why there has been such an advantage in sending grain westward this season is because of the rates eastward, and that has been caused by a blockade at Montreal. I think the government should look into this matter, and I should like to know whether the blockade at Montreal this past season was caused by the fact that the harbour board had control. Has it been caused by some people leasing storage who did not have grain? These are matters that should be considered when we are deciding whether it should be under the grain commission or the harbour board. Then again, the rates on grain going eastward this past season have been very, very high. An hon. member a few minutes ago, I think, gave the rate as twenty cents to Montreal. Now I have in my room a statement giving

the rates during 1909. I took the figures from the books of grain companies and figured out the average of a whole page of actual shipments, and the average was just a little less than four cents. I believe the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), who is in favour of opening up the St. Lawrence deep-water ways, claimed on one occasion that a great saving could be made; I think some even talked about a saving of six cents. If we could ever get back to anywhere near the 1909-10 rate, which is less than six cents by a considerable amount, then I think it would be just a question whether any saving could be made by shipping through the West. However, I am convinced that the West can well compete with the East. I am glad to see the proposition and I am prepared to give it my support.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is one feature of this proposal which astonishes me, and that is the unusual modesty of the city of Vancouver. That city is asking for a loan to improve its harbour, and I ask if any Canadian city ever made so modest a request before. There have been millions of money spent on the different harbours of this country by the Dominion government. Large sums of money, for example, have been spent at Fort William making improvements to the harbour, but all that Vancouver wants is a loan. Certainly, I would support a motion of this kind very gladly. I am of the opinion that most of the troubles of our friends in the West—and I think they seem to have more troubles than all the rest of the population put together—may be remedied by the improvement of marketing conditions; and if, as has been alleged here to-day, a saving of eight cents a bushel can be effected by using the route under discussion then I think it is up to the Canadian government not only to make a loan but to make an appropriation, to reach so desirable an end. I think that every proposition that offers lower rates for the marketing of the produce of the West should be exploited, because it is in the marketing of the products of our land that such a tremendous cost arises and that is the direction in which a reduction can be made. I am not very hopeful of being able to reduce the cost of production, at least for very many years. Because men are not going to work for less money than they are now working for, and there does not seem to be any inclination to do any more work in a specified time. The only way that I can see to relieve the situation of our friends in the western provinces is to devise some plan by which their produce could be marketed at lower rates. I believe that the improvement of the St. Lawrence canals would do a great deal in that connection, and at a later stage I hope to have an opportunity of saying something more definite on that question. What this country ought to do—not only for to-day but for the future—is to improve all its machinery and all its facilities for getting its products out of the country. We are growing a crop of three or four hundred millions of bushels of grain in the West. Why, Sir, if that western country is fully settled there ought to be surely four or five times as much produced as is the case to-day. If, then, the prairie provinces increase their production to that amount the present means of export, as any person can see, will be absolutely insufficient, and with inadequate means of export we are practically limited in our production. The statement has been made that a block existed at Montreal. I am not surprised at that, it is practically the only outlet we have for all the stuff that is grown in the West. I would have two or three outlets, because I think the time is not far away when we will need more facilities than we possess at the present time to handle the produce of Canada. We must remember that it is not only the produce of the West that has to pass out from Montreal, but all that is grown in the great province of Ontario which produces, I suppose, twice as much as any other province in the Dominion. The only existing outlet is either New York or Montreal, a little going, perhaps, to Portland. But my feeling is that it is wise on the part of this government and this parliament to consider carefully and sympathetically every proposal that is made for increasing the facilities for handling the produce of the western prairies. There is no man in this House who is more anxious, or who desires more ardently, to serve the interests of western Canada than I do. In that respect I am practically prepared to go the limit. It is not only wheat for which better
5 p.m. means of export are desired. The cattle industry, especially in the province of Alberta, ought to become a very large and very important one to Canada and particularly to the West.

Now I cannot speak with any definiteness as to the exact saving to be effected in the cost of transportation, not having gone into the matter as deeply as some hon. members, but it seems to me that there must be a substantial reduction in the cost of handling the produce of the West by the Vancouver route when it is remembered that the distance from Edmonton, I think, is only about eight hundred miles as compared with a distance of well on to three thousand miles to Montreal.

Manifestly there must be a very great saving in the case of a route so much shorter, especially with proper facilities and a fair and reasonable use of the Yellowhead pass as against the Kickinghorse pass. If the Canadian Pacific railway cannot haul grain through the mountains at the same cost as the National road then the latter and not the former is liable to get the business. And why should it not? Why not deal with transportation in the same manner as one would do when making a purchase of any commodity? If a man makes as good a pair of boots for $4 as a man does who charges $6 for footwear, it means that the former will sell more boots; and if the National road can haul grain through the mountains at a lower rate than another system can, by reason of better grades, it is likely to get the business. That is a very important item to consider in dealing with this quesiton.

I am very much in favour of the motion but I would go to the extent of suggesting to the minister that he should make a grant rather than a loan to the city of Vancouver.

Mr. COOTE: I want to disagree with the sentiment expressed by the last speaker that the government should make a grant rather than a loan to Vancouver harbour board. I would much prefer that the minister adhere to his proposal, that is, to loan this money to the board.

As far as the transportation of wheat is concerned, which will be carried through the port of Vancouver, I am sure that the men who raise that wheat are quite willing that the elevator at Vancouver should receive whatever reasonable charges are necessary. I simply want to mention one or two points that were not brought out this afternoon, and then submit one or two questions to the minister.

The first thing I wish to point out in regard to wheat production in Canada is that we have all the production that the present outlets can take care of. We are very close to the danger line. Last season we had a crop in Canada, we are told, of 399,000,000 bushels of wheat, an average of 17¾ bushels per acre. In the year 1915, we had an average crop in Canada of 26 bushels per acre. If in the year 1922, we had had the same average that we had in 1915, instead of 399,000,000, we would have had 582,000,000 bushels, or another 183,000,000 bushels, which would have had to be taken care of. We are also told that there was a blockade on the one big outlet, that is by the Great Lakes. What would the blockade have been like if we had had to market another 183,000,000 bushels this year? —and hon. members can see that that was quite a possibility.

One other point which, I am sure, will interest particularly members from the Maritime provinces is this, that if additional facilities are not provided at Vancouver for handling the wheat, particularly from Alberta, there is in the United States another Portland—Portland, Oregon—which in a few years will be taking a large quantity of our wheat, and then members from British Columbia will roar just as much about Canadian wheat going through Portland, Oregon, as members from the Maritime provinces now complain about wheat going through Portland, Maine. This last year, a representative from the city of Portland, Oregon, came to Alberta endeavouring to divert some share of our wheat to that city, and assured us that this would be to our advantage. This House should think seriously of that phase of the situation before doing anything which might hinder development of grain-handling facilities at Vancouver.

I am glad to note that there is so much unanimity in this House on this question, but there are a few points which I think we should be a little careful about. From expressions of opinion which I have heard so far this session, I notice that the demand for economy is very general in all quarters of this House, and I hope economy will be exercised in building facilities of one kind or another at the port of Vancouver. I sympathize very heartily with some of the statements expressed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), for instance, that a great deal of money has been wasted in Canada, particularly on ocean ports or even ports that are not on the ocean, and I want to ask the minister a few questions. After he advances this money to the Vancouver harbour board, will he exercise any supervision whatever over the expenditure of it by the board? If a new elevator is built, would the work be done by tender? Does he expect to have any of this additional elevator capacity at Vancouver ready for the 1923 crop? Once these elevators are put under the board of harbour commissioners at Vancouver, will the department, through the board of grain commissioners, exercise any supervision whatever over their operation? I understand the minister assents. I am glad to be advised of that. Is the elevator at the present time under the Vancouver harbour board?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. WARNER: I am glad to have an opportunity to support this resolution. It is a pleasure, to western members at least, to see so much support throughout this House for this proposition. I would that all questions could be considered on their merits, and it seems to me that the considerations which have been put forward by previous speakers as regards this proposition of improving the harbour facilities at Vancouver in order to take care of the western grain by way of the Pacific, have been founded on the merits of the question. We are glad to have this support.

I live at Edmonton, which is, one might say, on the western edge of the great grain producing district, and we are close to the Pacific coast as compared with even the lake ports. We have held for years that it was rather an injustice that we should not be permitted to ship our grain west when we felt that that was our natural route to the world market and our natural outlet. As has been said this afternoon, that route has the advantage of being an all-year-round route. Any time that you want to send grain that way, you can do so. I also live on the line of the National railways, and I have no hesitation in saying that I am partial to having grain travel over the National railways. I believe, too, as a previous speaker has said, that an opportunity is given to ship grain more cheaply on those National roads on account of better grades. Why not patronize the National roads? We have them; we have to make the best of them. Moreover, if any part of Canada will do something towards making those National roads a success, it will be the undeveloped part of Canada in the West which is lying there ready for the hand of man to make productive.

I do not know that I should, at this moment, introduce more than this one idea; but I want to tell the committee, as I told hon. members last year, that in Edmonton we live half way between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans. If the Hudson Bay route is opened up at some time or another—I do not know when that time will come—we are about 800 miles from tide-water in Hudson bay, and we are from 700 to 800 miles from the Pacific. We hope that as this route develops there will be established at Edmonton storage elevators and all the facilities for handling, cleaning, drying, keeping and taking care of grain that may be shipped either way. I do not see that that should interfere with present development at Vancouver. The other proposition I have referred to is practically untouched just now. Now, all we ask is that the government should have an eye to the future in order that western Canada may get its share of the development that must be carried out if the whole dominion is to become a really great country. We believe that we have a great country to-day, but our opportunities are so vast when compared with what has already been achieved that we cannot help feeling that we are only beginning to develop Canada. We want more wheat growers in the West, and we must provide for them, and enable them to put their products on the market.

One hon. member has observed that nothing has been said about the other products besides wheat. But if hon. members could understand the conditions in the West they would appreciate the other resources we have and perhaps they might view our future with more optimism. But people living in that part of the Dominion have some reason to hesitate about endorsing an immigration policy until they can be assured that intending immigrants will have a better opportunity than they themselves at present enjoy. Personally I do not share that view to any great extent, but I do feel that the work of taking care of the crops which future immigrants will raise in that part of the country is just as important in the interest of Canada as is the question of getting immigrants into the country. We must provide for that work or we shall not be able to hold the people when they do come. But I believe that all this can be done, and I am pleased this afternoon to note the broad view that has been taken by those hon. members who have spoken on this question. I do not think it is too much to hope that the representatives in parliament of the Canadian people may soon learn to appreciate the great value, and the crying necessity, of developing the western part of the country. That development is essential if a market is to be found for the products of the factories of eastern Canada. If the people in the West had been getting better markets and better prices there would have been a better sale for the manufactured goods of the country to-day. I do not like to recount the bad conditions that prevail out there to-day, but I must say that the reason why the manufacturers of the East are not selling their shoes and clothing in the West on a larger scale than they are now doing is simply because the people cannot buy them. I have reason to believe that we may be able to add eight or ten, indeed fifteen cents, a

bushel to the price of our wheat when the rates are as they should be, and when other necessary conditions are brought about along with reduced freight rates. I do not hesitate to suggest that we could effect a reduction of fifteen cents a bushel on the handling of wheat, which of course would naturally go to the producer. If that can be done, why should we not do it? As I said before, I do not see why elevator capacity should not be provided at Edmonton if the western route is opened up. I do not believe that the government would need to invest money there for taking care of the grain and storing it, in fact, the government in the present case are doing nothing more than making it possible for Vancouver to establish those facilities which it needs. We do not want the government to make any donation; I believe that any business ought to pay for itself. I think we are paying for the transportation of our wheat, no matter who carries it; and all that is asked is that the government loan what moneys are necessary to provide that transportation which shall pay for itself. I am pleased to associate myself with those who are supporting the resolution, and I have hopes for the government when they bring in a resolution that is as fair and reasonable as this one, and undertake a development that is so badly needed in Canada to-day.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It does not seem necessary for me to extend the discussion. It is pleasing to find a resolution of this character so well and so unanimously received by our friends opposite. I have a pretty close knowledge of the conditions that led up to the desirability, in fact the urgent necessity, of the government bringing this resolution before the House. It has been shown during the last few years that it is possible to ship the grain of the western provinces particularly Alberta and western Saskatchewan, through the Pacific ports. It has been found that that grain can be taken to these ports and transported across the Pacific to the markets that apparently are waiting for it. It has also been proved that by utilizing the Panama canal this grain can be sent to the world's markets, particularly the United Kingdom. As demonstrating that possibility, the present elevator at Vancouver has served a very useful purpose. But it has been seen, particularly during the operations of last year and this year, that if that western route was to carry in competition with the eastern routes and was to serve the purpose it ought to serve for our grain products, then additional facilities would have to be provided at Vancouver. An hon. member has suggested that he does not altogether like the idea of the government voting money in chunks of $5,000,000 for expenditures of that kind. I will call his attention to the wording of the resolution. He will notice that although parliament will, as I have no doubt, grant the proposed sum of money, the resolution provides that each of these advances shall be made from time to time and must go through the department concerned, namely the Department of Marine. This money is not handed over in a lump sum, but is advanced as the work progresses. It is also well understood, I think, that the harbour commission is under the authority and control of the government of Canada, so that their activities in the harbour of Vancouver are at all times subject to our approval. It is true that as a commission they may initiate policies and advise the department, but after all the moneys advanced by parliament do remain in our control and are advanced as the occasion requires.

Now, in regard to the port of Vancouver, in fact to our Pacific ports generally, we find, due to the expansion of trade in the Orient and the operation of the Panama canal, that there is going to be a great change in shipping on the Pacific coast. We believe the day is not far distant when freight will be moved to the Pacific coast by water and thence transported into the interior of Canada. And in the handling of this grain traffic we will find that as the grain movement increases to the Pacific coast there will be a larger tonnage coming into that port bringing imports and taking return cargoes in the way of grain and other products of this country.

As to the transfer of the elevator from the grain commission to the harbour board, that matter was very carefully canvassed between the two departments of the government, and owing to the fact that the harbour commission not only controlled the pier over which the elevator is served, but also the movement of ships in the harbour, it was felt that the harbour commission would be in a better position to serve the handling of grain at that terminal point than a grain commission operating either in Port Arthur or Fort William. There is no complaint to make as to the activities of the grain commission. They, in conjunction with the harbour commissioners, did make regulations last year which rendered it possible for the harbour facilities to serve the grain traffic to the utmost limit of their capacity.

I am satisfied that this loan will do much to improve not only the grain handling facilities but other facilities at the port of Vancouver. It has been stated that it is not

the intention of the harbour commission nor the people of British Columbia to come back to parliament for further grants. I would not promise that, because I believe that the development in the port will be so great and so profitable that the harbour board will be able to come back and ask for further loans, and that this parliament will grant their requests, knowing that it is good national business and in the interests of the whole Dominion to make such expenditures.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution, and I wish to congratulate the minister on bringing it forward at this early sitting. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has asked whether we support this expenditure because of anticipated developments in the grain trade. I would answer: No, because of the actual demand which exists to-day on the part of the grain growers of the prairies. They demand facilities for handling their grain through the western port. The facilities at present are not sufficient to accommodate their demands, and consequently an immediate increase is necessary. To-day there are many grain growers on the prairies who would like to send their grain via Vancouver—I know many of them myself—and they cannot avail themselves of that outlet because there are no facilities to handle more than a certain quantity of grain. I repeat, the necessity for greater facilities exists now.

I think I can illustrate by the general growth in trade through the port of Vancouver that there is a necessity for increased facilities in handling this commodity, and I will use the Panama canal as the basis of my illustration. The canal was opened for traffic in 1915. From that year to 1920 the freight rates were so prohibitive that no traffic moved from Vancouver via the canal—practically none. In 1920, however, the rates became normal and traffic was resumed. If we go back to 1913, that is before the Panama canal was opened, we find the total number of ocean-going vessels which docked in Vancouver was 132. We can eliminate the intervening period up to 1920 because no bottoms were available. In 1920, the first year after the war in which ocean rates began to fall, a total of 333 ocean-going ships entered the port. In 1921 a total of 496, of which 103 used the Panama canal. That is practically the first year that the Panama canal was used in so far as shipping from the port of Vancouver is concerned. In 1922 for the first nine months—I do not think the figures are available for the full year—509 ocean-going ships used the port of Vancouver.

Now for the imports from and exports to Europe through the port of Vancouver via the Panama canal. In 1921 the exports were 154,513 tons; in 1922 they increased to 470,272 tons—more than three times the amount in one year. The imports in 1921 via the Panama canal were 20,416 tons; in 1922, 149,553 tons—or practically a little over seven times the amount in one year. I use that illustration as a basis to demonstrate why it is feasible to ship grain via the Panama canal. Some doubt did exist as to whether or not grain would heat and thereby deteriorate in its passage through the canal, but I am assured that that theory is completely exploded, as pointed out by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens).

The member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) stated, I think, that he did not approve of the method of loans. But I would point out, first, that this money is essentially for the benefit of growers of grain on the prairies, and, secondly, that Vancouver is going to pay for these facilities—and we are not complaining. As the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) pointed out, we are extremely modest and we could not adopt any other course than that of paying for the facilities which are required for the western grain growers.

Mr. COOTE: The hon. member says that Vancouver will pay for these facilities. Is it not a fact that the shipments that pass through Vancouver harbour will eventually pay for them?

Mr. CLARK: The harbour commissioners will run this thing as a business. The port of Vancouver will pay through their collections.

Mr. COOTE: And the wheat that goes through there will pay its share.

Mr. CLARK: Oh yes, it will pay its share

Mr. DUFF: It is the business that will pay, not the port of Vancouver.

Mr. CLARK: The question of economy has been raised, and I certainly support that principle. But I would point out that the present elevator capacity of the port of Vancouver is 1,250,000 bushels, and it is proposed to increase that capacity to the extent of 500,000 bushels. Now, we got that capacity of 1,250,000 bushels at a cost of from $800,000 to $900,000, but in order to get an increase of 500,000 bushels we must pay $400,000, or half the original cost. I understand also that the original cost included the working plant, whereas this is only storage. I think the minister should give us some light on this point.

There are one or two other things which surprise me in connection with the use to which this money is to be put. There is vital necessity for terminal railway facilities if this grain is to be handled economically and with despatch. I am surprised that no mention is made of the harbour railway facilities. At present all railways other than the Canadian Pacific are handicapped because the Canadian Pacific has all the water frontage where the elevator is and where the proposed elevators will be built. It is important, therefore, that the harbour commission should have under its jurisdiction at the earliest day the harbour facilities so that all railways will have a chance and so that the grain can be handled with the utmost despatch.

The port of Montreal, which is a much greater distance away from the grain-growing country than Vancouver is, handles nearly 200,000,000 bushels a year; therefore it is a moderate estimate that the port of Vancouver, given the necessary handling facilities, should handle 100,000,000 bushels a year. But even with this increase we shall not have more than one-third of the facilities offered at Montreal, so I anticipate that at a very early date the western grain growers will be demanding additional facilities. I recommend to the government an immediate consideration of the necessity which is obviously in front of us.

Mr. PORTER: Is it contemplated that this proposed advance will be sufficient to enable the commissioners to complete and efficiently equip the intended improvements in this harbour, or is this merely a commitment, so to speak, in connection with which further expenditures will have to be made later? I would also like to ask whether the government is in possession of plans and specifications necessary to enable it to determine whether the expenditure of this $5,000,000 will be advisable. That information ought to be in possession of the government, and we should know whether the proposed expenditure will be sufficient without the placing of further obligations upon the people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount which it is proposed to lend to the harbour commissioners of Vancouver will, it is anticipated, meet the estimated immediate requirements. Of course, it is impossible to say definitely that this will be sufficient to meet all future requirements. We have had a rather prolonged discussion and many questions have been asked; I would ask that the resolution be allowed to pass and when the bill comes back before the committee after its second reading I shall be in a better position to give the information asked for this afternoon from various quarters.

Mr. SALES: Will the minister give me again the name of the engineer he mentioned?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Rolph.

Mr. SALES: Is there any particular difficulty with regard to the site at Vancouver? The minister gave a lot of figures—$171,000, $155,000, and so on; some of these amounts will no doubt be for preparatory work on the site. My question is this: Is the $2,000,000 for the 2,000,000 bushels merely for the construction and equipment of plant? The minister need not answer immediately if he does not wish to do so. Another point: the amount of $400,000 for the extra 500,000 bushels, as mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) certainly seems very high. I am sure that the estimated storage costs—merely for bins, without any working plant—at the elevators at the head of the lakes are very much below that amount per bushel. I would also draw the minister's attention to the fact that there is one man, a resident of Port Arthur, who does practically all the planning of the terminal elevators. It is very necessary that this elevator should be equipped with the proper machinery. Terminal elevators very soon become obsolete, and if they are not efficient it becomes too expensive to handle the wheat going through them. This gentleman has devoted practically the whole of his time to devising new methods and new machinery for these plants, and I would certainly suggest that in order to make this Vancouver elevator an efficient and economical plant, the government should consult with Mr. Howe and with Mr. Fennel, who, in my opinion, has in Montreal a very efficient and economical organization.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interject that Mr. Howe is the engineer who designed the existing elevator?

Mr. SALES: Yes, also the ones at Calgary, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and our own co-operative terminal, as well as the new one for Mr. Stewart and a number of others. I think he is probably the best man in Canada to-day for that work. I do not know the gentleman you have named here but I would suggest that you have the two men work together in order to get the most up-to-date plant possible.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 16, to provide for further advances to the Vancouver harbour commissioners.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 7 to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

On section 1—Jurisdiction and powers of stipendiaries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose this merely carries out what the hon. Minister of Justice told us a few days ago was the purpose of the bill. I have not studied it very closely, but I will accept his assurance.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Exactly. I gave the explanation the other day in introducing the bill. It is to provide for the trial of Eskimos who are now under guard at Herschell Island.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice that this section provides that a man may serve as a juror although he is not a British subject. Is that not a new thing? Is it not an improper precedent to create?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is not a precedent. If my hon. friend will read clause 44 of the Northwest Territories Act, chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of 1906, he will find that a judge has unlimited jurisdiction in choosing jurors. It provides:

> Persons required as jurors for a trial shall be summoned by a stipendiary from among such male persons as he thinks suitable in that behalf; and the jury required on such trial shall be called from among the persons so summoned as such jurors, and shall be sworn by the stipendiary who presides at the trial.

This provision my hon. friend mentions is to remove any doubts which might arise in this case. These men are to be tried in the Yukon district, where there is a provision that no one can serve as a juror unless he is a British subject. In the Northwest Territories there is no such restriction. These are offences that were committed in the Northwest Territories, so the procedure is not being changed; but the trial having to take place in the Yukon district, where there is a restriction, we feel that we should first remove that doubt.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not follow my hon. friend at all. I understood him to say that he was not creating a precedent. It seems to me now that he is. He says that in the Yukon district it is necessary for a man to be a British subject before he can serve on a Canadian jury. I should think it was necessary everywhere, without any qualification, that before a man has the right to take part in the administration of Canadian justice he must be a Canadian citizen. I should have thought that a primary qualification. My hon. friend says the provision is necessary here because while that general principle applies in the Yukon, it does not apply in the Northwest Territories. I venture to suggest that unless there is an express exception such as we have here, it would apply in the Northwest Territories. What my hon. friend is doing here is saying that in the case of a trial which is to take place in the Yukon, where you have British subjects and the proper machinery for the administration of justice—it is because of that very fact that this bill is being introduced to change the venue of the trial—the procedure in the Northwest Territories, where there might not be those facilities, shall apply. Unless the minister can give us some explanation, I can see no reason why the general rule should be departed from.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The hon. member says that there is on Herschell Island a population from which we could get British jurymen. It is exactly because we have no such population there that this provision is made. The population of Herschell Island is very small. It is of a transient character and it is only in case British subjects cannot be found that we shall need the provision that it will not be necessary to be a British subject to act on the jury. This, let me say, is the law under the existing Northwest Territories Act, but there is a difference with respect to Yukon district. My hon. friend knows very well that the qualifications with respect to jurors are prescribed by the provincial legislature. This, however, is an exceptional matter inasmuch as we are legislating for an entirely different district, and the Revised Statutes of 1906 for the Northwest Territories gives unlimited jurisdiction to the judge to select any man residing in that territory to act as a juror. But having to try cases outside of the Northwest Territories, we have to make this provision that a man need not be a British subject. I have no desire to insist upon the provision if the committee objects to it. I repeat that it is not an exception we are making, we are simply transferring to that particular district the procedure of the Northwest Territories.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I understand it, this legislation is for the purpose of securing efficient administration, saving money, and the like, and we all want to help my hon. friend in those matters. He is ask-

ing to change the law so that an accused man can be tried in a different territory, and we are all agreeable. In making that change the minister changes the venue and he says that the venue shall be at a place where, as he himself admits, the necessary machinery and people are to be found. He changes the law so as to apply to the Yukon Territory, and he himself says that in the Yukon territory the law is that a man should be a British subject before he is qualified to serve upon such a jury. And yet my hon. friend says he is not changing the law. Why that is changing the law entirely. In the first place the accused has a right to his local venue. He may not be hurt very much by the change but his right is gone. Having changed that venue, then my hon. friend declares that the laws which apply to the Yukon administration shall not apply to the place to which the change of venue applies.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I shall again try to make the matter clear. These people will be tried under the procedure of the Northwest Territories Act, and by that statute the judge has the right to choose any citizen that he finds as a juror. What objection can there be to our proceeding under the law as it obtains in the territories? The reason for the proposed legislation is that there is a very small population, and unless the amendment is accepted we shall, in all probability, have to send British subjects with the judge to act as jurymen in the cases in question.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 13, respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Lapierre.

Bill No. 14, to incorporate La Banque des Cultivateurs.—Mr. Parent.

COLD STORAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 9, to amend the Cold Storage Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is a very short one consisting of only two sections, and yet it is capable of rendering a great deal of service and usefulness, especially in connection with fruit, dairy, fish and other perishable commodities throughout Canada. But before going on with the bill itself, might I refer just for a few moments to the working out of the original Cold Storage Act of 1907, because I think this House, when it is asked to vote subsidies for a certain activity of this nature, is entitled to be placed in possession of the facts with respect to the expenditure of subsidies that have been granted under the original act since its inception? I have in my hand a full report of those activities, thirty-four in number, that have been organised throughout Canada under the subsidy act of 1907. They are scattered throughout all the provinces as follows: Prince Edward Island, 1; Nova Scotia, 3; New Brunswick, 2; Quebec, 2; Ontario, 16; Manitoba, 1; Saskatchewan, 4; Alberta, 2; British Columbia, 3; total, 34. We cannot assume that all these are due to the subsidies given to encourage construction; but I think we can reasonably assume that a very considerable proportion of these cold storage plants are there to-day as a result of those subsidies. The quantity of cold storage space furnished by these thirty-four plants amounts to 5,244,215 cubic feet. The total cost of construction was $2,408,-354.85. The total amount of subsidies that were voted for these various plants during those twelve years was $722,506.46, or less than three-quarters of a million dollars.

For a number of years after the act was first passed, not very much advantage was taken of it. At that time cold storage plants generally were the subject of a good deal of suspicion. As a matter of fact they were looked upon as almost an evil, if not a menace to society; and a great many people, if they wanted to secure a good hearing, would expatiate upon the alleged heinous conduct of cold storage plants as a whole. As time went on, however, people got more familiar with the great service that these institutions afforded, especially if properly controlled and regulated; and as the years passed more advantage was taken of the subsidies, with the result that there were established 34 plants altogether during the twelve years that the old act was in operation. When the war came on we discovered, as other countries did, that we were very short of cold storage facilities, and at the conclusion of the war the government of that day amended the act so that the subsidies should apply to municipal cold storages only. I went over this matter fully when the resolution was introduced, but as there are a number of hon. members here to-night who were not present last Friday when I made the statement, I shall cover the same ground to some extent this evening.

The effect of the change in the act was practically to suspend its operation, because during the four years that it operated in its amended form no subsidies were paid because no municipal cold storage plants were organized nor were any moneys earned under subsidy. During that period the government that preceded us undertook the construction of one of the best cold storage plants, if not the best, in Canada, at the port of Montreal. I had the pleasure of visiting this institution and in my opinion it is one of the finest not only in Canada but on this continent. I do not know whether that government's policy was to converge on that plant to the exclusion of others, but the policy, if that was the object, was a sound one. Be that as it may, the plant is a credit to Canada. But that period has gone by. The present act is not operating and we are voting sums of money from year to year which we are unable to spend because apparently no municipality is desirous of taking advantage of the grant to build municipal cold storages. The proposal therefore is to amend the terms of the act so that it shall apply to co-operative institutions.

When the resolution was before the committee there were two criticisms offered, which I think had a useful object. The first was the fact that the bill did not provide for any proper regulation of these cold storage plants after the instalments had all been paid. It had been my intention to provide for this in one of two or three ways, preferably at that time by way of regulation. It is very difficult to get a bill sufficiently flexible to apply to all the meritorious institutions when you incorporate such a regulation in it. But you can have regulations sufficiently flexible to suit the conditions and the times as necessary. However, I am not committed to that method. If the committee to which I purpose referring the bill, that is, the Committee on Agriculture, has any method of regulation, without making it too rigid, for incorporation in the bill I shall be pleased to consider it favourably.

Another suggestion was that there should be a more specific description of what constitutes co-operative associations. Now, the bill was left open on that point purposely. We may differ as to what constitutes a co-operative association. Sometimes semi-philanthropic joint stock companies may be real and valid co-operative organizations. On the other hand, a great many people hold the view that no institution is strictly co-operative unless its profits are at least partially distributed on the basis of business supplied by each patron. It occurred to myself and my staff, and to those who had the charge of drafting this short bill, that it would be better to leave the point open as to just what constituted a co-operative society, because it might be considered that a joint stock company that had as part of its objective profit making, when it was in fact semi-beneficent in its character, had just as much right to be recognized for a subsidy under the act as if it were a full-fledged co-operative organization with at least part of its profits distributed on a business contributing basis as regards its patrons. However, if any change can be suggested without being too rigid and confining the application of the bill to too small an area, I shall be pleased to consider such a suggestion. As a matter of fact, all we desire is to get the bill functioning. We are not satisfied with merely voting $50,000 a year in the estimates without having the money spent in providing proper cold storage facilities, and the primary object of the bill is to afford such facilities. I do not know that I have anything further to add, Mr. Speaker, and I would now formally move the second reading of the bill so that I may refer it to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The minister stated that under the act three plants had been subsidized in Nova Scotia. Are they still in existence and what are the names of the companies? Further, can the minister tell us whether the Montreal cold storage plant was a municipal institution?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, national.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Constructed by the Montreal harbour board?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Did it receive a subsidy under the act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Then it has nothing to do with the act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I mentioned it incidentally. As I understood it, the object of the government in practically suspending the operation of the act was to concentrate activities on the Montreal institution. As regards the Nova Scotia plants, I understand they are all in operation. The Lockport cold storage plant receives a subsidy of $17,055, the Halifax Cold Storage Company, at Port Hawkesbury, $9,115, and the Leonard Fisheries, Limited, $60,000. I might add that the largest grant earned under the old subsidy act was $105,000 by a cold storage plant at Prince Rupert. The Canadian Fish and Cold Storage Plant, which the hon. member for

Skeena (Mr. Stork) referred to in the course of his speech on the Address the other evening. I had an opportunity of visiting this plant last summer, and it has certainly contributed largely to the development of the fisheries, especially in regard to halibut, on the Pacific coast. The smallest grant was given to the plant at Peterboro.

Mr. HANSON: In view of the statement the minister makes that he has been unable to spend the money voted for subsidies each year, may I ask him if there is any pronounced demand on the part of co-operative societies for this measure, and, if so, from what part of the country does it come? Or does it emanate from the officials of his department so they may be enabled to spend the money which at present they have no outlet for?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Properly these questions should be put when the bill is before Committee of the Whole, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to answer my hon. friend. We have had requests from several quarters, the principal one being from the minister of agriculture for Ontario. We have discussed the matter with him several times. He is very much interested in co-operative effort, particularly as it relates to the dairy industry. The fruit-growing industry of the Niagara peninsula also made a request through Colonel Roberts, who is himself operating a plant at Grimsby and is very familiar with the local fruit industry. He recognizes that the fruit industry can only be successfully carried on in future by the establishment of pre-cooling plants, so that the fruit directly it is gathered may be put into cold storage to reduce its temperature, retard the ripening process and arrest bacterial action. We have also had a request from the Pacific coast. Hon. members from British Columbia are of course familiar with the fruit industry there. We are informed that what is wanted probably more than anything else is cold storage accommodation so that the marketing season may be extended and thus give fruit producers a chance to dispose of their products over a longer marketing period.

Mr. SPEAKER: I need not remind hon. members that they can speak only once on the second reading. Of course, when the bill is in committee stage no restriction applies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I asked a question, Mr. Speaker, preliminary to making some remarks on the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member put a question a moment ago.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I do not go so far as to say that I am opposed to the bill, but my experience of cold storage operations aided by government subsidy is not such as to urge me to become enthusiastic over the proposals contained in this measure. The minister (Mr. Motherwell) says he has $500,000 a year to spend for this purpose, and he wants an opportunity of spending it. But surely that is hardly sufficient justification for the bill. We can easily relieve him from his embarrassment by not voting the money.

Mr. MARTELL: Is my hon. friend prepared to state that the fruit industry of the Annapolis valley, comprising the counties of King's, Hants and Annapolis, is not in need of government subsidies for the establishment of pre-cooling plants for the better handling of fruit? Do I understand him to be opposed to such assistance?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know whether the fruit industry in the Annapolis valley is in need of such assistance or not. My hon. friend, I have no doubt, will tell us before the bill passes whether or not there is necessity for such state aid in Nova Scotia. If there is such necessity, I have not the slightest doubt that private interests in the Annapolis valley could very well supply the accommodation themselves. However, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that I doubt very much the wisdom of continuing the Cold Storage Subsidy Act, and when this bill comes before the Committee on Agriculture I hope it will be given full and frank consideration. In so far as the act has been applied in Nova Scotia the results have not been satisfactory. The present Cold Storage Act owed its genesis I think to the efforts of persons interested in the fish industry in the Maritime provinces. I am not quite positive about that, but that is my impression. As the minister has stated, some plants have been subsidized there, but gradually they have drifted into private hands, and to all intents and purposes they are now private institutions. I believe that will happen in almost all cases where such plants are subsidized by the government. I observe that the minister in moving his resolution stated that he was very doubtful whether the act should be continued, simply by reason of the fact that such few requests for aid under its provisions had been received by his department.

I do not see how you can very well distinguish between a corporation, a co-operative society, and a private individual. The end which any one of the three might have in mind would be served and the same results

accomplished in any locality by any of these agencies. If the principle is sound I think it should be applied to everyone. In Nova Scotia, so far as fish products are concerned, it is my opinion that considerable private capital would be invested in cold storage plants if government control were abandoned. It is very difficult to-day to attract private capital to any business which is subject to severe government control and regulation of rates. As the minister himself stated on Friday last, there has been so much criticism in recent years of the management and direction of cold storage plants that private investment in them has been discouraged. Give them the opportunity to do business with the same freedom as obtains in other industries and I think there will be forthcoming all the capital that is necessary. I quite concede that if institutions of this kind are to be subsidized there must be state control and regulation. It is also true, perhaps, that even though not aided by the state they should be regulated to some extent.

I am not going to the extent of opposing this measure, but I doubt its utility, for our experiment with state-aided cold storage plants has not been successful in any respect. Indeed, I think this might be a very good opportunity to abandon the act altogether and see what will happen in the development of these plants without any aid from the state. However, I have no doubt that the bill will be thoroughly considered by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, cold storage, in so far as it relates to improved facilities for fruit growers in Nova Scotia, is of vital importance. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), whose experience, it would seem, has been a very bitter one. He is undoubtedly in favour of every possible government expenditure that will go toward the improvement of his constituency. But the people of western Nova Scotia—and I am referring to my own constituency—are in need to-day of some sort of cold storage or pre-cooling plants in which they can place their fruit when the market does not enable them to sell at a price that will yield a reasonable return for their labour. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks in reply to the hon. member for Halifax referred to the North Atlantic fisheries, and also to the Port Hawkesbury cold storage plant and one or two others. It is true that these plants may not have been a great commercial success, but if the hon. member for Halifax will look into the question without philosophizing upon economy, he will find that cold storage has been of inestimable value to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. The other day I referred to the fact, as also did my colleague from the county of King's (Mr. Robinson) that there were thousands upon thousands of barrels of apples down in the Annapolis valley, so-called, for which the people there could find no market. If we had these cold storage or pre-cooling plants these apples could be kept until such time as they could be placed on the market at a price to yield a reasonable return. The hon. member for Halifax spoke merely from the point of view of Halifax. We of the western counties are speaking—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If I may interrupt my hon. friend, I would deny to him the right to say that I was speaking primarily for Halifax. I appeal to the House and ask hon. members if any portion of my remarks justify my hon friend's making such an unwarranted statement. If he wishes to discuss the question, let him do so intelligently.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend is discussing the matter with a view to getting away from any improvement in cold storage plants that will go to aid the industry of agriculture in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend is wrong in saying that.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member can make his own interpretation of it; that is the interpretation I place upon it, and I intend to stand by my own. The bill that the minister has introduced has a tendency to encourage the fruit grower; the only objection I have to it is that it does not cover private corporations engaging in the cold storage business. In many cases the carrying out of the co-operative idea has not been successful, and people are loath to engage in a co-operative business. In the western counties of Nova Scotia there are people who are ready to erect a cold storage plant. The hon. member for Halifax, in his wisdom supernal, said he did not know of any demand having been made for cold storage plants in Nova Scotia, but if he examines the files in the Department of Agriculture he will find that within the last week or so I presented to the hon. minister a communication from persons in the county of Hants asking that the government give them a subsidy for the purpose of the erection of a cold storage or pre-cooling plant in the town of Windsor. My hon. friend may live in Halifax, but the city and county of Halifax is not the province of Nova Scotia. I repeat that the minister in bringing this measure before the House is taking a step in the best

interests of agriculture in my province. I do ask, however, that the granting of subsidies be not confined to co-operative or municipal bodies but be extended also to companies duly incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act of Nova Scotia or the Canadian Companies Act, having in view the erection of cold storage plants. I have stated that the people of western Nova Scotia are handicapped; they have no market for their fruit, their vegetables, their meats, and so on, and the government should do all they can to enable these people to conserve what they produce and get a legitimate return for their labour. But to come here and philosophize and to oppose the measure because it does not happen to favour one constituency is not in the best interests of agriculture in my province. I say again to the hon. member for Halifax that the city and county of Halifax do not constitute the whole of Nova Scotia; the portions of the province which bear the burden and heat of the day are the country districts, particularly the agricultural districts. On these the province must eventually depend; therefore, everything within reason should be done in their interests.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn) Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this bill opens up a question in connection with which a big principle is at stake. It is quite evident that there is great difference of opinion as to the best methods of helping the cold storage business. I am afraid I shall incur the displeasure of the member for Hants (Mr. Martell), as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has done by opposing this measure. I realize the great necessity for giving all possible encouragement to the cold storage business, but, like the hon. member for Halifax, I am of the opinion that the bill in its present form is not in the best interests of all concerned. I realize that the men in Nova Scotia who are growing apples, the potato growers and the fishermen, the farmers in Ontario and Quebec and in the western provinces—they all need cold storage facilities. But hon. members know that we are in much trouble in Canada to-day as a result of this pernicious system of subsidies. It opens up a big question; we are going to have demands from many quarters for bounties by the government, just as we have had them in the past. I think public opinion is changing; the people are tired of giving subsidies. The minister told us that $2,408,384 had been spent in twelve years in thirty-four plants, and that to these the government had granted by way of subsidies, $722,506. I think a much better way would be to give long-term loans at very low rates of interest, and these could be returned to the public treasury without any hardship on the borrower. I believe they would conduct their business better if they knew they had to return the money, for it pauperizes many people to give them grants. It is a pernicious system, either for the individual or a corporation. We can all recall instances in our own locality of companies getting grants from towns or provincial governments on the understanding that they were to do so and so, and as soon as they got their hands on the money they would turn the tables in some way, go broke or by some manoeuvre get out of their contract, and the parties making the grant would have no redress, and the public would not get the service intended. I am not objecting to the bill in this form for the purpose of putting obstacles in the way of the minister. I merely want to do what I think is best, and we can see from the discussion already that there is going to be a demand from different places if the bill goes through in its present form. The minister will simply be bombarded with requests for big grants for particular districts. But if people know that they are not going to get a free grant, but a loan—

Mr. MARTELL: You want the Hudson Bay railway, do you not?

Mr. MORRISON: I am not asking for any free grant for that road, for the very reason I have given. Railway subsidies have been the curse of Canada, and have been the cause of the biggest problem confronting parliament to-day. It is that very principle I am speaking against. If you give a subsidy to one, others have a right to expect it. The whole practice should be stopped. I am not going to be a party to something that will help farming, and then have Montreal and Toronto come and ask for ten or fifty million dollars and say: Well, you got $100,000 for your constituency; why cannot we have something for ours? The principle is wrong, and there is a good remedy. It is the lack of credit for cold storage, which is so great a necessity in this country, that is the difficulty, and that lack of credit only proves to my mind that we have a poor financial system in Canada, or money would be available for this business on long term loans. I am in favour of giving approved loans on good security for cold storage wherever they are necessary, but I feel in duty bound to oppose the bill in its present form.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): When this discussion was up the other night I

understood from the minister that it was going to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration; otherwise, I should have fought it harder then. This is a very important project we are launching into, and it will require a great deal of consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I understood from the minister that we would be given the opportunity in that committee to make changes, and the bill requires several changes. In reply to my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell), I would say that having a cold storage down in the beautiful land of Evangeline—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want the hon. member to be under a misapprehension. This is the second reading of the bill, and though he is entitled to speak on the second reading, of course, this stage is preliminary to referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE: I was scared of letting it advance too far, but if it is going to the Committee on Agriculture I shall have an opportunity to make suggestions there. I was going to say to my hon. friend from Hants that having a cold storage down in the land where he lives, and which he admires so much, will never create a market for his stuff. More than that, having a cold storage sometimes leads holders of perishable goods to hold them too long; they do not put them on the market at the proper time. That has been my experience in the business. I have known many cold storages, and I do not of one in Ontario that has made any money. They are exceedingly hard to carry and cost a lot of money. If you subsidize cold storages, you will have to open wide the door and subsidize municipalities as well as co-operative companies. The other night municipalities were eliminated from this resolution, and I took exception to that. If this bill is going to be of benefit to the fruit growing industry or to any part of the Dominion, I am willing to support it, but it is obvious there is not much demand for it when for the past four years we have not had a single municipality demand a cold storage subsidy. There are two or three cold storages in Toronto, and not one of them is making money. If this government undertakes to go into the cold storage business or to subsidize cold storages, it will be a losing investment, and we should be very careful especially in these times, when we are talking so much about economy, that we do not go too far. I am willing to discuss this further in the Committee on Agriculture, when I shall try to point out to the minister where he is wrong.

[Mr. Spence.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

LIVE STOCK ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10, to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting Live Stock.

He said: This is a consolidation of the original act of 1917 and of amendments thereto. It has in addition certain new features, not of a very radical nature, but yet fairly important.

The bill provides for the better control of stock yards. While the act is named the Live Stock Act, the title does not seem to me to fairly represent its purpose. The purpose briefly is for the proper control and establishment of stock yards, and stock exchanges associated therewith, and also to give to the by-laws and regulations of such stock exchanges, the status of law.

The bill also provides for the organization of exporters' associations, very much like what we have in the West in the shape of small shipping associations. Some of the provinces have a statute providing for the organization of shipping associations in order that the farmers may unite and ship their live stock collectively. The bill also provides for the inspection of animals prior to slaughter, and for the establishment of an egg-breaking plant where low grade eggs may be taken care of by breaking and freezing, or breaking and drying.

The administration of the act will be about as before. I think I explained the provisions pretty fully on the resolution.

Mr. MILLAR: In the Farm and Ranch Review of December 20th appears an article which may have a bearing on this bill, for I see it refers to stock yards. It says:

> This relates to the gangs hanging around all places where cattle are received from the farms—kind of speculators, who buy old cows and broken down dairy stuff direct from the farmers for $8 or $10. They then ask for a test. Where infection is disclosed, the animals are condemned and the speculator gets $40 for his investment.
>
> This questionable traffic has grown to considerable proportions around Winnipeg. Farmers do not, of course, engage in this sort of thing. They are glad to get the small amount the old stuff sells for to these speculators. Their cattle are consigned to commission men who, of course, are not expected to call for an inspection until the stuff is ready to leave the yards. By that time the speculators have made their purchases. Not infrequently drovers go over the prairies buying nothing but the old cattle that are likely to react to the test for infection and for which they expect to receive, in that event, $40 from the government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the House to rule 21 which provides that no member may speak twice on the motion for the second reading of a bill except the mover, who can reply. Remarks can be exchanged on the bill in committee when the measure reaches the committee stage. If no other hon. member now wishes to speak the minister will reply and close the debate.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If any abuse, such as complained of by the hon. member (Mr. Millar) exists, or if there is any violation of the regulations of the stock exchange organized at each stock yard, it must be remembered that the purpose of this bill is partially to give effect to the by-laws and to the wishes of those stock exchanges. With respect to the buying up of old "canners" and "cutters" of which there are all too many around some of our stock yards, the purchasers taking the chance of their re-acting, I do not understand how any person would do that deliberately because they are sure to be caught in the abattoir. The man who owns these animals will find, that when they reach the abattoir they have to run the gauntlet of three or four government inspectors at various stages of the slaughtering, from the beginning to the end, and they are sure to be caught and condemned —they will not be used for food at all. If the animals are not too badly infected the parts which show tuberculosis will be cut away and the sound meat retained for food. If the animals are of the kind referred to they are sure to be condemned, therefore whoever is handling them is going, in the last analysis, to lose money. Anyway the purpose of the bill is to control our stock yards, to give our stock exchanges more authority over their members so that if they make a ruling it shall be carried into effect; also to give the regulations and by-laws of the stock exchanges the effect of law by being O.K'd. by the department.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 11, to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers.

He said: The original act dealing with this subject was passed, I think, in 1905, and there have been some six or seven amendments to it. The measure before the House is a consolidation of all these statutes. A little more than a year ago a conference was held in Ottawa, when every phase of the fruit industry was taken up and a statement prepared embodying many changes and recommendations to the government. The matter was taken up too late to pass legislation governing last season's crop, consequently it is introduced at this session.

Some of the changes have to do with the size of the container. When the resolution on which this bill is founded was introduced I explained that there is nothing rigid in the proposed changes, they are adjustable. I may point out that we have had the advice not only of the fruit growers but of all the organizations interested in fruit, from the producer right to the consumer. They have harmonized their differences and given expression to their wishes, and that expression is embodied in the present bill. Nevertheless I have no doubt we shall find quite a number of hon. members familiar with fruit growing who will be able to advance suggestions calculated to improve the bill. If there are any such who are not members of the Committee on Agriculture I can assure them, on behalf of the chairman of the committee they will be given an opportunity to be heard on any particular phase of the bill respecting containers or anything else that they may be specially concerned in.

There are certain changes in the matter of grading that I went into before, certain changes intended to make our berry boxes conform to the American box; certain changes with regard to the half barrel of apples which hitherto has not been recognized by law; also regulations governing the export of fruit and, in the matter of imports, designed to see that such imports conform to the grading of Canadian standards.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

TESTING AND INSPECTION OF SEEDS

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 12, respecting the Testing, Inspection and Sale of Seeds.

He said: The original Seed Control Act was passed in 1905. It was preceded by one or two attempts to put a similar act through the House which resulted in discussion. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Tolmie) has had some experience in the matter of legislation of this character. As the bill referred to was the first measure of the kind introduced into the Canadian parliament it naturally created a great deal of discussion, some of it of a contentious nature. However, the bill finally passed the House in 1905, and at that time was considered one of the most advanced acts

of the kind, I think, on this continent. It stood the test of time until 1911, when it was again amended and brought up to date. Since then it has continued in force up to the present day without any additional amendment. During the interval a number of similar acts have been passed in the various states of the American republic, and also on the continent of Europe, where they have not only overtaken but, in many important respects, actually surpassed us. It is now time that we should make further progress and not only consolidate but virtually build a new act that will do credit to us and compare favourably with any other legislation of the same nature to be found elsewhere.

In the old act the grading of clover and grass seeds was made compulsory. In the present bill not only is the grading of these seeds made compulsory, but likewise the grading of cereals for seed purposes. The grades are described by law just as our contract grades of wheat are described by law. The cereals, however, are not described by law, but are set by an advisory board in the same manner as the commercial grades of wheat are set in the West by the Western Standards Board. There are a number of other changes in the law, one of which I might mention. I mentioned it on the resolution, and it is a very good example of what we refer to as direct legislation. The conference to which I have referred, during their deliberations recommended to the government that we should insert a section making provision to protect the public from being exploited by some new or fancy variety of cereal, that might have no economic value at all, probably some old, worn-out variety that was rechristened, being put on the market, and an unsuspecting public exploited by such methods. I can recall many occasions in my farming experience when some glib-tongued gentleman would come around and expatiate on the advantages of, say, Alaskan wheat that was to enable one to grow 100 bushels of good milling wheat to the acre. That has been done, not once, but many times. In this bill, there is a clause stipulating that before any new variety of cereal or seed shall be put on the market, it shall be tried out either in some experimental plots privately, or under the auspices of some experimental farm and its merits tested out before the owner thereof will be permitted to sell it. While there are advantages in that in the protection of the public, it has disadvantages also. It might have a deterrent and hampering effect on the real plant promoter or breeder. If a gentleman, let us say, like Mr. Seager Wheeler, who is recognized throughout this continent as a plant breeder, thought that his discoveries had to go through two years' experimentation in some other hands than his own, that might have a retarding effect on his investigational work. There are the two sides. I am not married to either of them; but I will invite discussion by the agricultural committee of them, because there is a real grievance there. I do not, however, desire that the remedy shall be worse than the disease, and that is the danger of this amendment.

9 p.m.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention by the Horticultural Association that it is very desirable that provision should be made for the registration of plants. We all know the great value of registering live stock to enable people, who are desirous of improving their herds and their methods of farming, to purchase such a line of breeders as will be of assistance to them in that regard. In the same way, plant breeding has been advancing of late years to a great extent, and many of our florists and horticulturists have made great reputations by the production of specimens of particular excellence. They desire now to be able to register such plants so as to be sure that those purchasing the plants will be able to obtain the proper strain and also to ensure that they themselves will derive the benefit which is naturally coming to them as a result of their efforts along that line. They strongly protest against anything in this bill which will prevent that. They point out quite clearly how important this registration is, and I sincerely hope that the minister, before the bill reaches its final reading, will give this matter careful attention, with a view, perhaps, of adopting their suggestion.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANION:

What Civil Service Commissioners signed their names to the recommendation which was followed by Order in Council of June 29, 1922, removing large numbers of employees from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. COPP: The recommendation which was followed by Order in Council of June 29, 1922, was signed by Mr. Clarence Jameson and Mr. LaRochelle, of the Civil Service Commission.

SEED PURCHASING COMMISSION

Mr. MILLAR:

1. What has been the cost by years of administering the Seed Purchasing Commission during the last five years?

2. What are the names of the members of that commission, and what remuneration has each received for each of the last five years?

3. What services to the state are performed by the commission?

4. What services are rendered by the seed branches of Winnipeg and Calgary?

5. How much of each of the various kinds of grain have been distributed in each of the last five years?

6. What kinds of grain, and how much of each is it proposed the commission shall distribute this calendar year?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. 1918, $28,614.86; 1919, $28,905.52; 1920, $21,553.61; 1921, $9,890.39; 1922, $9,188.92.

2.

	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922
A. E. Wilson.. ..	$3,170	$2,820	$3,040	$2,330	$2,490
J. J. Mulvihill ..	2,344	2,536	2,720	2,800	2,800

(Mr. Wilson is paid at the rate of $10 per day when employed).

3. The commission have purchased, assembled, stored, cleaned and distributed for cash, seed grain that has been inspected and graded according to the established grades for seed, in quantities each year to meet the estimated requirements of provincial and municipal governments, farmers' organizations and individuals in any part of Canada.

4. The district inspection and laboratory staffs, having headquarters at Winnipeg and Calgary, each year determine so far as possible the areas in their respective districts within which the supply of seed for any kind of crop may be deficient or of inferior quality, due to drought, rust, hail, frost, insect pests or other causes; determine or estimate the amount of the shortage for each kind of grain and ascertain the areas from which a supply of good seed grain to meet the requirements may be economically obtained; inspect, test and grade seed grain and other seeds for commerce, including all seeds purchased and sold by the Seed Purchasing Commission; enforce the Seed Control, Feeding Stuffs and Fertilizers' Acts.

5.

	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922
	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels
Wheat	500,620	2,181,445	1,040,270	41,990	37,624
Oats.. ..	2,386,250	1,734,870	1,287,631	113,000	654,500
Barley.. ..	87,645	31,442	17,197	892	4,031
Rye..	.....	11,840	2,769	.....	.....
Corn	10,380	2,519	.....	.....	.....
Peas	3,656	41,376	.....	.....	.....
Beans	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....

6. The reports received from the inspectional districts would seem to indicate that there does not exist in any part of Canada a seed shortage of a nature sufficiently serious to render activities this year on the part of the Seed Purchasing Commission a matter of necessity. It is known that there is a substantial number of farmers located in east-central Alberta who may have difficulty in securing their requirements of seed grain because of their inability to obtain credit. There is, nevertheless, in adjoining districts plentiful supplies of seed grain, of all kinds, that are being held for sale for seeding purposes by individual farmers, farmers' organizations and seed and grain merchants, a great deal of which seed grain has already been tested and graded for commerce and is available at a cost estimated to be less than the Seed Purchasing Commission would have to charge for the same grain because of having the additional expense of freighting and elevator charges.

EIGHT HOUR DAY

Mr. NEILL:

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government towards calling a conference of all the provinces on the eight hour law recommended by Article 427 of the Treaty of Versailles?

2. If any invitation was issued by the federal authorities what was the response from the different provinces?

3. What further action is contemplated by the government towards getting the provinces together on this matter?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. The labour principles set out in Article 427 of the Treaty of Versailles, including that which urges the adoption of the eight-hour day or 48-hour week as "the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained," were made a subject of consideration between the federal and provincial governments at the National Industrial Conference which was held in Ottawa in September, 1919. All of the nine provincial governments were also represented at the first session of the International Labour Conference in Washington in October-November, 1919, at which a draft convention was adopted on the subject of the eight-hour day and 48-hour week and submitted to the various countries, including Canada, which comprise the membership of the League of Nations. The views of the provincial representatives on the eight-hour day were also obtained in consultation with the federal delegates in attendance at the Washington conference. The federal government, in connection with the Dominion-provincial conference which was held in Ottawa in September last for consideration of the unemployment situation, proposed that attention should also be given to other industrial and social questions which had been

the subject of attention at the International Labour Conference. The obligations assumed by Canada in connection with these matters under the Treaty of Versailles were considered at the conference, and a resolution was adopted expressing the view that the authorities deemed to be respectively competent to deal with the matters in question should give careful and sympathetic attention to the proposals emanating from the international labour body with a view to enacting necessary legislation where this may be found practicable. The resolution also provided that the federal government, on request from a majority of the provincial governments, would summon a special conference for the consideration of International Labour Conference matters when this may be deemed necessary. In conformity with this last-mentioned resolution a letter was addressed by the Prime Minister of Canada to the several provincial premiers on December 22, last, proposing that a federal-provincial conference should assemble in Ottawa in the near future to deal with matters arising out of the relations between the Dominion of Canada and the international labour body and inquiring if the provincial governments desired that a conference for this purpose should be held.

2. The replies of five provinces were favourable to the proposed conference, those of two other provinces were not unfavourable but intimated that these provinces had limited interest in the subject matter. In one case the reply was indefinite, and in another case the reply of the provincial government has not yet come to hand.

3. The suggestion was made in the letter of the federal Prime Minister that the conference should be held in the end of February or early in March. The replies indicated that a meeting in Ottawa at this time would be inconvenient for several of the provincial governments on account of their respective legislatures being in session. After consideration of the replies received, it was decided by the Dominion government that it would be in accord with the desire of most of the provinces that the conference should be held, but that the question of the date should be taken up with the provinces in the spring looking to a meeting in the early part of next summer.

TORONTO SUBURBAN RAILWAY

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What legal agreements and options have been made by the Government of Canada from time to time to date for the sale in whole or part of the Toronto Suburban Railway between Guelph and Toronto to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and why were these agreements for the whole road not carried out and acted on in view of this road being an inactive asset of the Canadian National?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to enable the city of Toronto to acquire the part in the city limits in accordance with an agreement made between the city and the Toronto Suburban Company validated by the Ontario legislature many years ago by which the city at the expiration of the company's franchise which expired over a year ago, could acquire this road within the city limits by arbitration?

3. Was any agreement prepared for sale of the part within the city limits and on what terms, and is the announcement correct of Mr. Gerald Ruel, Vice-President of the National Railways in a letter to the Board of Control of Toronto in January last that such an agreement existed for sale of part? If so, with whom was it made?

4. Under what terms and conditions of purchase of this road by the Government a few years ago; and its absorption by the National Railways System, can the government sell part and not all of this railway without the consent of the bond holders?

5. Why was the agreement and options legally given for the sale of the whole road to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario not carried out, and has the policy of the old Board of Directors of the National Railways to dispose of this whole road which never paid, been abandoned by the present directors, in view of a favourable vote of the ratepayers of Toronto to sanction such purchase agreement for the whole road?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No legal agreement or option was given.

2. The question is not one for the government, but for the management of the Toronto Suburban Railway.

3. No agreement has been prepared for the sale of the lines within the city. The agreement which Mr. Ruel referred to was an operating agreement.

4. The government has not purchased this road. The stock merely was acquired by the Canadian Northern Realties Limited. The question of sale is one for the management of the railways.

5. See answer to No. 1.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

On the motion of Mr. J. S. Woodsworth (Centre Winnipeg.)

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interest of world peace that Canada should withdraw all claims on Germany for reparations.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am ready to go on with this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is an important question in which the whole House will be interested. There can, of course, be no objection to my hon. friend going on with it this evening if he so desires, but I would suggest that we adjourn the debate after he has concluded so that we may have a fuller House to discuss the subject on another occasion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like, of course, to have as full a house as possible when the motion is brought up, because it

deals with an important question. I do not want to let it go by default, and perhaps it would be better to let it stand until there is a larger house.

Motion stands.

On motion of Mr. Graham, the House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

Thursday, February 15, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Annual Report of the Editorial Committee for the year 1922—Hon. Mr. Copp.

MESDAMES KENNEDY AND LAFORTUNE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received two letters, one from Mrs. W. C. Kennedy and the other from Madame D. A. Lafortune, thanking the House for its expression of sympathy in their great sorrow. In behalf of the House I acknowledge these communications.

ROYAL ACADEMY OF ARTS

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17 respecting the Royal Academy of Arts.

He said: The object of the bill is to grant a public charter to this academy and to bring it under one of the federal departments. It has been in existence for some time but so far has had no official channel of communication with the department. The purpose is to bring it under the purview of one of the ministries. The Department of Public Works is mentioned in the bill, but that is a matter of detail that can be considered and decided upon when the bill is in committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALES TAXES

SIR HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What amount has been collected under the sales tax during the present fiscal year in each city with a population of one hundred thousand or over, down to the 31st of December, 1922?

2. (a) What amount of sales taxes were due and unpaid upon such date and (b) what is the number of taxpayers in arrears ond said date in each of said cities?

3. Have legal proceedings been taken against such taxpayers? If so, in what cities and what is the number of such proceedings in each city?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Sales tax collections are recorded by customs and excise ports and not by cities. The collections at city ports, where population is in excess of one hundred thousand each, for the present fiscal year to 31 December, 1922, were as follows:

Montreal, $16,265,019.40; Ottawa, $1,046,811.26; Toronto, $15,996,953.16; Hamilton ,$3,318,522.63; Winnipeg, $3,511,598.66; Vancouver, $2,758,414.11.

2. (a) Information not available. (b) The number of taxpayers in arrears on 31 December, 1922 in each of the said cities: Montreal, 1,058; Ottawa, 38; Toronto, 276; Hamilton, 71; Winnipeg, 152, Vancouver, 221.

3. Yes: Montreal, 169; Ottawa, 12; Toronto, 83;Hamilton 9; Winnipeg, 13; Vancouver, 24.

INCOME TAX

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What amount of income taxes has been collected during the present fiscal year down to the 31st day of December, 1922?

2. What amount of income taxes was collected during the last passed fiscal year down to the 31st day of December, 1921?

3. What amount of income taxes has been collected during the present fiscal year down to December 31, 1922, by each of the different offices?

4. What amount of income taxes has been collected during the fiscal year last past down to December 31, 1921, by each of the different offices?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $55,517,222.02.

2. $72,517,814.77.

3. Halifax, $1,517,505.96; St. John, $922,425.89; Quebec, $1,953,853.75; Montreal, $18,195,749.82; Ottawa, $2,655,577.23; Kingston, $523,374.59; Toronto, $11,742,770.71; Hamilton, $3,693,159.12; London, $3,686,784.92; Belleville, $250,784.65; Fort William, $262,996.14; Winnipeg, $4,019,399.64; Regina, $1,217,009.04; Prince Albert, $104,143.93; Calgary, $1,477,994.05; Vancouver, $3,255,525.40; Dawson, $38,167.18.—Total $55,517,222.02.

4. Halifax, $1,664,504.78; St. John, $1,338,395.70; Quebec, $3,227,560.37; Montreal, $19,149,250.82; Ottawa, $4,035,053.52; Kingston, $1,158,667.29; Toronto, $15,517,891.37; Hamilton, $5,648,794.90; London, $4,954,217.39; Belleville, $377,371.17; Fort William, $597,594.98; Winnipeg, $5,754,174.24; Regina, $1,890,685.33; Prince Albert, $208,855.61; Calgary, $2,253,263.35; Vancouver, $4,705,494.50; Dawson, $36,039.45.—Total, $72,517,814.77.

DIRECT TAXATON RESULTS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What percentage of the receipts of the present fiscal year, down to December 31, 1922, has been raised by direct taxation?

2. What percentage of the receipts of the last passed fiscal year, down to December 31, 1921, was raised by direct taxation?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 24 per cent.
2. 32 per cent.

STAMPS ON CHEQUES

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Have any rulings been made for the direction of the public or the banks as to affixing stamps on cheques under the legislation of last session? If so, what ruling or rulings?
2. What are the penalties for failure to affix stamps, or sufficient stamps on the cheques?
3. Have any proceedings been taken in respect of such breaches?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. No, as far as the Department of Customs and Excise is concerned.
2. As provided by Special War Revenue Act, 1915, part 3, and amendments thereto.
3. Yes.

NEW BRUNSWICK REPRESENTATION ON RAILWAY BOARD

Mr. MacLAREN:

Is it the intention of the government to add to the new Canadian National Railway Board a representative from New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

After consultation with the president of the Canadian National Railways, it was decided to begin operations with a comparatively small board representative of districts rather than of provinces. Should experience indicate the necessity for further additions, within the limits of the act, the government will not hesitate to make these additions.

D.S.C.R. HOSPITALS

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. What was the cost per patient in different D.S.C.R. hospitals in Canada for year 1922?
2. What was the per capita maintenance for same institutions for 1921?
3. What was the strength of the staffs of these hospitals at the beginning of the year 1922, and also at the close of the year 1922?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. During the period from April 1, 1922 to December 31, 1922, the average cost per patient per day was $3.31.

2. From April 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922, the average cost per patient per day in the different D.S.C.R. hospitals was $3.29.

3. On January 1, 1922, staff employed in the D.S.C.R. hospitals numbered 1,751, and on January 1, 1923, 1,502.

RECEIPT STAMPS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What rulings have been made with reference to the affixing of stamps on receipts as required by legislation of last session? What receipts are exempt from the tax?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

2. Does the use of forms or printed letters enable the tax to be avoided?
3. Does the usual course of mailing receipts obviate the necessity of stamping them?
4. Has a complete list been compiled showing the different manners in which the affixing of stamps to receipts may be avoided?
5. Under what conditions must the stamp be affixed?
6. What is the penalty for the omission to affix the stamp?
7. Have any proceedings been taken to enforce such penalties?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Counter sales slips and cash register tickets are not taxable, provided no words implying or stating acknowledgement of the receipt or the payment of money appear thereon.

Pay-rolls,—signature of employee thereon being receipt for wages,—taxable, in respect of each such signature.

Receipts for payment of legacies are taxable. A receipt for money in a deed or mortgage is taxable.

Receipts for payment of taxes, except those given to, or by, the Dominion Government or Provincial Government, are taxable.

Individual freight bills and periodical statements of same, acknowledging receipt of payment, are taxable.

Customs house brokers' receipts are taxable.

Letters forwarded by mail, also postcards, acknowledging the payment of money, are regarded as letters and cards and not subject to this tax.

All insurance policies, whether fire, life, marine or casualty, wherein the payment of money is acknowledged are taxable.

All insurance receipts, acknowledging the payment of money, are taxable.

Receipts drawn out of Canada, but not valid until countersigned, in Canada, are taxable.

Voucher cheques and cheques with receipts endorsed thereon, when drawn upon or addressed to a bank, are not taxable as receipts.

Remitters counterfoil, being part of a taxable express money order, is not taxable as a receipt.

Employers may, if they so desire, affix a stamp or stamps to the Pay Roll for the amount of the total tax payable in respect of the receipts therein given, and they may cancel same by the method prescribed in the Act.

No stamp duty is required on a mailed post card acknowledging a remittance as such post card bears on the reverse side thereof, evidence that such card has already

been taxed under Section 13 (5) of the Special War Revenue Act, there being required thereon the tax of 1 cent in addition to the postage payable.

A mailed form letter, which by the method of folding has the address placed thereon without the use of an envelope, requires no stamp duty for the same reason as in the case of a post card.

A form letter, mailed in an envelope, acknowledging payment of $10 or over, requires a two-cent stamp affixed thereto because it has thereon no evidence that any other tax has been paid under the Special War Revenue Act.

2. & 3. Answered by No. 1.

4.

5. Conditions as provided by the Act.

6. Penalties as provided by the Act.

7. Yes.

MINISTERS' AND OFFICIALS' TRAVELS

Mr. STANSELL:

1. What Ministers of the Crown have been absent from Canada since the close of last session?

2. What were the several tours taken by each minister so absent, and what was the object of each trip?

3. What were the names of those who, at public expense, accompanied each minister, and what was the purpose?

4. What officials of the various departments have been out of Canada since the last session and for what purpose in each case?

5. What were the several tours taken by each official so absent, and what was the object of each trip?

6. What has been the cost to Canada of such trips by ministers and officials, and those who accompanied them?

7. What has been the cost to the Dominion of the various trips made by ministers and persons who accompanied them since the last session of parliament: (*a*) within Canada; (*b*) out of Canada?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: I would ask the hon. gentleman to kindly renew his question in the form of a motion, when it can be better considered.

MATT C. BECKETT

Mr. DUNCAN:

1. Was Matt C. Beckett, of Owen Sound, Ont., appointed Customs and Excise Preventive Officer for Grey county?

2. If so, when was such appointment made?

3. Was the said Beckett subsequently dismissed?

4. If so, for what cause?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1 and 2. Mr. Matt C. Beckett, of Owen Sound, Ont., was authorized to act as a Customs-Excise Enforcement officer, without salary, and with power to make seizures for infractions of the excise laws, by letter dated 16th March, 1922, such authority to terminate at any time at the discretion of the hon. the minister.

3 and 4. Authority for Mr. Beckett's employment was withdrawn by letter dated April 24, 1922.

GRAND TRUNK ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to a telegram sent to the Hamilton Board of Trade by Sir Henry Thornton, President of the National Railways, dated December, 1922, stating that the Grand Trunk would be immediately electrified between Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls and the border?

2. Have plans been prepared, and what will the cost of this work be, and what amount of money will be required to be furnished by parliament for this project, and why were the government and parliament not consulted before such a declaration of policy involving an expenditure of millions?

3. Is it the intention of the government to electrify the National System in other parts of Canada as well?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The President of the Canadian National Railway system has given no assurance to the effect that the Grand Trunk would be immediately electrified within the territory contemplated by the question. An assurance was given, however, that the Canadian National Railways would at once undertake an investigation of the whole position, to see to what extent it was necessary to improve transportation facilities to meet the requirements of the public; and that as soon as such investigation was completed the public might anticipate immediate relief.

2. The investigation referred to is under way, but has not yet been completed.

3. The Canadian National management will consider the electrification, from time to time, of such parts of the system as can be electrified economically and in the interests of the public.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY LAND

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. What is the total number of acres of land sold as authorized by Statute of 1908 for the purpose of Hudson Bay railway construction?

2. What is the total amount for which this land has been sold?

3. How many acres of land are still held in western Canada on account of the above legislation?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

1. There was no specific authority under the Dominion Lands Act, 1908, for the sale of land for the purpose of Hudson Bay railway construction, but pre-emptions and purchased homesteads were sold under the provisions of the said act as follows:—

2. Total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads sold under the statute of 1908,—8,050,720 acres approximate. Total

amount for which pre-emptions and purchased homesteads have been sold $24,152,160, approximate.

3. Total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads held as entries not having been paid for in full 2,500,000 acres, approximate.

FORT CHURCHILL TOWNSITE

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. Has any land or lands in Fort Churchill townsite been sold to any private party or interests?

2. If so, what are the names of the parties, and the extent of the holdings of every person or interest in the townsite?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Lands in the townsite of Fort Churchill disposed of by sale:

East Peninsula: Block 30, lots 9 and 10, and block 31, lots 11 and 12 sold to Wm. Beech, approximate area 1.2 acres. All of blocks 440, 441, 442, 456, 457, 458, 511, 512, 513, 530, 531, 532, 585, 586, 587, sold to Carl Emerson Beech, approximate area, 44.5 acres.

Lands finally disposed of otherwise than by sale:

East Peninsula: All of blocks 432 to 439 inclusive; 459 to 466 inclusive; 503 to 510 inclusive; 533 to 540 inclusive; 577 to 584 inclusive, homestead of Wm. Beech, approximate area, 118.4 acres. All of blocks 443, 444, 452, to 455 inclusive; 514 to 517, inclusive; 527 to 529 inclusive; 588 to 590 inclusive, special grant to Carl Emerson Beech, approximate area, 44.5 acres. A parcel of land containing 12.63 acres, more or less, on the east shore of the West Peninsula patented on the 7th June 1913, to the Hudson's Bay Company (under deed of surrender), approximate area, 12.63 acres.

Lands in the townsite of Fort Churchill held under lease:

East Peninsula: Block 10A., lot 14; block10, lots 5, 6, 7, 8, leased to the Hudson's Bay Company, approximate area, 0.6 acres.

West Peninsula: Block E, lots 7, 8 and 9; block F, lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, leased to the Hudson's Bay Company, approximate area, 1.0 acres.

TRADE REPRESENTATIVES

Miss MACPHAIL:

1. How many Consuls and Commercial Agents has the United States resident in Canada?

2. How many Consuls and Commercial Agents has Canada in the United States?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint enough Commercial Agents in the United States to adequately take care of Canadian trade interests and foster Canadian trade?

4. If not, why?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. There are ninety-one consular representatives of the United States in Canada. So far as the government is informed there are no officials of the United States resident in Canada designated as commercial agents.

2. Canada has no foreign consular representation distinct from Great Britain. The Department of Trade and Commerce has no commercial agents in the United States. It has, however, one trade commissioner's office in New York City.

3 and 4. The question of appointing trade commissioners in the United States has been considered at various times. Up to the present, owing to the proximity of the two countries and the cost of maintaining trade commissioners, appointments have been confined to foreign countries whence commercial information is not so accessible to Canadian exporters.

Miss MACPHAIL:

1. In view of the fact that a large volume of trade is done between Canada and the United Kingdom, what steps has the government taken to appoint representatives in Great Britain to foster and encourage Anglo-Canadian commerce?

2. What officials with technical knowledge of Canadian trade are attached to the High Commissioner's office in London?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce have established officers and trade commissioners in the United Kingdom as follows: London, Manchester, Liverpool, Bristol, Glasgow. The trade commissioners and their assistants foster and encourage Anglo-Canadian commerce.

2. On the staff of the High Commissioner there are two officers with long association with Canadian trade who are able to deal effectively with any commercial inquiries received. There is also attached to the office a special customs investigation officer. The Dominion trade commissioner in London and trade commissioners throughout the United Kingdom are also in immediate association and close touch with the High Commissioner's office.

SIR HENRY THORNTON

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Did the government of Canada in October, 1922, enter into a contract with Sir Henry Thornton by which the government agreed that Sir Henry Thornton would be appointed President and General Manager of the Canadian National Railway Company, and by which contract the salary of Sir Henry Thornton was fixed, and other terms and conditions imposed?

2. If so, did the government have any authority from parliament for making such contract, and in what section of what statute is that authority?

3. What authority in law exists or existed for the government of Canada to enter into any such contract for a fixed term?

4. If the government had no authority from parliament for the contract made with Sir Henry Thornton, why did the government make such contract?

5. If the government was of opinion that a contract of the nature made with Sir Henry Thornton was necessary, and if there was not authority in law to make it, why was parliament not asked at last session to grant such authority by statute in the usual way?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. None.
4. It was deemed in the public interest to definitely secure the services of Sir Henry Thornton, and, as the Board of Directors had not been previously appointed, the government decided to make an arrangement with him and rely on the board ratifying it, as has been done.
5. The circumstances under which it became advisable to execute this contract were not contemplated during last session of parliament.

LOUIS LEBLANC

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the position of light-house keeper at Carleton Point, Quebec, held by Louis LeBlanc prior to November 15th, 1922?
2. Was the said Louis LeBlanc dismissed from the service?
3. If so, why?
4. Were any charges laid against the said Louis LeBlanc?
5. If so, was an official inquiry held, was the said Louis LeBlanc brought before an official tribunal and what were the findings of the official tribunal, if any?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Political partisanship.
4. Yes.
5. No.

CONSUMPTION OF INTOXICANTS

Mr. EVANS:

1. What was the per capita consumption and per capita expenditure of all intoxicating beverages generally in Canada during the years 1914, 1920, 1921 and 1922, on the basis of the excise returns?
2. What were the figures by provinces?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Per capita consumption of domestic beer and spirits based on excise returns during the fiscal years mentioned.

Fiscal year	Beer Gals.	Spirits Proof Gals.
1914	6.942	0.590
1920	4.096	0.424
1921	3.945	0.313
1922	4.389	0.204

Per capita expenditure not available from excise returns as these returns show quantities of beer and spirits, and not values.

2. Information not available for the same reason. Beer and spirits upon which excise duties are paid in one province are not all consumed in such province.

SALES TAX COLLECTION

Mr. JOHNSON (Moose Jaw):

1. What were the sales tax collections, by months, during the calendar year 1922?
2. What were the collections on domestic sales, and imports, respectively?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Period 1922	Domestic	Importations	Total
January	$4,280,908 70	$1,330,333 10	$5,611,241 80
February	2,935,733 48	1,372,919 69	4,308,653 17
March	3,208,772 71	1,984,678 91	5,193,451 62
April	2,072,795 69	1,254,350 87	3,327,146 56
May	3,829,680 84	1,771,193 00	5,600,873 84
June	3,910,192 57	2,376,161 46	6,286,354 03
July	5,072,161 64	2,338,538 20	7,410,639 84
August	5,558,573 84	2,634,669 71	8,193,243 55
September	6,314,427 85	2,387,863 36	8,702,291 21
October	6,692,070 84	2,533,984 44	9,226,055 28
November	6,213,902 40	2,663,118 62	8,877,021 02
December	6,113,319 02	2,471,639 60	8,584,958 62
	$56,202,479 58	$25,119,450 96	$81,321,930 54

IRREDUCIBLE MINIMUM OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MARTELL:

1. Was a conference ever held between representatives of the various provincial governments of the provinces of Canada and the federal government of Canada, between the years 1912 and 1922, with a view to securing for the four original provinces of confederation an irreducible minimum of representatives in the Canadian House of Commons?
2. If so, what was the result of said conference?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. There is no record in any of the government departments of any such conference having been held.
2. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

OFFICIALS ATTENDING FAIRS

Mr. LEADER:

1. How many officials of the Department of Agriculture attended fairs during the nine months ending December 31, 1922, and what duties did they fulfil?
2. What was the total expense incurred by such officials?

CIVIL SERVANTS—POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch which appeared in the press on the 13th in-

stant, and which I think is of public interest as relating to public affairs. This is the despatch:

Toronto, Feb. 13.—Charges of political partisanship against certain employees of the Dominion government in Ontario are to be proved.

I believe that must be a misprint for "probed."

Mr. COPP: There should be no trouble to prove it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The report continues:

Thomas R. Mayberry, of Ingersoll, Ont., has been appointed as commissioner to conduct the investigation. His appointment has been officially gazetted.

I would ask if the substance of this despatch is correct, as the commissioner happens to be a resident of my constituency. Might I also ask, who are the officials against whom the charges have been preferred; and if one, Duncan Marshall, an official of the government who delivered an address at a political gathering in my riding in June last, is among those so charged?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the practice the government has adopted with respect to any charges of political partisanship against members of the civil service has been to proceed very guardedly, taking care to see that the charge is proved in a manner to which no exception can be taken, before permitting dismissal of the person offending. In that connection the government has followed the precedent adopted by previous governments of appointing commissioners to investigate such charges where there appear to be substantial reasons for believing that they are well founded. I believe Colonel Mayberry has been appointed a commissioner to investigate some charges of political partisanship. Who are the parties concerned I am unable to say at the moment, but I can probably get that information for my hon. friend. He mentions one name that I do not recall as being among the number affected.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps the Prime Minister will explain why there is such a multitude of exceptions to the rule which he says has been adopted, and why so many have been dismissed without any charges being preferred against them to their knowledge, and without any pretence of investigation.

Mr. BUREAU: There are precedents by the thousand.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In some cases charges have been preferred against certain officials by hon. members of this House. Where an hon. member has been prepared to state to the House that of his own knowledge an offence contravening the provisions of the Civil Service Act respecting political partisanship has been committed, the government has acted under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, which provide that a civil servant guilty of political partisanship shall not be retained in the service. I think that list will cover any of the dismissals to which my right hon. friend has referred.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume that that list would cover practically every case, because the statement from any member that a man has been guilty of political partisanship is not very hard to secure from a partisan supporter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say a statement from any member. I said a statement from an hon. member of this House that of his own knowledge a civil servant had been guilty of a certain offence which was in the opinion of the government sufficient to warrant his dismissal under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That of course will apply in future to members of the House on all sides?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Undoubtedly. It always has.

Mr. BUREAU: I make an exception in regard to the Customs department. I will not take any notorious recommendations.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Resign!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BUREAU: Say out loud what you want to do. Don't do it behind closed doors.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The Chairman of the meeting, who is a member of the Liberal executive of the province of Ontario stated that the party referred to by me was asked by Premier King to appear and address this Liberal picnic on his behalf.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no recollection of having asked anyone to appear at a picnic, and I do not think I did. But I would say to my hon. friend that in regard to any matter deserving discussion here it is well not to base his information entirely on a press report.

STEEL STRIKE AT SYDNEY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): In the press of yesterday there appeared a despatch with regard to a steel strike at Sydney. I have information from the men that they applied for a board some weeks ago and were refused; that their members are being discriminated against because of their protest against a wage rate of 28 cents per hour, and that yesterday their active members were dismissed, the result being a spontaneous walk-out of workmen. Three thousand men are affected by this strike. Is it proposed that this board shall be granted? What further information can the government give us with regard to this industrial dispute?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Some four weeks ago the first information the Labour department had of a possible strike in the steel works at Sydney was in a newspaper item stating that a board was to be asked for to investigate the question of the adoption of the eight-hour day, the check-off system, and an increase of 15 per cent in wages. The article stated that as the steel industry was not a public utility under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, a board would probably be denied by the Labour department. On the 31st day of January application for a board was made; it came to the Labour department on the third day of February. The workmen were advised at once that their application had been received and that we would ascertain from the officers of the British Empire Steel Corporation if they would be parties to the formation of a board. Yesterday the answer of the companies was received. It indicated the company would be unwilling to submit the question of the eight-hour day in the steel industry, to a board for investigation, as that matter had been dealt with in 1920 by a board, which unanimously indicated the belief that it would be impracticable to adopt an eight-hour day in the steel industry. The companies also stated that they would be unwilling to submit the question of the check-off system—which, in substance, means that the company would be required to collect the union dues of all workmen engaged in the steel plant—to a board, and that it would be inadvisable to submit to a board the question of an increase in wages, in view of the low price of steel products and the inability of the company, as it was stated, to make a profit instead of losses, wage increases were not possible. That information has been to-day conveyed to those who are now strikers at Sydney.

The information given the Labour department in regard to the actual strike is this: The day before yesterday an employee there, who thought he should be, for the time being, on account of the illness of a foreman, placed in the position of that foreman—threw some belts onto an idler, or in some other way interfered with the proper operation of the plant, and was promptly discharged therefor. The workers' union took the matter up and insisted on his immediate reinstatement, and when that was not granted they brought on a strike. The information received to-day is that the strike situation is serious indeed and that every effort is being made so to handicap the steel industry at Sydney as to cause—if they are successful in their undertakings—irreparable damage to the steel plant. I may say that is all the result of a campaign undertaken during the past few weeks in Sydney. For instance, I hold in my hand a newspaper containing a full-page advertisement; it is dated February third, but there were others in advance of this one. The advertisement reads:

> **Wanted!**
> **1,000 Steel Workers**
> **Who Have Courage**
> **Not Fear**
> **Who are Men, not Scabs**
> **Who will demand**
> **An Eight Hour Day,**
> **15 per cent increase of Wages**
> **Recognition of the Union**
> **And Put it Through and Win a Victory**
> **Are you with us, or Against Us?**

The strike appears to be a part of the campaign of the Workers' Party of Canada, which to all intents and purposes is the same as the Communist Party, or the party in control of affairs, it is said, in Russia at the present time. That is the cause of the trouble as it has developed, and I may say that we have to-day advised the strikers at Sydney that they should not interfere with the protection and maintainance of the plant to the extent of causing great damage to the property of the Steel Company. That is the situation, briefly, existing for the past few days.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I hope the hon. member does not rise to reply.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I wish just to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already put a question, but if his further question will be brief, he may ask it, by leave of the House.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The question is whether the government are making any provision to protect the men from being worked twelve hours a day, and twenty-four hours every alternate Sunday?

Mr. MURDOCK: The wage rates are by the hour, I understand, the day has been one of twelve hours, generally speaking, some days thirteen hours.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With twenty-four hours every other Sunday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not sure as to that.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—
EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): May I be permitted to ask the government if it has under consideration any pension scheme to be applied to the employees of the Canadian National Railway, and if not at the present time, do they contemplate taking the matter under advisement shortly?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): That is a pretty large question to answer without any notice having been given. The Grand Trunk has a superannuation scheme. The Intercolonial has what is called a provident fund, which is a similar scheme. Just what the Canadian Northern had I am not able to say—perhaps nothing. But the question of having some kind of fund established is under consideration. I cannot give any particulars with regard to it.

PENSIONS COMMITTEE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): May I ask the government if it is their intention to reconstitute the pensions committee of last year? This committee did excellent work and made a number of recommendations which became law; but I am prepared to prove that the government officials, the Pension Board, whose duty it was to carry out these recommendations, have in some cases deliberately ignored them, and in others deliberately evaded them. I know nobody to whom I can bring the matter except this pensions committee which did such good work last year.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): It is not the intention of the government to appoint a special committee on pensions and re-establishment similar to the one that was appointed at the last session. The main reason is that a royal commission was appointed during the recess to investigate problems affecting the returned soldiers. This commission is now at work and its report should be submitted before the end of the session, when proper steps will be taken to carry out its recommendations.

EMPIRE SETTLEMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I should like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Immigration to an article which appeared in yesterday morning's press, from the London Times, in which the Times was somewhat critical of Canada for not having taken more advantage of the Empire Settlement Act, and pointed out that Australia and New Zealand were getting great advantage out of it. Will the minister be ready, shortly, to tell the House what move has been made by Canada to take advantage of the money which has been granted by the British government for this purpose?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Immigration): It is the intention of the government at this session to ask for some money for the purpose of taking advantage of some of the schemes promoted by the Empire Settlement Board.

THE MARKETING OF GRAIN
MOTION BY MR. MILLAR FOR A COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle) moved:

Whereas the conditions under which Canada, and particularlly Western Canada, markets its grain are matters on which the prosperity of all Canada in large measure depends; and

Whereas there is a widespread and insistent demand in all the principal grain producing provinces of Canada for an improved system of marketing said grain; and

Whereas there is at present a great diversity of opinion concerning the weakness and abuse of our present system and also as to what system if adopted would prove most satisfactory for the future.

Therefore be it Resolved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that this government should create a commission for the purpose of making inquiry into the grain trade, whose findings might serve as a basis for improvement of present legislation relative thereto or for the creation in the immediate future of some permanent solution of the grain marketing problem.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I realize in rising to make this motion that I am dealing with a matter of very great importance. First, let me say a few words in regard to the demand for a grain inquiry. There has been a persistent demand for it for some years,

and committees have been appointed from time to time to try and find some better methods for marketing our grain, though it is true that a great many are under the impression that the present method, so far as its physical features are concerned, is as good as it is possible to get. During the last few months the farmers have met in convention in the cities of Brandon and Saskatoon and passed resolutions in favour of a grain inquiry.

I should like to deal with a few matters in respect to which there is a general impression that there is a grievance, particularly on the part of the producer, but first a few words in regard to the methods by which we have advanced during the last twenty years. Many sitting in this House, and on this side particularly will remember the time when the conditions under which we marketed our grain were intolerable. I need not dwell on that; I merely wish to remind the House that it was a fact. Several times during the last two decades inquiries have been made, and I can think of no instance in which a thorough inquiry was made where it was not followed by legislation that has been of very great benefit to the producers and to the country as a whole. Commissions have been appointed in the province of Saskatchewan, and after one of these had completed its work and handed in its report, legislation was adopted providing for the creation of the Co-operative Elevator Company. I should like to contrast that procedure with the experience of the Manitoba government, which tried to apply legislative measures without first holding an inquiry. The question before them both was that of the government's owning and operating country elevators. In Saskatchewan, where they took the wise course of making an inquiry and careful investigation first, they have succeeded admirably, but in Manitoba, where they proceeded to apply legislative remedies without first holding an inquiry, they failed dismally. That is so well known that I need not dwell upon it. In the year 1906 a commission was appointed and made a thorough investigation into the grain trade, and as a result of its inquiry proposed twenty-six changes. Twenty-four of these were accepted and approved and became part of the present Grain Act.

Some have asked, what results have followed these inquiries by commissions, and seem to be under the impression that an inquiry usually starts with nothing and ends with nothing. I have not time to dwell on all the improvements that have followed this particular investigation, but let me mention only two which I think are well worthy of the consideration of the House. In the year 1907 and prior to that time, in the grain that was passing from Fort William to the transfer elevators, there was an annual loss of 50,000 bushels. That had been going on for years. The lake carriers, when asked why they did not watch the scales to see they were not beaten out of their weights simply remarked, "The more you watch the elevator people the more they take from you, and we simply take our loss and add it to the cost of carrying.' The point I wish to make is this: After the remedial legislation recommended by the commission was applied, you will find if you look up the figures that after 1908 instead of there being a loss, the weights on the transfer elevators and at Fort William agreed very, very closely; in fact, there was practically no loss; and that has continued, I believe, up to the present time. I would ask if that is not a very definite and substantial benefit?—and it resulted from simply one suggestion from the grain commission.

Let me mention another. At that time it appeared as though there were abuses on the part of terminal elevators. It was very difficult to find out exactly what was taking place, but recommendations were made to remedy the abuses if they existed, and in the following year, 1909, or possibly 1910, several of the managers of the terminal elevators were prosecuted by the warehouse commission and fined $500 each on some five or six charges. That was another practical and helpful work of legislation resulting from a recommendation by one commission only. I pass on.

Some have raised this objection, that we expect that steps will be taken to create a wheat board. I am in sympathy with that idea; in fact, I propose to urge the creation of a wheat board. But the faults of which I am going to speak nearly all existed under the wheat board of 1919, and I cannot see that they would not continue to exist under a new wheat board. What are they? The spread in the country elevator between the track price and the street price is very great. Now I would like it to be understood that the amount of grain handled in the country elevators is so small that they cannot make both ends meet—that is, the country elevators by themselves, receiving only the handling charges, are not paying propositions. And it is alleged—I will not say the allegations are all true—and our people generally believe, that a large part of this loss is made up by taking a too heavy toll from the man who is compelled to sell

his grain on the street. That man has not a carload, therefore he is at the mercy of the elevator. That is one allegation that is made and one which, I think, should be investigated by this inquiry board.

Another matter is this. An organization of grain buyers in the West are making very serious charges against the grain trade. I do not assume the responsibility for their statements, I do not know that the charges are all true; but they are very serious in character. They claim that those who employ them, the firms in Winnipeg, are using very strong pressure, amounting to intimidation and even threats, in order to induce them to take a greater toll from the farmers than they have any right to do. They are bonded to become good—that is what it practically amounts to—for any shortage. Their contention is that though they have purchased grain for a firm for many years they are not permitted by the firms for whom they purchase to know the outturns of the cars as they go to Fort William. The grain firms follow this practice: If a buyer writes to Fort William and asks for the outturns of its cars they are at once notified by the chief weighmaster and the grain firms thwart the buyers. This is their contention. The grain firms rather reproach the buyers when they ask for these outturns. They tell them, "We would supply them to you if you ask for them"; but the buyers allege that they have not been able to get these statements in a satisfactory manner from the firms who employ them. They are kept in the dark as to whether they are going to be short or not, and at the same time they are bonded to become responsible for any shortage. This keeps them in the position where they are constantly striving to get all the grain they can lest there should be a shortage for which they would be held responsible.

The buyers also allege that the bonding firms are in collusion with the grain firms to intimidate them and keep them in subjection; giving them anything but a square deal. Now it may be that they have tried to have these matters investigated by the Board of Grain Commissioners, and it may be that there is not much foundation for their charges, but it seems to me it is only fair that some regard should be paid to the wishes of a body of men—I do not suppose all are members of this organization—whose membership runs into many hundreds. They are the men to whom we must sell our grain, it must pass through their hands before it goes on to Fort William, and it seems to me that in view of the fact that they have been making these charges openly—in a little pamphlet they have issued, on the platform, and in every conceivable way they can get the charges before the public—it seems to me only reasonable that opportunity should be given to prove whether these charges are true or false.

Since this resolution was placed on the order paper, a select committee of this House has been appointed, and it may be the opinion of some that this committee could successfully inquire into all these matters. I would submit, however, that the charges I have just mentioned could not possibly be inquired into by this committee, for the reason that the organization referred to would probably make charges against a dozen, possibly two dozen, grain firms in the city of Winnipeg. It would be unfair to allow such charges to be preferred without giving the grain firms the oportunity of defending themselves. That would mean summoning witnesses by the score, it would mean occupying a great length of time, and it would be a very expensive process, because many of these witnesses live out in the country and probably would not be in a position to leave their work and spend a week or ten days in the city of Ottawa. Moreover the programme allotted to the select committee in question is so large and comprehensive that no committee, in the given time, could possibly cover one-quarter of the work laid out for it. That is quite evident and I need not labour the point. We all know how long it took the Committee on Agriculture to deal with the wheat board question last session—it occupied somewhere about three months' time. Now the work laid out for this select committee will probably cover four or five times as much ground. In that event, how is it possible for the committee to do justice to more than a very small part of the programme referred to it?

It has also been urged that the present Board of Grain Commissioners have the power, and it is their duty, to investigate these charges—that if anything wrong has occurred it is within the jurisdiction of the grain commission to investigate it. Let me point out the position in which the grain commissioners would find themselves if that course were pursued. Suppose a charge of injustice or irregularity in connection with a terminal elevator, or a country elevator for that matter, were made. These institutions are run under regulations laid down by the Board of Grain Commissioners, and the commissioners would be in the position of sitting in judgment of their own acts. Therefore, I submit, the Board of Grain Commissioners are not the proper authorities to investigate

these charges. Furthermore I am going to ask, among other things, that some changes be made in the Grain Act. Now I cannot conceive that the board would seriously regard it as a part of their duty to submit such changes in the Grain Act, although they might. I think they have known in the past that charges of injustice in connection with the inspection of grain have been made, and yet no recommendation, so far as I know, has come from that board. I had occasion to write to the grain commission some little time ago when the grain firms were following this course in connection with cheques issued for purchases of grain: They sent cheques to the farmers for the cars they had purchased and put the necessary stamps on the cheques all right, but they charged the farmers for the stamps. I wrote to the grain commission and pointed out that fact, but they took the stand that the matter was not within their jurisdiction. Now, if they regard little matters of that nature as not being within their jurisdiction, and if complaints have been made and have failed of investigation by the commission and no remedies are forthcoming, what is the use of going on year after year and waiting for a remedy which fails to appear? We cannot get a remedy for the difficulties which exist and yet plenty of time has been allowed to provide a remedy. Under the circumstances the time has come to adopt a better means of securing redress.

I have touched on the matter of the inspection of grain. Let me deal a little more in detail with that point. At the present time it is believed—it is not my opinion only but it is the general belief—by the producers of grain that they are not securing a just return for wheat of a certain nature. The wheat that I refer to is of this character: grain that has been damaged slightly, or at least slightly discoloured by rain. Nothing but the milling test will determine whether the grain has been damaged. Much of that grain is being graded as No. 3 Northern. Milling tests have been made again and again. A firm in Minneapolis made one test some years ago; our provincial governments have made tests; tests have been made in the city of Winnipeg; and in all cases it has been found that many of those samples of grain from No. 3 Northern, of the kind of which I speak, have proved to be equal in milling value to our very best No. 1. Northern. That has been proved beyond a doubt. The difficulty is how to classify this grain so that it shall be sold for its proper value. Some years ago a suggestion was made from the grain trade, and for a time was backed up by a few farmers, in favour of creating a sample market, in order that this grain might be sold on sample. In a very short time, the farmers, looking into the matter, began to see that it was not in their interest. It simply meant that the best of each grade, the choice cars, would be picked out, and the poor cars would be allowed to go forward, and would be the basis of the price fixed on the Liverpool market. It would be a skimming off of the cream, and allowing the skimmed milk to go forward. The farmers at once commenced opposition to the creation of a sample market. That opposition has continued up to the present time, notwithstanding the fact that the sample market was created some years ago. Let me point out to hon. members that although that sample market has been in existence for some years, very few bushels, if any, have ever passed over the sample market, but with the sample market went the mixing privileges —an excuse and a reason for the existence of the mixing elevator. I think I am not unfair or unjust when I say that those who asked for the sample market did not want the sample market, but wanted the mixing privileges. I am not prepared to say definitely how that grain can be classified. I will add a little more to the class I have just spoken of: It is not only grain that has been slightly bleached by being wet, but also grain that has been slightly frosted. There is in some years a considerable quantity of grain of that nature, and the farmers who raised it are selling it sometimes for fifteen and sixteen cents a bushel less than No. 1 Northern, whereas, it has been proved beyond a doubt that it is of as much value and as good milling wheat as No. 1 Northern. That, I claim, is a very great injustice, and I believe a change should be made in the Inspection Act, but I am not prepared to say just what it should be. If I could tell you exactly how that could be remedied, I do not know that there would be very much reason why a grain commission should investigate it. That is a matter which could and should be dealt with by a select committee, although I have pointed out some matters that could not be dealt with by them.

There is another evil to which I will refer. I suppose some of you would find it hard to believe, but there has been a practice in the past of substituting cars. Cars that 4 p.m. are near the top of the grade are of excellent quality, and those mixing elevators would want them very much, though by some mysterious method the cars have been selected from the general flow of grain and have been sent to the mixing elevators, and

cars of poorer quality have been put in their places. This, at one time, was carried on on a very large scale. There is a very great injustice. As I have pointed out—and I think I shall repeat because I want hon. members to appreciate the point—the price that the farmer receives for his grain is based on the kind of grain and on the value of the grain as it arrives in the Old Country market, and when the grain is deteriorated, damaged in any way, and the value taken out of it, then the price is less, and the farmer must suffer the loss. Sometimes, when a commission of inquiry engages in this work it will find evils of which nothing was known previously. I remember one remarkable case of this sort—it is quite possible that something of that nature might be discovered, if a board of inquiry were appointed at the present time. Investigation took place in Minneapolis some year or more ago, in which it was found that scalping played a very large part. That is, a grain firm would buy from a farmer and they would transfer to another grain firm. Sometimes, it would be a legitimate transaction and sometimes it would not. In some cases, carloads of grain were sold five or six or seven or eight times, and the spread between the first and second selling price was sometimes thirty and forty cents a bushel. Now as a great many grain firms that are doing business in Minneapolis are also doing business in Fort William, the relations between the two exchanges are very close, and the practice followed in the two exchanges is very much alike. I have no knowledge that the evil practice of scalping is carried on on a large scale, or to any great extent, in Fort William, or rather in Winnipeg, but the fact is that it is a growing evil, and as the commission denounced it roundly in Minneapolis, it would seem to me to be a question that the board of inquiry might investigate carefully.

Let me touch very briefly on a matter I think of considerable importance. Under the wheat board, I think it is common knowledge among farmers that the spread between No. 1 Northern and No. 3 Northern is seven cents—it stood at seven cents during the whole season. Wheat, you will notice, was nearly $3 a bushel. Now, mark you, after the wheat board ceased operations and the price of wheat dropped to about $1.50 a bushel, the spread, instead of being one half of seven cents, was doubled; instead of being 3½ cents, the spread increased to fourteen cents and in some cases to fifteen cents. It does not matter very much to a man who is growing No. 3 Northern wheat if the price of No. 1 Hard or No. 1 Northern is good, so long as he has not that kind of wheat, but what is a serious matter to him is the fact, if he has No. 3 Northern wheat, that the spread between No. 1 Northern and No. 3 Northern is sixteen cents, and it brings him a very small price, indeed. Can anyone well explain that? Is it not worthy of some investigation by a board of inquiry, that the spread between No. 1 Northern and No. 3 Northern was seven cents and since the wheat board went out of business, the spread doubled, notwithstanding that the price of wheat went down? I think it well worthy of consideration.

Let me say a word in regard to mixing elevators. A few years ago there were very few mixing elevators, Now there are a great many; and I suppose the reason is quite evident—they are profitable. Grain is taken into the mixing elevators, and according to the regulations of the Board of Grain Commissioners, as it is inspected out, it should grade up to the average. But what takes place in the meantime? Nos. 3, 4, 5—we do not know what grades, sometimes it is one and sometimes another—are mixed together and as the grain goes out of the elevators the lower grades disappear entirely. What has happened is this. They have cleaned the good grain out of the lower grades; their weights increase; a great deal of the poorer grain in the lower grades has gone out as screenings and a considerable quantity of the better grain has been mixed in, so that wheat that has gone in as No. 6, or No. 5 or No. 4 may go out as No. 2 or No. 3. A strong argument is advanced by the trade that this is really a benefit to the farmer, that it does him no harm but rather improves some of his grain, and that not so much storage is required. I grant you the last point, but I deny the others. I think that this practice entails a great loss to the producer of grain. In the first place, if the good cars are taken out of the general flow, what happens to the rest? The question arises, is the grain which goes out of the mixing elevators up to the average required by the regulations? I would not say that it is not, at the present time, because I believe that the change in the personnel of the Board of Grain Commissioners has very greatly improved the board. But I would point out that within the last few months, at least within the last year, one cargo went to the United States graded out of one of these elevators as "3 Northern straight." When it got to Buffalo it was held up, the purchaser refused to accept it, the inspectors drew samples which were sent back to Winnipeg, and it was declared by them that the grain instead of being "3 Northern

straight" was "3 and 4 tough." I know that that is only a matter of administration, and it is quite possible that it calls for no change in the regulations, but I think a board of inquiry would not do any harm if it investigated that matter along with others. How was it that a similar cargo was sent to the Old Country and there found in the same condition and rejected? I would mention another point in connection with these mixing elevators. In the evidence taken by the Committee on Agriculture last year, it was pointed out that there was considerable difficulty in getting rid of the grain. I do not know just where this happened, but the fact is that when James Stewart was head of the wheat board he refused to take grain out of these mixing elevators except at a discount of as high as four cents per bushel. What does it indicate, when a man who was competent and knew the grain trade thoroughly, refused to take grain out of the mixing elevators except at such a discount? It is pointed out, of course, that he did not exercise his powers in this matter. But what do we infer from that? Knowing whom they had to deal with and that he would take his discount if the grain was not up to the mark, they sent it out at the right grade. But in the past it has not always been that way. Now, even supposing that the grain goes out of the mixing elevators up to the average, the value for mixing purposes that is in the grain as it passes from the producers' wagons is taken out. I believe that the Old Country importer and miller, knowing that they buy our grain not for its intrinsic value as milling grain, but for its strength for mixing purposes, would use that grain for those purposes themselves, and if they got it unadulterated I think they would pay a higher price for it than they give at present. If that be true—and I think the point is well worth looking into—then the farmer is being robbed of something to which he has a right, because he is entitled to the full value of his grain as it passes from his wagon. Anything that damages grain or takes from its value in transit takes from it something to which the farmer is entitled. It has been told me, and the statement has been made on such good authority that I have no hesitation in repeating it, that a considerable quantity of grain is transferred between the mixing and the public elevators. For what purpose is this done? It is alleged that these mixing elevators have difficulty in getting rid of their grain, and the millers admitted in evidence last session before the agricultural committee that they would never take grain from the mixing elevators if they could possibly help it. That was their evidence, one and all. Now, when they have that difficulty in getting rid of their grain what do they do? It is stated that they send it to the public elevators. It then passes into the general bin. If it is not up to mark, or if the value has been in any way impaired, it passes to the general bin and goes to lessen the value of the grain that is shipped to the Old Country, and on which the price is based.

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend intend to imply that the public elevators are doing the mixing at the head of the lakes?

Mr. MILLAR: No, not necessarily so. The grain that has been mixed and skimmed down as low as the inspection system would permit, to such an extent that the millers do not want it, the exporters do not want it, and James Stewart will not take it except at a discount, is sent over to the public elevators where it loses its identity and becomes straight grade grain.

Mr. STEVENS: But my hon. friend says that it was put into the general bins and thereby impaired the standard of the grain already there. Is not that mixing, and is it not contrary to law?

Mr. MILLAR: What I am pointing out is that whatever value that grain would have for blending purposes, if it were not mixed, is thereby lost. That is to say, if that grain were sent over to the Old Country unmixed it would have a value for mixing purposes which it loses when mixed in the mixing elevators.

Now, some time ago a statement appeared in a great many of our newspapers that must have cost a considerable amount of money. It was published by the secretary of the Grain Exchange, Dr. Magill, and appeared in many of the agricultural papers and the daily papers all over the country. We know that this advertising is quite expensive, and that statement must have cost a good deal. In it, it is claimed by Dr. Magill that all that the trade at Winnipeg takes out of a bushel of wheat is 4.3 cents. Now, anyone who knows anything about grain, anyone who knows the number of people that are employed on the exchange, the profits they are evidently making, the staffs they keep, the enormous army that feed off the handling of the grain, will know quite well that these people could not live very long if that were all they got from the grain. If 4.3 cents per bushel were all they got I think some of them would starve inside of six months. It is quite evident that there are underground ways of reaping a greater profit from the

grain than that. It is obvious that this is not all the profit they receive. And that is one reason why, it seems to me, a commission should be appointed, not to look into any one of these charges, but to go into the whole subject from every point of view. All the circumstances taken together constitute a sufficient ground for the appointment of a commission to inquire into the matter.

There is another point I should like to mention. I know representatives of the trade on the Liverpool and London markets are very anxious to know just what steps are taken by the Canadian government to see that no deterioration of our grain takes place between Fort William and the seaboard. They ask again and again: Inspection takes place at Fort William; what inspection takes place after that? The grain is handled through elevators, some of which are private elevators. Are the steps that are taken to safeguard the various grades of grain sufficient and adequate? I know quite well that such steps in regard to grain that passes through American channels are not sufficient. I found on the other side of the water a great many complaints about grain that had come from American ports, and the trade could not understand why it was that such grain was not as good as that coming from Fort William. Although the evidence was not given on oath, it was discovered either at New York or Boston that after the grain passing through the American channels in bond has left the seaboard, it is considered to be out of bond and the grades are then mixed. Here I believe is a very strong reason why there should be an investigation into the trade, because 65 per cent of our grain is now passing through American channels. Our railways are crying out for more freight, and our elevators at Montreal, although they had all they could do last year, I am sure would not admit that they could not do more business. We want our trade kept in Canadian channels, and I believe that an inquiry might do much to this end, because the variation of a single cent in carriage would mean a great deal; it would keep millions of bushels in Canadian channels that are now passing out through American channels.

Mr. ARTHURS: Before the hon. member leaves that subject, has he figures as to how much American grain passed through Canadian channels in the same period?

Mr. MILLAR: I could not give exact figures to the hon. member. I know the amount is considerable. I suppose some people might take the attitude that while as much American grain passes through Canadian channels as Canadian grain passes through American channels, why, we are enjoying a square deal and have nothing to complain of. I do not take that view. It seems to me that the Americans take all they can get, and they would not stop if they got more than their share. And we too should get all we can. I do not think the Americans would blame us.

I am not just certain whether another matter should be brought under this inquiry, but I think it would do no harm if the possibilities of creating co-operative systems for handling our farm products were investigated and reported on. This system has been adopted in the United States with considerable success, especially by the fruit growers, and a little more information on the subject to our farmers that would eventually help them to solve their marketing problem by the creation of such a system would be of great value. It is well known that the wheat board which we are asking for and expecting this year is only regarded as a temporary expedient. We are looking for something that is permanent. We have not yet found it. It might be possible that a grain inquiry would serve as a kind of cleansing of our present system and wipe out some of those evils or clear up misapprehension. If so, our people might be satisfied to continue the same system, but I doubt it very much. Otherwise we want some other system of handling our grain, and it is the general belief that the co-operative system will be found the best. Any assistance that could be given by this board of inquiry would be very much appreciated by the farmers.

In closing, I am going to make one suggestion. Commissioners have gone to the Old Country and investigated the condition in which grain arrives there. There has been a strong feeling on the part of some that grain arrives very much deteriorated; in fact, extreme statements have sometimes been made to the effect that the grain reaches there as chicken feed. That has never been anywhere nearly true. But unfortunately those commissioners that have been sent to the Old Country have not numbered among them a single grain inspector, and I believe the government will be well advised to send a well qualified grain inspector overseas to look into this matter and to report back to the grain commission and to the inspection department the actual condition in which grain is arriving there, and also to make suggestions for overcoming any trouble that his investigations may disclose. A great deal could be accomplished by getting in touch with the trade there and encouraging them to further develop business with the

Canadian people. If a competent inspector were kept there for six months or possibly a year I believe it would be money well spent.

Mr. SALES: Why not permanently?

Mr. MILLAR: The member for Saltcoats asks, why not permanently? Well, that is a matter for future consideration. After a period of one year, if it were found advisable to keep such an official there, I certainly would have no objection to his being retained.

You will note, Sir, that I have not dwelt to any great extent on the serious conditions prevailing among the producers of grain, but this is simply because I think those conditions have been mentioned often enough by others. I think the House appreciates the fact that it would be a very great inspiration and help if something were done to give those producers encouragement, before they sell their next crop, that something of a practical nature is being done to relieve the difficulties under which they labour. Because, we must continue to sell our grain in competition with the other countries of the world, and accept prices regulated by supply and demand, while, as has been many times said, we are compelled to buy in very, very high markets. On these grounds I ask hon. members to support this resolution.

Mr. MANION: I should like to ask the hon. member a couple of questions. He has mentioned a sample market. Does he favour the operation of a sample market? The other question is in regard to deterioration. He referred to the deterioration of grain going from the head of the lakes or Winnipeg to the London or Liverpool market and the interest that the farmer had in that grain. Is it not true of a very large proportion of the wheat sold by the farmer at the track, that once he delivers it to the country elevator his interest in that wheat ceases entirely? I am asking for information in both these cases.

Mr. MILLAR: I will answer the last question first, lest I forget it. That ground has often been taken, that as soon as a farmer sells his load of grain at the country elevator, and receives his price therefor, he has absolutely no further interest in that grain. I think that is what my hon. friend means. But that is not so in any case, not even as to a part of his crop. The price he receives for that load has been based on the actual value of grain arriving in the Old Country. That is, those who are importing the grain know what they have been receiving for that grade. It does not matter what the grade is, but we will say it is No. 3; they know what they have been receiving for No. 3 in the past, and if anything is done in transit to lower the value of that grain, the price will be less. It is plain that if the price is less the price to the farmer will be less; there is no getting away from that. So that the farmer is interested in what happens to that grain from the time it leaves his wagon until it is sold to the Old Country buyer.

The question has been raised with regard to a sample market. When a very considerable part of our grain is milled in Canada, I shall be in favour of a sample market, but so long as nearly all our grain is sold by grade, I cannot see my way clear to favour a sample market. What takes place is simply this—and I do not know that I need cover the ground; in fact, I believe I have already done so—it is a picking out of the best cars, the cars that are of great value, and getting them for the same price as for the ordinary cars; little or no premium is paid. What is left is less valuable, but it is on what is left that the price is based; therefore the price is less.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution; I believe that an investigation into the grain trade is long overdue. The world's price for wheat is set at Liverpool, because Liverpool, being the great centre for wheat, collects the surplus practically of the whole world. It is this surplus, or the lack of any surplus at all, that sets the price for wheat all over the world. We, the growers in western Canada, are content if we get that price, minus the cost of getting our surplus on that market.

The farmer can market his grain in one of several different ways. He can sell outright to a country elevator at a price based on the Winnipeg price—to a dealer whose interest it is to create as much difference as possible between the initial price and the price paid at Winnipeg. Now, the farmer may possibly load a car over the loading platform and ship to Fort William and Port Arthur, in which case he will save the spread that may exist between the elevator prices and the cash prices in Winnipeg, as well as avoid the effects of all the devious methods of elevator operators regarding grades, shrinkage, dockage, and so on. He may send his car down to be stored at the terminal elevator, and to be sold later when the price suits him, in which case he is given a certificate guaranteeing the weight and grade. But that car of wheat may be spotted on the way by some miller and diverted to his mill for his own use, or it

may be diverted to a private elevator for mixing purposes; and all the farmer has to show for it is a certificate. If his car is diverted, it means that the wheat was a particularly fine type of that grade, and it also means, that, although the price is made in Liverpool, according to the value the British miller sets on Canadian wheat in competition with the wheat of other countries, the British miller does not get a chance at the wheat as it leaves the farmer's wagon. I think it should be made illegal for anyone to go into the business of buying and selling with no intention of ever taking possession or delivering in case of sale. Many of these men at one time or another overstep their capabilities and have to unload in a hurry. When they do this, advantage is taken of it by the exporter; the price is beaten down, and that sets a price for the next twenty-four hours over the whole of the three prairie provinces. It is possible, too, for a combination of these men, by withholding or dumping, to influence the price the way they want it. It is unfair, I say, to the grower that the remuneration for his year's work should be subject to such haphazard methods of price fixing and resulting violent fluctuations—seeing that he has no other channel open to him through which he can market his wheat.

While I believe in as little government control of industry in any form as possible, one must realize that wheat is different from all other commodities in that, because of its great bulk it must be moved from the grower to the consumer in a collective way. The grower has no control over any part of the business after the wheat leaves the wagons at the initial loading point, and yet his price is subject to the speculation of a set of men who are interested only in making all the difference they can between the price at the initial point and the Liverpool market. Since the farmer's price is established outside of his province, outside of his country, in competition with the wheat of other countries, it is surely the duty of the government to see that the grower is protected to the point where his product cannot be further tampered with, either in the physical handling or in the matter of price fixing. Since this product of the farmer is one which must be handled collectively and which has to pass through the hands of so many public utilities before it reaches the place where the price is set, I say again it is the duty of this government so to regulate these public utilities as to guarantee that full justice shall be done to those who are particularly interested in such products.

[Mr. Evans.]

Many features of the trade which this commission should investigate are outside the province of the present grain commission. I think it is necessary that some consideration should be given by the commission of inquiry to the routes by which the grain of this country can reach its ultimate destination in the most economical way. I shall hope to see the appointment of men in this capacity who, by their integrity and ability, will command the respect of all concerned.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I rise to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the two former speakers concerning this resolution. It is a cause of gratification to me that the government has so far conceded the point as to have this problem investigated by the select Committee on Agriculture, for a problem it is, and it has been a problem in the West ever since the West has been growing grain. I do not, however, think that the committee will have either the time or the opportunity to take all the evidence that is necessary in this matter. By way of illustration let me say that when a committee of this House sits and takes evidence it is only natural, and it is what we have been accustomed to find in the past, that the financial interests in the country, particularly those engaged in the grain trade, always send their delegations to give evidence before the committee, and invariably they are composed of capable men who give expert evidence. But I maintain that the producer, the man whose cause has been pleaded here to-day, and whose cause I am now endeavouring to plead, has not the same opportunity of giving evidence before a committee of this House that he would have before a royal commission, and that is one reason why I rise to make a small contribution to this debate.

I should like to see a royal commission appointed that would travel all over the country and give the producer, the man who has a grievance, and who has always had one —the man who is not receiving justice, and particularly so this last year—an opportunity to appear before it and give evidence. In my humble opinion that is necessary before justice can be done; but as I said before, I am pleased that the government have conceded the point of appointing a committee at all events. I hope that if the committee has not finished its work by the end of the session, and that if its work warrants continued investigation, as I think it will, the government will appoint a royal commission that will travel over the country and give all parties concerned an opportunity to give their

evidence, and then bring in their report which the government might act upon through order in council so that it would not be necessary to wait until another session was called, but give relief before the next crop was marketed.

The two speakers who have preceded me have entered into quite a technical point. For myself I wish to give only concrete evidence. I believe the commission could and would find out the conditions if they would only travel over the country and give the producer an opportunity to present his evidence. I might state that I think I have a right to speak for the producer, because I have endeavoured to take a man's part in the harvesting of thirty-one crops in that western country, and surely if an individual has done that much work, he should know something whereof he speaks and of the conditions surrounding the producing of grain.

As the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) said, the spread between the price the producer receives and the price that is received on the market at Liverpool is altogether too great, and in the first place it is the producer of the grain who pays all the charges between, to say nothing of the inequalities of which the hon. gentleman speaks.

We have heard the complaint of the miller, and in my humble opinion the eastern miller, in the province of Ontario, we will say, is warranted in complaining on the ground that the grain which he buys to grist in his mill has lost much of its value because of its being purchased at the mixing elevators. The grain he gets is not as a rule of the same quality as the grain forwarded to the initial elevators by the producer, and that difference in price is always deducted from the producer. I have no doubt it may seem that this point has always been stressed in the House, but it has not been stressed very much until the last three or four years, and that is one of the reasons why men are down here now endeavouring to bring the matter before the House. I think I can assure the House that when the conditions are recognized and remedies applied, you will not have the same complaint from the people of the West. It is simply because remedies have not heretofore been applied that we are obliged to come here and ask for redress for our grievances.

I stated a few moments ago that I proposed to present some real concrete evidence, something of which I am absolutely certain. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that in the year 1920 I made a statement on the floor here to the effect that I had visited the state of North Dakota and had found a great disparity in the price paid there to the man who sold his grain to the initial elevator and the price paid to his neighbour just north of an imaginary boundary line. I found a difference of $1.01 a bushel between the price paid to the Dakota farmer and the price paid to the farmer in the West. In this country we had a wheat board in existence at that time and over there there was none. The explanation given by the interests—naturally it does not come from the producer, yet it is the producer on our side who suffers and has suffered for years— was that the United States required what hard wheat could be taken across the boundary for the purpose of mixing at the Minneapolis mills to provide a grade of flour acceptable to the consumer in the British Isles. That is true, and all very well, but we find to-day that the United States is scarcely an exporting country; in fact, we believe that in the very near future she will forego the large revenue she has derived in the past from the export of flour; yet this same condition exists to-day. Again this year, for my own satisfaction and for the purpose of being in a position to furnish evidence to the House or before a committee, I made another visit to the state of North Dakota, and on the day of my arrival, which was 9th October, I found a spread of 11 cents a bushel between the price paid the North Dakota producer and the price paid north of the boundary line, and that was for a poorer grade of wheat than ours. They were receiving 93 cents a bushel, while I was receiving only 82 cents. I make this positive statement. In my judgment, and from what knowledge I have gained in seeing samples of grain, my grain that I sold this year—and you will pardon the personal pronoun, but I can speak more positively of my own case—was fully two grades better than the grain over in the elevators that I visited in the town of Sherwood in North Dakota; yet my neighbour was getting 93 cents a bushel while I received only 82 cents. When I reached home I found in my mail a map sent by the Railway Association of Canada, which shows the 49th parallel and the lines of railway paralleling the international boundary line. It also shows the comparative freight rates from points opposite each other along the international boundary, and I find that in each case there is a difference of 4½ cents per one hundred pounds in favour of Canada. We might call that equal to 2 6/10 cents a bushel. Add that to the 11 cents premium that my neighbour to the south was receiving, and for a poorer grade of wheat. I went home quite prepared to ask this further question,—why is it, when

Liverpool is the pivotal point where the price is fixed for all export wheat, that my neighbour to the south of the boundary can receive 11 cents more than I, and all these other favourable conditions? It does seem to me, and I urge it upon the House, that this is one of the questions which the commission should investigate and determine.

I also submit that a committee of this House could not secure the necessary evidence. It would be different with a royal commission moving through the country and hearing evidence at various points. I am sure in that case the producers of grain would only be too anxious, oniy too glad, to have the opportunity of appearing before them and giving concrete evidence upon the points referred to. The evils in connection with this matter have been apparent for many years, and it is a cause of gratification to us to-day, Sir, to know that our government have recognized the fact and are adopting means whereby we hope to obtain redress. It has been a subject of complaint in the past that governments have been loath to take action in the matter; I am happy to think that a change for the better has taken place in that respect.

It occurred to me, when the hon. member for Qu'Appelle suggested that an officer should be located in the Old Country to look after our grains, preferably at Liverpool, that our government might have obtained samples from the Liverpool market and laid them before the members of this House, or at least before the Committee on Agriculture which is to look into this matter. I might state that as a producer I am prepared to collect samples of grain as grown in the prairie provinces in the year 1922, and I am prepared to establish the grades upon which the producer was paid; it would be a very nice comparison for individual members of this House to see the quality of grain that was produced and sold last year as against the quality of grades that are fixed as standards upon the Liverpool market.

May I give another concrete instance illustrating the conditions that prevailed in 1922. I read in the statutes that:

> No. 1 Northern grain shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 60 per cent hard wheat.
>
> No. 2 Northern shall be sound and reasonably clean, of good milling quality, 58 pounds to the bushel, 45 per cent hard wheat.

The illustration that I wish to give the House, and I hope it will come before the committee, was furnished by an individual whose entire grain crop was grown upon prairie land that was newly broken. This individual purchased really good Marquis seed wheat from a responsible seed firm, and it was sown upon this land. I myself saw this crop many times, and helped to thresh and market the grain. When that grain was being marketed by the load on the street all the buyers were very anxious to purchase it, in all cases at the maximum price of No. 1 Northern. The producer placed 1,206 bushels of this wheat in the elevator to ship out, and when it was shipped out he received the grade of No. 2 Northern. Complaint was made and a re-inspection asked for, but the reply the producer received was, "We are not paying No. 1 Northern prices for wheat this year." Now I am prepared to take my oath, Sir, that that grain weighed 62 pounds to the bushel, that it contained more than 80 per cent hard wheat, and that it was as beautiful a hard, red wheat as anyone would wish to see. Yet that was the treatment accorded to that fine grain. I have wondered many times how many cars of a poorer grade of wheat those 1,206 bushels were intended to be mixed with to conform to the standard of grade required on the Liverpool market. That illustrates the problem which confronts the producers to-day, and it is an injustice to refuse them the opportunity of appearing before a commission.

Referring again to the question of the spread in prices in the state of North Dakota I wish to state that since the date to which I referred previously the spread there has gone up to as much as 21 cents per bushel, and the question arises why it is that a grower in the United States who produces wheat under the same conditions and suffers the same disability that I do, should receive 21 cents per bushel more for an inferior grade when the price for export wheat is set at the pivotal point of Liverpool. That is a very important question and one which enters largely into the question of immigration, as I would remind my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart). How largely it affects the question of immigration I can best demonstrate by citing a newspaper quotation which I would like to have placed upon Hansard. It reads thus:

> On Wednesday, December 13th, the Whitehead family, comprising Mrs. Whitehead, Sr., Mrs. Wm. Whitehead, Jr., and Edmund took their departure from this district proceeding to Sherwood en route for Michigan. This is the fourteenth family to leave this locality with no one up to the present coming to take their places. Out of the number gone only one was a bachelor.

That is the condition which prevails in the West; it is the condition which prevails all along the international boundary. And again I state, and reiterate, that this matter is one which we must take into considera-

tion, because there must be an equitable price paid to those who are producing grain and who are working fourteen and fifteen hours a day in so doing. I say that the question of immigration does enter into this matter and that the exodus from western Canada must be stopped. Because there should be the fullest opportunity of demonstrating what the West is worth. The potential wealth of the country is not challenged, the people of the West have a heritage that is well worth while; but parasites must be stopped from stepping in and taking an unjust toll from the people who are labouring there.

I am very pleased indeed that the government have at last made a move towards investigating the conditions about which we have for so long complained.

Mr. ARTHUR L. BEAUBIEN (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, when coming down to Ottawa last year, a large percentage of the electors of Provencher, which I have the honour to represent here, told me that they thought that a royal commission to inquire into the grain trade should have been established long ago. I thought so myself and was under the impression that during the last session, we had voted the sum of $40,000 for such an inquiry. If I am wrong in that respect I am open for correction. When parliament prorogued I returned to my electors and told them that $40 000 had been voted for such an inquiry. Afterwards the statement appeared in the press that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was of the opinion that there were not sufficient complaints to warrant an inquiry. I do not know what grounds there were for making such a statement. At any rate, I came back to Ottawa this year with full instructions from the people of my riding to press for a royal commission to inquire into the marketing and grading of grain. I want to take up the question of grading and emphasize that point to a greater extent, perhaps, than other speakers who have preceded me. In Manitoba—the oldest province of the West and one that has been growing grain for a longer period than the other two western provinces—we have a weed element to contend with, a menace which is more formidable than Saskatchewan or Alberta have to contend with. Consequently we are doing all we can to destroy the noxious weeds. And just here let me say that the farmers in Manitoba are the best farmers in the West because they have had a very much longer experience. And we are doing everything in our power to eliminate weeds, but we have a very hard proposition on our hands and we cannot eliminate them to the extent I would like. So, therefore, the grading affects us to a larger extent than it affects the people in Saskatchewan and Alberta. This fall, I think, we grew one of the best crops in the southern part of Manitoba, which I have the honour to represent, that was ever grown in that province, and at the same time we have received lower grades this year than in any year I know of. Even in 1916, when we had an epidemic of rust, we really received better grades than we did this year, and, of course, our grievance is much more prominent than the grievance in any other part in western Canada, for the simple reason that we are very close to the boundary. I live only 22 miles from the boundary, and I have taken wheat to Pembina, on the American side, and my wheat would grade No. 1, at Pembina, but on the grading market in Canada, it would grade No. 3 and No. 4, so that being so close to the line does not conduce to the farmer receiving justice in regard to the grading proposition.

I received before I came to Ottawa, resolutions from practically every municipal council in the county of Provencher, and I know that copies of these resolutions have been forwarded to the Prime Minister; at least, the councils intimated to me they were sending them. The municipal councils represent all the people in the country, and I think that these resolutions are not passed lightly. Before they pass those resolutions, they study the question, and they hear plans discussed, and so forth, and I do not think they would pass these resolutions, unless they knew what they were doing.

I think the appointment by the government of a parliamentary committee was a good move, but if the parliamentary committee were going to give the grain trade a thorough investigation, we would be here until this time next year, because we cannot hold a thorough investigation in Ottawa. You must go through the country and find out from the people who know. If you brought these people to Ottawa, it would involve a great deal of expense, and there is no doubt, if that were done, the Prime Minister and his colleagues would not be able to attend the Imperial Conference next June.

The kind of commission that we in this corner of the House desire—and I think the government should give us all the support possible—is not a political commission, but a commission of men who know the grain trade and have the interest of the country at heart. In my opinion, a political commission is no good and has no right to be appointed at any time. We want a commission that will

bring our recommendations to the government, so that if the Grain Act needs to be amended, the recommendation of this commission, which would be a royal commission, will be put into the Grain Act, and will relieve the Canadian farmers. I might offer a suggestion. We have a commission inquiring into the lake freight rates to-day. If the government consider that commission is competent to inquire into the marketing and grading of grain, I would throw out the suggestion that, when they are through with their present work, they keep on investigating and do not stop until the people of
5 p.m. the West are getting justice in the grading, marketing and mixing of grain.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I have been waiting in the hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) would make a statement to the House and save further debate. Hon. gentlemen know that we had this all threshed out last year, and at the request of the government, we put through a vote of $40,000, if I remember rightly. Again, if I remember, we had the whole matter discussed one evening, when many of my hon. friends to my left were present, and when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) told us, as I recollect it—hon. members will correct me if I am wrong—that in view of the fact that the Progressives, as well as the official opposition, demanded this investigation, it would be held. Well, of course, the government have been very busy. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has been out of the country a great deal, but he is here now —they are all home—and I was in hopes that we could be told that the investigation would go on.

Something has been said by an hon. gentleman to my left to the effect that they are glad that something is now going to be done. Well, we tried to do something and we were stopped. It was said we wanted to get a special organization—a political organization. We asked Mr. Wood—Mr. Henry Wise Wood —of Alberta, to act as chairman of that investigating commission, and he would not act. We thought that if we put him in charge of it he would at least see it was not political. He would be there and would be in charge. Failing to obtain Mr. Wood, we then asked Mr. Stewart to take charge. Mr. Stewart has been described more recently as a representative of the farmers on the railway board, but he declined. We did not want any political commission. However, that is all old history. We thought the grievances of the West ought to be properly inquired into, and that any possible remedy that the West was entitled to ought to be given to it. We still think so, and I hope my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, will now tell us that the vote of last year is going to be put into effect, that the government still are where they were last year, and that the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be given immediate effect.

Mr. L. H. JELLIFF (Lethbridge): It was not my intention to take part in this debate, but it seems to me one important feature has been omitted in the remarks that have been made, and that is the effect that this investigation might have on immigration matters. We have heard a great deal said during this session on the vast number of our people that were going to other countries, especially to the United States, and what should be done to keep these people here. It seems to me that if this question which is before us this afternoon is properly settled, it will afford some solution to that problem and assist us in keeping our people on the land. I come from the Lethbridge constituency, where we are engaged in a great irrigation project. Somewhere in the neighbourhood of $8,000,000 is to be expended in that country in placing those farmers in a position where farming in the future will be a permanent success and not be subject to all the ups and downs that have been experienced there during the last twenty years.

I want to acknowledge here some real and valuable assistance we have had in our labours from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). We have sent men into the United States in an endeavour to get settlers to come in and take up surplus lands in the irrigation districts, and in this connection I would read a few lines from a letter which I have received from a friend who was in the United States engaged in that work. What I shall read has an important bearing on this discussion. It is dated from Oakland, and reads:

> As you know I am down here to try to interest people in the Lethbridge Northern and I have had some success as far as interest is concerned but the people that would come have no money and those that have money see no real benefit in changing. I just want to call your attention to some of the things I can't explain to their satisfaction. Why fat steers at Calgary are selling for 3 to 4 cents per pound when they are worth 10 to 11 in Chicago? There is a man out north of here feeding Canadian stockers he bought at Minneapolis and says they are the best feeders he ever fed but he says where does the Canadian farmer get off that raises them? This country would take every steer for sale in Canada at a good price if it was not for the tariff. The farmers are getting $1.10 for wheat that would not make chicken feed, why do we have to take

80 cents for No. 1 Hard when the farmer here gets $1.10 for worse than chicken feed? Ask the Minister of Agriculture. They also ask the rate of interest and when I tell them 8 per cent they say "no Canada for me."

I thoroughly appreciate and endorse the action of our government in proposing this committee for this session to make a special investigation into these matters affecting agriculture. But, as has been pointed out by the mover of this resolution (Mr. Millar), it is hardly likely that that committee, within the short period available in this one session, could in any wise be able to cover the ground of the complaints raised this afternoon. I think what is needed is a royal commission to investigate this whole subject in as thorough a manner as possible. The subject is one that has been discussed up and down this chamber for the last four or five years. Not only last session was it under discussion; from the reading I have done of previous Hansards which have been sent me, I find that this same discussion has been going on for the past few years. Now, let us get down to the bottom of the whole thing and have it settled. It is the most vital question we have to deal with to-day, and bound up in it is the question of immigration, in fact, the question of the whole future of this country. It is a matter of patriotism that a royal commission be appointed to look thoroughly into the subject.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) is to be congratulated on bringing this important national subject to the attention of the House. I do not know any hon. gentleman more capable of dealing fully and fairly with the question than the member whose name is associated with the resolution. Grain inquiries are not new events in Canada. We have had a number of them, some national, some provincial, practically all of them, I think, considerably effective, and certainly all of them of an educational character. The first one I can recall was conducted in the year 1899. It was preceded by the action of a private member, the late Senator Douglas, who introduced into this House a private bill dealing with the grain trade. Previous to that we had had no legislation governing the warehousing, transportation and sale of grain, except what was called the Manitoba Inspection Act. The government of that day assured the late Senator Douglas that if he would withdraw his bill they would take the matter up at a subsequent session and during the recess have an investigation into the trade, bringing down later a bill based on the recommendations of that investigation. I remember quite well the personnel of that commission, which created a great deal of interest throughout the West. People had been harassed and were not only filled with suspicion but were absolutely certain that things were not all well and this being the first commission of its kind it can well be understood with what interest it was received. The late Judge Senkler of St. Catharines, was appointed chairman of that commission and his colleagues were three gentlemen from Manitoba, all still alive, Mr. C. C. Castle, now in British Columbia, Mr. Lothian and Mr. Sirrett. I forget who was the secretary. They conducted the usual inquiry, travelling about the country, and created a great deal of interest, especially among the farmers. I travelled myself some fifty miles on the prairies to give evidence, and I felt when I went home that I had not spent the time in vain. When the recommendations came down, and subsequently the legislation based thereon, I was convinced that it was perhaps one of the most successful investigations that had ever been held in connection with this important industry. Notwithstanding the very thoroughness of that inquiry, however, time seemed to reveal certain weaknesses in the act. No matter how you legislate, it is said that some people can always drive through the law. And in the year 1906 another agitation sprang up for a further inquiry. I had the honour of recommending to the government of that day that the present member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) be not only a member, but chairman, of that commission; and I have no doubt that the opportunities he had at that time of investigating the trade, not only of Canada but of the British Empire, as well as the practical knowledge we had of the producing end, have enabled him to gain that familiarity with the subject which it is evident he has to-day. In 1906, there were a number of other commissions, all more or less important. One of them was provincial, appointed by the province of Saskatchewan, and resulted in the present co-operative elevator system in that province. Later on we had the commission of 1921 which has been referred to by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). It is true that the operations of that commission were estopped by injunction proceedings, and it has occurred to me, since attention has been drawn to the fact, that before any more royal commissions are appointed it might be well for the status of the federal government to be established in order to ascertain how far we can go in these matters. There is no doubt that there is a federal jurisdiction; but apparently the royal commission could not go the limit of the

present Grain Act in this inquiry. It would be well, therefore, for any investigation to try to avoid such an impasse as occurred in this case, because it brings discredit on investigations generally and on the Grain Act in particular. I have no doubt that before such an investigation proceeds the necessary steps will be taken to see just where our jurisdiction ends and that of the provincial authorities begins. I would gather, however, from the remarks of two hon. members that we were to avoid duplicating the personnel of that commission—I do not know exactly why, I must admit—and that the personnel of the present lake rates commission is of the right type. If that is so, we naturally feel gratified at having pleased the House, more particularly that portion of it which is intimately associated with grain growing, with the personnel of this commission.

During the last few years not only has the agitation for a further inquiry into the grain trade been continued on the part of the producers themselves after these injunction proceedings were successful, but the Organized Buyers' Association, with headquarters at Moose Jaw, have been doing a great deal of educational work throughout Saskatchewan directed to the necessity of further inquiry, especially from their standpoint as buyers. I have noticed in the press the very radical and extraordinary statements made by them which, if true, should receive very careful attention. I have no doubt that the inquiry by the special committee mentioned in the Speech from the Throne will give representatives of this association an opportunity of being heard. At all events, I hope that will be dealt with when the committee is organized.

Might I state, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion the spirit of this resolution is being complied with by the sessional programme? It is true that the commission to inquire into lake rates touches very slightly the particular matter mentioned in the resolution, but the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which I am about to read is so comprehensive that I think it can be taken to embrace all phases of the grain trade. The only question is whether it is possible to get at the bottom of these matters from one central point like Ottawa, or whether it is necessary to have a commission take evidence throughout the country. This is the paragraph:

> The adverse conditions with which agriculture generally is confronted in many parts of Canada, despite the abundant crops of the past year, render it desirable that a special committee, with powers to make recommendations, be appointed to look into various agricultural matters such as the mixing of grain in private terminal elevators, the marketing of farm porducts,—

[Mr. Motherwell.]

To look into "the marketing of farm products." That is a very broad and comprehensive term. So I think the scope of the committee is quite sufficient to cover every phase and form of grievance. The paragraph concludes:

> —the development of the live stock industry, and the possibilities of further diversification in our Canadian agriculture.

I wish to point out at this stage that the desire of the government in this direction is already shown by the commission which has already been appointed to inquire into lake rates, and by the appointment of a special committee, the personnel of which is almost complete. I have in my pocket the names of all but three of the committee, and its full personnel will be announced, I hope, in the course of another day. The committee will be set to work immediately.

I take the ground that this special committee is necessary even though the grievances were imaginary—which they all are not, of course—simply for the educational value of these investigations. Every few years there is a new body of producers growing up who know nothing about the history of the grain trade or the former investigations of that trade, and who find our grading, inspection and sample systems very mysterious processes indeed. I remember very well in 1901, when I was first associated with the Farmers' movement of that day, going to Winnipeg as the Farmers' representative to inquire into the intricacies and mysteries of the grain exchange. I went with great trepidation, feeling I was entering a den of thieves but to my surprise I found the men engaged in the grain trade were very much like other business men. I got to know David Horne, W. W. Thompson, the warehouse commissioner, and Mr. Searle, our present chief inspector. You cannot find more upright men in any business in Canada. Later on I became acquainted with some of the grain merchants whom you would find on the grain exchange acting like so many madmen. I have no doubt hon. members have all played the parlour game imitating the grain pit, and even this mild game causes quite a lot of excitement; but when millions of bushels of grain are being dealt with the excitement in the pit of the grain exchange is easily accounted for. One can expatiate on the mysteries of the grain trade to people in a country district whose minds are harassed by a hundred other things and suggestively remark what these grain dealers are doing and that their intervention between the producer and consumer might well be dispensed with. Naturally a very bad impres-

sion can be left on the minds of your hearers. I had an opportunity of being in the grain exchange in the city of Budapest, Hungary, and unless I had had a preparatory course in Winnipeg I would have thought that the wildly gesticulating men before me should not be at large. For the sake of its educative value alone the committee referred to in the Speech from the Throne should make its inquiry as exhaustive and complete as possible.

The question of grading and sampling is a very difficult one to handle, but if we can get men of the type of Mr. Searle at the head of affairs we have made a good start in removing the suspicion that the whole business is wrong. Many men entertain the idea that the grading system could be dispensed with altogether. In my youth in Ontario when we had any wheat for sale we took it to the local mill and sold it on sample. The owner and the miller were there, they both dug their hands into the bag, and arrived at a conclusion of the value of the contents. The value was decided by weight only, but it was a matter of negotiation between them, and was in effect a sample market. That practice is all right where the wheat is for domestic use, but for export purposes the quality of your wheat must be designated by grades, and consequently a system of grading has been worked out. The contract grades are Nos. 1, 2 and 3 Northern which are specified by statute. What we call the commercial grades under No. 3 Northern are set from year to year by the Grain Standards Board, and of course these grades fluctuate. No wonder it is all very mysterious to the man who has not been behind the scenes, but at the same time I do not know any better system of grading.

In the United States they have practically the same system, supplemented by what is called the sample market. In a country like the United States, where a large volume of wheat is milled at home, the sample market —in Minneapolis, for instance—is a tremendous factor. But in Canada our alternative markets are not sufficiently numerous to make the sample market a dominating factor; it is the export trade that counts, consequently our chief method of grading must be by statute or by standards board rather than by sample. You will recall that before the war a great agitation arose in the West for a sample market. The multiplicity of grades, running to fifty or sixty in number, the mystery that seemed to surround the establishing of them, the taking of the samples on which they were based, and so on, led to an agitation for a sample market such as they had at Minneapolis. That demand naturally reflected itself in this House in the demand of the western representatives—in 1911 or 1912, I think it was—for provision for a sample market. I do not think it was realized at that time just what a sample market meant.

A sample market cannot be of any appreciable value to anybody, much less the producer, unless those engaged in the trade have the opportunity of mixing the grades and the various wheats. The very essence of it is the buying of wheat which has an excess of virtue over the standard grade and mixing it with lower grade wheat. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in our determination to progress we sometimes take a mistaken step; at times we learn only by finding out that we are wrong. So that action was taken, at the request of the western members of the House, to provide for sample markets—and that always implied mixing, and now we have come back to the old difficulties of twenty-five years ago in connection with these mixing elevators.

Prior to the passing of the old Manitoba Grain Act, which is now the Canada Grain Act, mixing prevailed at Fort William to such an enormous extent that that was one of the causes which led the late Senator Douglas to bring down the bill to which I have referred. It was felt that the mixing process was deteriorating our export wheat to such an extent that the only solution of the difficulty was to stop the business entirely. There was no way of controlling it; therefore they stopped it.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle has stated that mixing should be all right theoretically, because the owners of the mixing houses are required by law to turn out every carload up to the average grade of the public terminal elevator. That sounds pretty reasonable; in fact, it is almost more exacting, you would think, than the result would be in the case of the terminal elevators, because they have to turn out nothing less than the minimum.

Now, I find that quite competent men in the trade, men who are probably better versed in it than any of us here, differ as to the mixing. Of course, a man who is engaged in mixing is invariably in favour of it, otherwise he would not be doing it. The man who grows the grain, especially if he is feeling hard hit at other points, is likely to suspect that there is some immense advantage accruing to the man who does the mixing, with corresponding detriment to the grower himself. Is it possible to take out, say one-third of the best of the wheat, one-third of the contents of a car showing quality over and above the straight grade —is it possible, I say, to take this out and have a residue as good as if there were no

mixing? Let us get it down to a simple illustration that we can all understand: if you had a dozen apples on that table and you took out the six best apples, could you possibly have as good apples remaining as you have taken out? It cannot be done. We may talk wisely about mixing elevators; we may say it is the only system by which export can be kept uniform and that no harm is done to the producer; we may say that on the other hand we are establishing an industry that is so profitable that it will bid up for these off-grade cars and that a part of the benefit will then be transferred to the producer. Well, I will guarantee that there is no hon. gentleman present who, even with the aid of the most powerful X-ray, has ever been able to see any benefit come to the producer as the result of mixing.

I know there are some men who know more about the grain trade than I do who take an exactly opposite position and say that mixing is all right. I know, too, that some of these gentlemen have the complete confidence of the Progressive group—and, indeed, of everybody who knows them. Well, if doctors disagree, who is to decide? It shows the necessity of reviewing this whole question thoroughly before coming to any hasty conclusion. There is nothing to be said against anyone for having carried out the wishes of the West in the matter of the establishment of a sample market. We tried it, and it is only by trying things that you get anywhere.

Mr. SALES: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. minister, but what he says there is not quite correct. At the meeting in June, 1917, when the grain commission decided to put the sample regulations into force, the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the organized farmers of the three prairie provinces, objected to that being done.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not mention it with the idea of blaming anybody. I will put it this way: the western representatives of that day—I cannot recall who they were—thought they were voicing the public sentiment of the West when they agitated in this House for a sample market. It is a reflection on no one; we often have to retrace our steps. There is no other way of trying some things. Take the Hudson Bay railway; there is no way of proving whether or not it is feasible except by trying it.

Mr. STEVENS: May I point out to the hon. minister that when the act was amended providing for sample markets, it was not made obligatory; it was simply laid there for the use of those who desired to have it. It is there to-day and may be used if there is a desire to use it. It was not forced upon an unwilling public.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not the act before me, and I speak subject to correction, but my hon. friend knows that certain changes were made in the act that were construed to mean that the right of mixing went with the sample market. Anyhow, everybody believes in its being practised—

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will permit me, there is an impression going forth from his words, now, I think, in this House, that when the act was amended this parliament placed the seal of approval upon the principle of mixing. I submit to him in all fairness—and I think he will make himself clear on that point—that that is not the case. All they did was to provide, because of a widespread agitation in favour of it, for a sample market.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not aware whether it was the government prior or subsequent to 1911 that was responsible for it, but that is immaterial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was years after. The sample market was not created till about 1914 or 1915.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Anyhow, the point is that the sample market means nothing unless it implies mixing; there is no question about that. It is a dead letter otherwise, and I think a great many people did not understand that. I am not trying to reflect on anybody; I am simply trying to give the facts. If there is any construction to be placed on my remarks, they are of an extenuating nature with regard to anybody who was responsible. I happen to have taken the other side, and I have taken it all my life. You cannot eat your cake and have it; you cannot take the good out of your wheat and have as much good remain in the residue. It has often surprised me, Mr. Speaker, that this custom of mixing has not been complained of more in the United Kingdom. I can recall the time when my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle went overseas and found, as others have found, that our wheat arrived there in a very satisfactory condition, but the whole, or I will say, three-quarters of the milling trade of eastern Canada will not order out of those mixing elevators if they can get wheat out of the ordinary terminals. Do you think they do not know when they get value? Is it possible for a miller who has been in the business for years not to know what kind of raw product makes the best flour? I am told by the secretary of the Dominion Mil-

lers' Association himself, who is to-day in Ottawa, that the milling industries of the East avoid buying out of these mixing elevators every time they can. That may not apply this year, because there is nothing bad to mix with the good wheat, for 70 per cent or more of the wheat of the West this year is No. 1 Northern, and it is nearly all in the contract grades. Consequently, mixing has gone out of business this year, because there is nothing to mix; but almost every other year you have enough low grade stuff to mix with the virtue in the high grade stuff. I have often wondered how men who should and do know infinitely more about the grain trade than I can ever possibly hope to do without going into it, can argue on behalf of mixing from the standpoint of the producer.

Mr. STEVENS: Then is it the intention of the government this year to amend the act so as to prohibit mixing and to eliminate entirely the so-called mixing elevators?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That will depend, I presume, on the report of the special committee, to which every facility will be afforded to get to the bottom of this question. Those gentlemen who believe in mixing will have the opportunity to give a reason for the faith that is in them, and those holding the contrary opinion will also have an opportunity to be heard, so that we can get to the bottom of this question. Then I presume that parliament will act as it usually does, on the recommendations of the special committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the government's mind is made up so firmly as the hon. gentleman represents, why make further inquiry?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am only giving my own personal view. The question was raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, and quite properly so, and I am simply saying that gentlemen in the trade whom I know, as well as others not in the trade, hold exactly the opposite view. Consequently, we must move with the greatest caution. We should consider the matter thoroughly and get to the bottom of it. In the multitude of counsellors surely there is wisdom; I do not think that any one man has all the wisdom on this very involved and intricate question.

Just a few words on the question of grades. This year there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in the West regarding the grading system. I can remember that in the year 1901 there was similar dissatisfaction. Every time that we have a good crop, as in 1901 or 1922, the average man knows that it is good, but sometimes before he can get his grain threshed, climatic conditions intervene, and while the grain is still in the stook it is so badly bleached that it grades as No. 3 Northern. We cannot see the point of it. Wheat that at the beginning of the season graded No. 1 Northern and sometimes No. 1 Hard, after one or two snowstorms, or perhaps even a rainstorm and exposure for five or six weeks in the stook, would be graded as No. 3 Northern. The miller will tell you the reason.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: How do you account for wheat grading tough when there never was any rain except in June? Along the Red River valley we had most of our threshing done before the rains, but after one rainstorm in the West our grain was graded as tough.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I had a note on the tough question, and it is a tough question, but first with respect to the bleaching. I may say that the questions of bleached grain and tough grain are the two outstanding questions around which so much dissatisfaction revolves. The exterior of the grain is so wrinkled and bleached with the weather —sometimes I have seen grain actually frozen in the stook after it had been dry enough to thresh—that it looks as if it had been frozen before it was cut. No miller can extract as high a percentage of flour out of that grain as he could if it was not wrinkled. It has lost part of its commercial value, because there is no machinery for getting the maximum amount of flour out of it. But that is a miller's question. I can understand why the wheat would be graded down, although I did not at one time in my life. The wheat being mine I naturally saw it with a friendly eye, and I could not see how wheat that was perfectly good at the outset when it was cut was going to deteriorate in six weeks. I wanted the grade the wheat was at the outset.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I do not think the minister got my question right.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am coming to that, but I am leaving the tough question till the last. I have had the opportunity, might I say, for over thirty years of being closely identified with the grading of grain, through being a member of the Western Grain Standards Board, and every year except last I was able to attend its annual meeting in Winnipeg. I think there is more real abuse in the disposition of that tough grain than in anything else I know. What are the facts?

I have just forgotten the percentage of moisture that is permitted in wheat—

Mr. SALES: Fourteen per cent.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think we follow largely the practice of the United States, and I think they operate on the basis of 13 or 14 per cent. If there is excess moisture over that, it is graded as no-grade or as tough; it is moist, or it is tough. There are two degrees of toughness: one is slightly tough, and the other is so tough that it has to go to the dryer. There are thousands, and in some years, tens of thousands, of bushels of wheat with so little excess moisture that even though it goes no-grade, it can still be mixed with perfectly dry grain, which absorbs the moisture, and it all goes as straight grade. Every hon. member knows that. Well now, if my hon. friends were in the business, I have no doubt they would say that that was a fine way of dealing with this no-grade stuff. Here you have a dry wheat with a slight amount of moisture below the maximum, and here you have one with an excess of moisture. What is to prevent you mixing the two and producing a straight grade. At the last Standards Board meeting I was at, this question was very thoroughly discussed, and particularly in its relation to sprouted grain. What amount of sprouted grain is going to condemn a No. 1 and a No. 2 Northern and drive it into a No. 3? It is a very fine question as to how are you going to define many of these points by law; it has to be left to the fairness or honour of the chief inspector and his subordinates. We should not leave any more to them than we possibly can, but there are some points that are extremely difficult of definition in law. For example, would you say that if there was one kernel of sprouted wheat in a bushel you should throw it into No. 3 Northern? Well, that is a matter of judgment. If the wheat was uniformly good and very superior in other respects the inspector might permit that to go into No. 2 Northern. If he does not, the grain must go into No. 3, although it is otherwise good grain. It is the same with tough wheat.

Mr. STEVENS: I think my hon. friend said a moment ago that he had been for a great many years a member of the standards bureau.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A member of the Western Grain Standards Board.

Mr. STEVENS: I think it would be very instructive and interesting to the House if the minister would explain how this board fixes the standard from year to year. It would largely explain many of the technical points he has been discussing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I should be very pleased to but I want to try and get through by six o'clock. I would leave that subject until the last if my hon. friend will permit me.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a very important question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Tougher than the tough. We can continue the discussion after dinner. In the meantime let me just finish my story. I have a few notes here jotted down as hon. gentlemen opposite were speaking.

Getting back to the tough grain, that is the grain that has just sufficient excess moisture in it to make it go straight grade. How should we legislate with respect to that? Should we prohibit that going into the straight grade? If you did that you would inevitably reduce its value to the man who buys it. It is a big problem and I just leave the matter there. It shows that the question is one which cannot be dealt with offhand. It is very complex and very involved, and it would take the united wisdom of the whole of this committee to bring about an improvement. However I think improvement can be made in the law.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle said that even apart from the benefits that may be expected to spring from an investigation, the question of improving the morale of our people on the farm is well worth considering. I think I am safe in saying, without laying myself open to the accusation of anything like pessimism, that the morale of the people on the land throughout the whole civilized world, and not merely this country, is low. Anything that can be done to remove either real or imaginary grievances should be done. An imaginary grievance is often nearly as bad as a real one to the man who cherishes it, and we should not be intolerant of people when we find out their grievances are imaginary. I was closely associated with the grain trade for years, and I can appreciate the difficulties that arise when you are dealing with a question so involved. I never saw anybody yet who, on his first glimpse of it, was not ready to be permeated with suspicion because he did not understand it. The more one understands the intricacies of the grain trade, the more a lot of these mysterious things of which complaint is made disappear because they are capable then of being understood.

I am well acquainted with Mr. Searle, Mr. Horne and Mr. W. W. Thompson, the latter an octogenarian whose honour is above reproach. These are some of the men engaged in the grain trade. I hold no brief for them, but I think some of those who make charges are in the same position to-day that I was twenty-five years ago when I thought that no good thing could come out of the grain exchange.

Now let me endeavour to comply briefly with the request of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Just as soon as the crop is sufficiently dry to thresh action is taken. I may say that the low grade grain, as a rule, is slower in drying than good grain, with the result that it is usually the middle of October—from that to the 20th—when the inspection department, through its various agencies secures samples of the grain from every important area throughout the Canadian west. Those samples are obtained from the threshing machines through the various channels through which we have been getting them for years. As soon as they are secured the various members of the Grain Standards Board, composed of millers, dealers, and farmers, some of whom have been serving for twenty-five years, are notified by the secretary, Mr. C. N. Bell, that the annual meeting will be held in the city of Winnipeg at a given date to fix the standards for that year. When the board meets the bags are all arranged. There are fifty or sixty bags in approximate grades. Then the members of the board proceed each with a bucket or tin to go round to the different bags, each bag having a number to indicate that it was the one from which the sample was taken. They start we will say, at No. 4, that is the first commercial grade under No. 3, and the members of the board go about and build up from the samples from various districts as near as possible to the No. 4 of the previous year, and yet having entirely different characteristics. The year before it might have been a No. 4 because, we will say, of rust—thin, meager, lean stuff, but still of quite a good color. Or it might have been graded as No. 4 because of frost. That makes it a very difficult thing sometimes to get a standard sample of the same commercial value as the standard sample for the year previous. It is quite an involved business collecting standards, but that is the way it is done. We bring the wheat into the north light and spread it on the table. Three or four samples of the same grade are selected. Then they are set out in the light and compared in order to determine which comes nearest to the No. 4 sample of the year before. Next the samples are tested in the scales for weight, and finally we have a vote on the matter and that decides the grade for No. 4 for the current year. We do the same in the case of No. 5 and No. 6. Before we do No. 5 we take all the sacks from which samples were taken—a tin pailful having been taken from a number in succession—and empty them on the floor in a big pile and mix them up together. After giving them a thorough mixing we take a sample from it and compare it with what we chose before, and if they are similar—that is to say if the sample taken when the bags are emptied is similar to that taken from the respective tin pails—a vote is taken and the grade decided upon.

That briefly is the procedure. I have seen articles in the press making great sport of it. A person with a sense of humour and an active pen can ridicule anything especially something that he knows nothing about. However we have not been able to devise a better means. The only difficulty has been that as the result of rust or frost in order to get the samples graded properly you had to add a certain amount of low grade wheat. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle and the rest of the hon. members for the West will understand why and how that is done. But in order to meet that situation one year we had two series of low grades, one low grade series, Nos. 4, 5 and 6, as a result of frost and a corresponding series of low grades as a result of rust. And there you are. There are the two of them; you pay your money and take your choice. In the actual working out it was found that when they went on the markets of the world the prices of the two were practically indentical and the result was we never tried that dual system again.

I think I have covered all the ground, and I want to express my appreciation of the moderate manner in which the whole question has been discussed, and also to assure the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, that the spirit of his resolution has either been or is being complied with. When the matter comes up for inquiry before the special committee, if it is found that their facilities for research are so limited that they cannot get at the bottom of it, it will be their privilege to make a recommendation, and go as far as they can. The sample markets are still get-at-able. A great many phases of the matter are capable of thorough investigation, but if it is found it cannot be dealt with, either on account of insufficient time, or from being operated from one centre or from another, then it will be within the province of that committee to make a recommendation accordingly, and any recommendation made, either in the direction of a fuller and more favourable investiga-

tion, or otherwise, I am sure, will receive full consideration by the government of the day. Whatever becomes of this resolution, I may say that I do not feel strongly about it, as I think that the spirit of the resolution has been complied with. I do not think harm will be done if it passes. I leave the matter with my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.): It is not my purpose to prolong the debate, but I would associate myself with the mover and seconder of the motion. No hon. member who has sat in this House for the last three or four years, and certainly no member who was here last year, will doubt that there have been some abuses of the Grain Act and in the handling of that very important commodity which contributes so largely to the wealth of Canada. I think the government would be well advised to inquire thoroughly into the matter. As regards the method that should be pursued, not being so well acquainted with the grain business as are my hon. friends from the West I do not, of course, feel like making any very definite suggestions. I should think, however, that if it is found that the scope of the committee which it is proposed to appoint is not adequate—and I doubt very much whether a parliamentary committee could deal fully with the subject—the government should appoint a commission to go thoroughly into all the circumstances in order that the investigation might be as complete as possible. However, as I have said, I do not intend to offer any suggestions in that direction.

I intervene in the debate especially to urge upon the government the advisability of extending the scope of the investigation to the marketing of all farm products, particularly those raised for export, instead of confining it to wheat or grain alone. We have a serious situation in eastern Canada. While we do not grow wheat for export, we grow a crop that is as important to us as wheat is to the West. And at the present time the outlook for the potato growers of eastern Canada is serious indeed as a result of some things that possibly are beyond our control, although there are some contributing factors that can be remedied by action on the part of the government. During the past summer the government established a frost-proof warehouse at the port of St. John to facilitate the export trade to Cuba. I might say that it became necessary for me to do a great deal of work this summer towards getting the project carried through. I am not blaming the government, but they had information that this frost-proof warehouse was not necessary at St. John, and that information came from persons who were interested in cornering the potato export trade of New Brunswick. When I came to Ottawa and explained the situation the government, I think, were fully seized with the importance of providing these facilities at St. John.

But we are faced with what is possibly a more serious difficulty. While the United States market was open to us our shipping problem was a fairly simple one; we just shipped by the carload. But since that market has been closed to us by the American emergency tariff, Cuba has been practically the only outlet for any quantity of our potatoes. I urged upon the government last spring, apart from the providing of these facilities at St. John, the importance of giving us a regular service of the Government Merchant Marine between St. John and Cuba. I would make that representation even stronger now, because my worst fears have been realized with regard to transportation from St. John to that island. In order to ship potatoes from St. John to Cuba our shippers must charter a vessel and load it with potatoes. If they cannot fill all the space with potatoes they must pay for it anyway. This puts the export business in potatoes into the hands of a few of the largest shippers of New Brunswick. The smaller shippers are practically shut out because they cannot charter and load a vessel at each trip.

There is another condition to be contended with in Cuba; and while we have no control over the actual trade in Cuba I believe that regular sailings from St. John would enable us to overcome the difficulty from this end. To-day there is a combine in Cuba that handles possibly two-thirds of the trade in potatoes on that island. I know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), were he in his place, could verify the statement I am about to make, that there are a number of independent wholesale potato dealers in Cuba outside the combine who have been unable to get supplies from our exporters in New Brunswick because the Cuban combine, to whom our exporters have been shipping, absolutely refuses to take delivery of any potatoes from a vessel if there are any potatoes on it for one of the independent dealers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but I would call his attention to the fact that he is not speaking

to the resolution. The question before the House has reference to the conditions of grain marketing, and the hon. member is speaking on some other subject. I would ask him to bring his remarks into conformity with the resolution.

Mr. CALDWELL: I certainly bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I was merely urging the government not to limit the scope of the inquiry to grain alone, and was endeavouring to show the necessity for making it comprehensive enough to embrace the subject to which I was referring. I should like to have an assurance from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), that when the proposed committee begins its deliberations, or when the commission, if the government decide to appoint one, is constituted, I may have leave to submit this matter for consideration. I thought this an opportune time to bring to the attention of the government the fact that there are other important exports in Canada besides grain, in the handling of which there are great abuses.

Hon. C. A. STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Needless to say, the department over which I, for the time being, have control, is very vitally interested in this question. Indeed, so vitally interested are we that it is the one field that is left open, under the provisions of the Immigration Act as it stands to-day, for which we may secure settlers. Owing to the occupational test and the fact that there has not been employment for intending immigrants to Canada, and the fact that those immigrants whom we are trying to induce to come to this country must be of the agricultural class, or domestic servants, any matter that affects agriculture is of vital importance to the Department of Immigration.

It is needless to say that in these days of readjustment agriculture is suffering more severely than any other industry in this country. It is desirable that this unfortunate condition of affairs should be changed, and with a view to ascertaining if some remedies at least might be applied through the agency of government, you find in the Speech from the Throne that a special committee is to be appointed as wide in scope as that requested by my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Caldwell). When proposing this inquiry it was not the intention of the government that it should be confined to the one subject of grain marketing, but rather that it should cover the wider field of all agricultural activities. My hon. friend who has brought forward this resolution (Mr. Millar) has introduced a question that is not at all new, and in my remarks to-night I shall confine myself to his resolution.

His contention is that a special committee of this House would have neither the facilities nor the power to make the inquiry necessary to enable them to recommend a solution of the problem. Two features appealed to the government in discussing this matter. There is no desire on our part to circumscribe the inquiry in the slightest degree either with respect to the marketing of grain or to any other matter that hon. members may be desirous of having investigated as being of importance to agriculture. But we have had commissions in the past dealing with this very question, and it will be remembered that the one last appointed came to a somewhat untimely end not very long ago.

There are a few difficulties of grain marketing which it is doubtful if we can remove. Ten or twelve years ago I was directly interested in marketing grain, and I found that there is one type of farmer whom it is very difficult to protect, namely, the man who takes his grain and sells it on the street or to the local elevator. I have not yet heard of any scheme that will protect him, nor do I know whether one can be devised. We who raise and market grain in western Canada know how serious a problem that is to deal with. This year during the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) I had the pleasure of looking after his department and I did not let any opportunity pass to facilitate the movement of grain. The sending of the commission to Vancouver to investigate when a blockade seemed imminent was for the purpose of keeping that outlet open if at all possible. We took some chances in that connection, and one hon. member told you the other evening that the transfer of bills of lading to allow the loading of grain freely at the port of Vancouver assisted very materially in overcoming the threatened blockade. The cleaning of grain and its storage in the Calgary elevator also helped. We are anxious to maintain the flow freely to the Pacific coast, but that does not help the very large number of farmers who sell by the wagon load throughout the whole season. Indeed, when a blockade occurs, as any farmer knows, they are the men who suffer most severely, and usually they are most remote from the points at which they market their grain. Therefore any drop in price affects those who usually can least stand the loss. But frankly, I doubt if any of us would be able to secure evidence that would assist that class of farmers.

Then the inquiry resolves itself into an investigation of the inspection and the mixing

of grain. The man who ships his carload of grain, and is not satisfied with the return he gets can have the transaction reviewed. You may strengthen your inspectional system, and with that I do not intend to deal.

There is a great difference of opinion on the question of the sample markets, but what I had in mind when discussing this matter in government circles was that within the confines of the membership of this House, within the confines even of the Progressive membership, there are men who know every phase of the marketing conditions surrounding wheat. I do not believe that a commission will be able to secure any new evidence bearing upon those conditions. But a committee can summon before it the grain commissioners and the grain operators, and it can get the outturn of the mixing houses as well as of the larger elevators at Fort William. It rather goes to confirm what I have always had in the back of my head in connection with grain marketing or the fixing of our samples. With all due respect to my good friend, when I was handling grain actively in western Canada I always had a suspicion that the grades upon which we sold our grain were fixed too high, with consequent detriment to the farmer who had grain to sell. I may be wrong about that. However, while I had charge of the Department of Trade and Commerce I wired my colleague (Mr. Robb) to get samples off the Liverpool market, in order, as suggested by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) that we might have them before us for comparison when discussing the matter. Those samples will be here for the inspection of members of this committee, and we will secure all evidence available from the sources where the difficulty originates, namely, in the inspection and mixing. With that evidence before us we will endeavour to improve these facilities, if they are capable of improvement, and we will do it this session even if it requires an amendment to the Grain Act. If that evidence is not sufficient—and undoubtedly hon. members of this House will be prepared to give evidence and to suggest what evidence might be brought here of an expert character—then the government stand ready and willing to go to any length to settle, if at all possible, this very vexed question.

In my opinion we were wise, on the evidence we had in hand, to appoint a commission to investigate the lake shipping combine that we think exists to the detriment of the western farmer, and we are willing to carry on an investigation that will help to solve his difficulties in connection with the growing and marketing of his grain. The question is whether it would be better to start a commission at once upon the inquiry. I have attended many sittings of these commissions, and some of the material dealt with is not of very much value; they frequently wander very far from the point when it comes to evidence that is gathered indiscriminately. But this committee can decide what evidence is vital and what concerns should be brought here. The grain board itself should be here to show the net result of a year's operations, and with this and other information we can judge whether or not we have, through this process, been milked to a very large extent in connection with grain marketing.

Let me say this further thing: In the years when I was actively interested in this matter, we were furnished with Canadian samples and secured standard samples for grading in Minneapolis, and invariably, not upon expert test but with the naked eye, a difference of one grade could be observed between our standard and that of the American sample. I have not examined samples in recent years, but I assume that the same condition would exist to-day. My contention is that those who fixed the standards for the Canadian grain trade fixed them too high, with resulting detriment to the producer. When we get the samples from Liverpool we shall be able to compare them with the samples upon which our grain is graded in western Canada, and in that way I think we can arrive quickly and definitely at a conclusion as to what will be necessary to assist in the settling of this rather vexed question.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): Mr. Speaker I do not wish to make any lengthy remarks on this subject, for I do not know very much about the mixing of grain, although I am the son of a farmer. But I would like to ask the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) if he would add to his resolution, after the word "grain" in the first paragraph, the words "and potatoes." I do not believe he will refuse to grant that request. The reason why I ask him to do that is this. Our American friends are coming over to New Brunswick for potato seed. It seems that we are growing the best potatoes in Canada, and our difficulty—just as it is with the grain growers—is the necessity for an improved system of marketing our potato seed. I would ask my hon. friend, therefore, to include these words in his motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that when the mover of the resolution speaks, he closes the debate. If, therefore, any hon. member wishes to address the House on the subject, he should do so now.

Mr. MICHAUD: If I may be allowed, in case my hon. friend does not like to make the amendment I suggest, I would propose it myself.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to spend very much time in closing the debate. There seems to be a unanimity of opinion in regard to the necessity for an investigation.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has just said that a commission of this nature could not bring out very much new evidence. It is some years since an investigation of this kind was held, and all the time our system has been changing. The mixing elevator system, methods of mixing grain, the transfer of cars and many other evils have grown up since the last investigation took place, and I feel quite sure that even those in this House who are best posted on the subject cannot say that they know all about these matters, or that they know what allegations are true and what are not. Several charges have been made; and none of us are certain as to their accuracy. We shall make a great mistake if we base legislations on rumors or hearsay; we should have the actual facts before us.

The hon. minister stated also that he believed our present grades were too high. I must disagree with him in that respect; I do not think we suffer from that. If one raises a superior grade of grain, it is hardly just that he should not receive the better price. If his very best grain is thrown into something which is poor, naturally he must take the average of the good and the bad. The man who raises No. 2 Northern is not injured in the least if his neighbour raises grain that is one grade better and receives a little better price.

The last speaker asked that the words "and potatoes" be added to the resolution. Personally I have not a very strong objection to the addition of these words. But it may be suggested that those who are appointed to investigate the grain trade would naturally be men who are posted in that trade, and I was wondering whether they would have the necessary insight into and knowledge of the problems which my hon. friend has in mind. I was wondering whether that matter could not be brought before the special committee. If that, however, is not satisfactory to my hon. friend, and if it is thought by the House that it would be best to have the two subjects investigated by the same commission, I would offer no objection to the addition of the words suggested.

I have nothing more to say, except in regard to the personnel of the commission. I am convinced that it is very necessary to have men on this commission who are well posted on the grain trade. I am not sure that it is always wise to depend on a lawyer to act as solicitor for a commission after its appointment. I remember one experience where one of the best lawyers in Winnipeg was engaged, a man well known throughout Canada, than whom for ability in his chosen profession I believe there is none better, yet I have seen him badly tied up when dealing face to face with the expert members of the grain exchange. He admitted to me that his knowledge did not go deep enough. He could get at the information on the surface, but when it came down to the difficult matters, the men who were dealing on the exchange day after day and knew all the ramifications of the business could twist and turn and get away from him. He admitted that to me more than once. I just mention that lest it might be thought that any men in whom the public had confidence, whether they had an intimate knowledge of the grain trade or not, might be trusted to do this work provided they had a competent lawyer to act as solicitor. I do not think that would be wise.

I am willing to insert the words "and potato" before the word "trade" and also before the word "marketing" in the last paragraph.

Motion as amended agreed to.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

MOTION BY MR. WOODSWORTH FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CANADA'S CLAIMS

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interest of world peace that Canada should withdraw all claims on Germany for reparations.

He said: One perhaps almost hesitates to introduce a motion of such far-reaching importance as this, on a question on which there has been comparatively little discussion in our Canadian press. However, anyone who has been following the situation at all as it has been discussed in the Old Country papers must recognize that we in Canada have a certain responsibility with regard to the Old World situation. I feel that since we were asked to participate in the great world war we ought to have some voice at this time in

deciding what our policy toward European affairs shall be, and especially as to our attitude toward the Peace Treaty of Versailles which concluded the war, and which in the judgment of a great many is very largely responsible for the chaotic conditions that prevail in Europe to-day.

I cannot discuss this resolution without discussing to a certain extent at least the Peace Treaty of Versailles, and also the war itself. One difficulty is that our Canadian people have had comparatively little discussion of the various aspects of affairs in Europe during and since the war. We have been perhaps inclined to say: Great Britain is at war, or Great Britain has adopted such and such a policy, and we must follow the lead of Great Britain. I think perhaps the time has come when we ought rather to say: Since we have a certain responsibility in this matter, we must think out these questions for ourselves, and determine each on its own merits. I remember very well being in England during the time of the Boer war and hearing its merits discussed very freely in halls of various kinds, as well as reading the discussions in the newspapers. As you all know, at that time Lloyd George was among those who were bitterly opposed to the Boer war, and I think later events have shown that he was in the right. On my return to Canada, after the war was over, it was almost a shock to find that the people of this country had absolutely refused to consider any other than the one point of view. They said "England is at war, we must rush to her defence"; and apparently they were greatly perturbed if anyone suggested that there could be any other policy than that which happened to have been adopted by the party which was then in power.

Now with reference to the reasons alleged why we went to war. We were told that we went to war because Germany invaded Belgium, and it was only later that we discovered that Canada had been committed to war two or three days before Germany invaded Belgium. I think the Americans, probably, have been greatly excited during the last few months since they have learned more definitely the cargo that the Lusitania bore; not that anyone is exonerating Germany for the attack, but they are understanding a little bit more fully some of the circumstances that surround the various events of the war.

Further we ought to remember very clearly that whilst certain policies may be arrived at in Great Britain, these may in fact represent the conclusions of only a small section of the British people—possibly the conclusions only of her diplomats or her great financiers. Some of us take the ground here that the interests of the common people of this country are not identical with the interests of the moneyed kings of this country; and a great many of the people of England, as shown by the last election, are also taking the ground that we ought not to follow the great financial leaders of Great Britain. If we criticize British policy, we are criticizing the policy not of the great masses of the people of Great Britain but the policy of a certain definite section of the people of that country.

Further I think, perhaps, it were well that when we refer to Germany we should, as far as possible, dispel from our minds the idea of the Germany which was conjured up during the war. Germany is no more a single entity than is Great Britain. Rather is it composed of a very large number of sections of people, very widely diverse in character. The Germany of the junkers and the war lords is one Germany and, I think, a Germany that very few of us here have any use for. But that is not the Germany of a large majority of the people. I remember that even during the heat of the war there was one man, at least, who stood up in the Reichstag and there suggested that war credits should not be voted, Karl Liebnecht, who was at that time hailed as being the bravest man in Europe. He represented another type of Germany, a type that was at that time protesting against the carrying on of the war.

However, I should not like to think so much of the Germany of the past, but rather to call attention to the fact that we have to deal since the war with a new Germany. Some among us have said that the Kaiser was responsible for the war, but we must remember that the Kaiser has been deposed, that the German people themselves have repudiated him and some of the war lords that were associated with him, and the policies which they represent. We are dealing with another Germany than the Germany that went to war. More than that—and this is the most important point it seems to me that at this stage we should keep in view—the indemnities which were saddled upon Germany by the Peace Treaty of Versailles are to be extended throughout the life time of another generation. Little German girls and boys playing around —if they play in Germany these days—are to be asked to pay reparations which simply means to give of their time and effort to pay for what men, for whom they had no responsibility whatever, were guilty of. And as we look forward to these payments extending away along through the years to come, it seems to me we may well pause and ask whether it is right, whether it is in the in-

terests of world peace, that we should attempt to carry out a programme of this character.

I should like to place this resolution frankly on the basis of the interests of world peace. We must rise above the old war-time viewpoint of one nation or empire set against another nation or empire, and think of the actual situation as it presents itself to-day and the extent to which we can establish a greater measure of good will and peace in the world of to-day. I take it that the Treaty of Versailles which closed the war was based on the theory of Germany's sole responsibility for the war, and I must ask your indulgence if I go into the matter a little on this point. Lloyd George said on March 3, 1921:

> For the Allies, German responsibility for the war is fundamental. It is the basis upon which the structure of the treaty at Versailles has been erected, and if that acknowledgement is repudiated or abandoned, the treaty is destroyed. We wish, therefore, once and for all, to make it quite clear that German responsibility for the war must be treated by the Allies as a chose jugée.

But murder will out. You cannot always fool the people in these great concerns, and the publications which have been given to the world in recent years will, I think, indicate clearly to any unprejudiced man who studies the documents that are brought to our notice that Germany should not bear the blame forced upon her in the Peace Treaty because she is not solely responsible for the war. I am not standing here as in any sense whatever exonerating Germany for the dastardly part she played in the war—I want that to be clearly understood—but at the same time I say that we must not hold Germany solely responsible for it. Mr. A. J. Nock in a little book The Myth of a Guilty Nation which may be found in the Parliamentary Library has summarized the statements which have been given to the world recently. I may say that these statements are well documented if any of you are interested in reading them or in trying to follow them out in detail. Let me give these statements in brief:

> 1. The British and French General Staffs had been in active collaboration for war with Germany ever since January, 1906.
>
> 2. The British and French Admiralty had been in similar collaboration.
>
> 3. The late Lord Fisher (First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty), twice in the course of these preparations, proposed an attack upon the German fleet and a landing upon the coast of Pomerania, without a declaration of war.
>
> 4. Russia had been preparing for war ever since 1909, and the Russian and French General Staffs had come to a formal understanding that Russian mobilization should be held equivalent to a declaration of war.
>
> 5. Russian mobilization was begun in the spring of 1914, under the guise of "tests," and these tests were carried on continuously to the outbreak of the war.
>
> 6. In April, 1914, four months before the war, the Russian and French naval authorities initiated joint plans for maritime operations against Germany.
>
> 7. Up to the outbreak of the war, Germany was selling grain in considerable quantities to both France and Russia.
>
> 8. It cannot be shown that the German government ever in a single instance, throughout all its dealings with foreign governments, demanded or intimated for Germany anything more than a position of economic equality with other nations.

Mr. Lloyd George said on December 23, 1920:

> The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before the first of August, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they glided, or rather, staggered or stumbled, perhaps through folly, and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it.

Here we have a man occupying a most responsible position in the British Empire, a man who is credited with having done more than any other man in the prosecution of the war, coming out after the war is all over and saying that they simply stumbled into it, and that a discussion might have prevented it. Ex-Premier Nitti, in his book, Peaceless Europe, says—and he was another, let us remember, who was in the midst of things, and who had inside knowledge of what was transpiring at the time of the Peace Treaty, and who has intimate knowledge of the events of the war:

> When our countries were engaged in the struggle, and we were at grips with a dangerous enemy, it was our duty to keep up the morale of our people and to paint our adversaries in the darkest colours, laying on their shoulders all the blame and responsibility of the war, but after the world conflict, now that Imperial Germany has fallen, it would be absurd to maintain that the responsibility of the war is solely and wholly attributable to Germany and that earlier in 1914 in Europe there had not developed a state of things fatally destined to culminate in a war.

Let me again remind you that it was in the Peace Treaty of Versailles, that we had the arrangement with regard to reparations which we deal with in our resolution. It was the very basis of that Treaty of Versailles that Germany was solely and wholly responsible for the war, a position that is abandoned by at least two of the premiers responsible for the drafting of that treaty. Now it is quite obvious that we in Canada are in a position—

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. member tell me who those premiers were?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Lloyd George was one and Nitti the other.

Mr. VIEN: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Lloyd George stated that Germany was not responsible for the war?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I shall read again, if I must, the passage which I have already quoted to the House.

> The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before the 1st of August, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly, and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it.

That is very different from his earlier statements of a great conspiracy of which Germany has been guilty. It is very different from the thought that Germany is, as Premier Nitti had said, wholly and solely responsible for the war.

In Canada, during the war, we had no opportunity, as neither had other nations, to discuss the real causes of the war; in fact, it became a crime to discuss the causes of the war. Quoting the law, I find the provision:

> It shall be an offence to print, publish or publicly express an adverse or unfavourable statement, report or opinion concerning the causes of the present war, or the motives or purpose for which Canada or the United Kingdom of Great Britain or Ireland, or any of the Allied nations entered upon, or are prosecuting the same, which may tend to arouse hostile feeling, create unrest, or unsettle, or inflame public opinion.

Now that the war is over we have an opportunity almost for the first time to discuss publicly the real causes of the war, and perhaps we do so even yet in a spirit of prejudice which it is extremely difficult for any of us to overcome, it is only the seriousness of the situation in Europe which forces us to enter upon a question of this kind.

As to responsibilty for war, might I call to your attention a very excellent pamphlet, which some of you probably have, published by Mr. John S. Ewart, K.C., entitled Canada and British Wars. Few of us have had the opportunity of studying closely the many documents which have been put forward in recent years. We all recognize that Mr. Ewart is a very profound student of constitutional history and of European affairs. Mr. Ewart distinguishes between what is called the predisposing causes and the precipitating causes. Let me quote a paragraph or two with regard to the predisposing causes, the general situation which existed in Europe when the war broke out—

> As already indicated, distinction ought to be made between the predisposing causes—I prefer to call these the roots—of the war, and the precipitating causes. The whole subject is much too large for treatment here. I must content myself with stating—very shortly, and therefore, inadequately,—the conclusions, at which, after prolonged study of the immense mass of material now available, I have arrived.
>
> 1. The chief of the predisposing causes in western Europe was the desire of France to repossess herself of Alsace Lorraine, which had been taken from her in a war which she had precipitated.
>
> 2. The chief of the predisposing causes in eastern Europe was the inclusion of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. For the inception of that situation (Berlin Conference 1878), the United Kingdom and Austria-Hungary were principally responsible. For its development Austria-Hungary was alone responsible.
>
> 3. The predisposing causes, as between the United Kingdom and Germany were (1) German competition in manufactures, trade, mercantile marine, and war navy; (2) the substitution of Germany for France (the British traditional enemy in western Europe) as the potential aggressor upon Belgium and Holland, and the consequent establishment of a menace upon the North Sea coasts; and (3) the substitution of Germany for Russia (the British traditional enemy in eastern Europe) as the potential aggressor upon Constantinople and India.
>
> 4. A general predisposing cause was the erection of Europe into two vast military camps, for which all the Great Powers were, in varying degrees, responsible.

In giving the situation which prevailed immediately on the eve of the war, let me turn to Lord Loreburn, who was in a splendid position to know the situation. He says—

> Serbia gave to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, cause of just offence, as our ambassador frankly admits in his published dispatches. We (England) had no concern in that quarrel, as Sir Edward Grey says in terms. But Russia, the protectress of Serbia, came forward to prevent her being utterly humiliated by Austria. We were not concerned in that quarrel either, as Sir Edward also says. And then Russia called upon France under their treaty to help in the fight. France was not concerned in that quarrel any more than ourselves, as Sir Edward informs us. But France was bound by a Russian treaty, of which we did not know the terms, and then France called on us for help. We were tied by the relations which our Foreign Office had created, without apparently realizing that they had created them.

Reference is here made to those secret treaties, which were not known to the world generally until they were published
9 p.m. by the Bolshevik who had obtained access to the archives in Petrograd. I have never yet seen these secret treaties published in any Canadian newspaper. They were first published, I think, in England in the Manchester Guardian, a reliable old paper which we all know. They were not sent broadcast to this country, and there are those who do not yet know of the serious nature of these treaties, which had a great deal to do with tying us to France and Russia and thus preventing us from acting at the moment when possibly war might have been avoided. But we have to deal with other treaties which were made in the course of the war. I want to quote from a man whom I regard as a high authority, Mr. E. D. Morel, who, by the way, it is of interest to remark,

defeated Mr. Winston Churchill. And this was one of the questions which were to the fore in the recent elections in Great Britain. Mr. Morel, in Foreign Affairs, says:

In this period it has been demonstrated by the acts of the Allied governments that our people were grossly deceived in respect to the motives proclaimed by those governments in waging the war and in rejecting overtures of peace.

For all those to whom authentic information was accessible, the demonstration had been complete long before the end of the war. From the date of the secret treaties between the Allies, the war became a war for loot.

Mr. Lloyd George, speaking at the Queen's Hall, August 4, 1917, said:

What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations; carefully, skilfully, insidiously, clandestinely plotted in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination.

To continue:

And that was very early in the day, although their existence only became known (in part) at the end of 1917, through the Manchester Guardian. It is doubtful whether the general public ever knew of them at all, i.e., in any comprehensive sense. Secret negotiations began between the Allied governments for the division of enemy territory and resources almost immediately after the war broke out. By the spring of 1915 the British government had consented to the Tsardom realising its secular ambition, i.e., the acquisition of Constantinople and the Straits, receiving in exchange a large slice of Persian territory—Persia not even being an enemy; Italy had been induced to enter the war by a treaty ensuring the break-up of Austria-Hungary, with large territorial concessions to Italy in Europe and in Asia. All through 1915 and the summer of 1916 the bargaining with Rumania continued, and was finally concluded in August of that year, which also saw the conclusion of the secret bargain with Japan at China's expense. By the spring of 1917, Russia and France had made their arrangements for the division of Germany, which would have brought Russian Cossacks to within sight of the Oder. When Mr. Lloyd George was declaiming in the Queen's Hall, in August, 1917, about defeating a German "conspiracy" against the liberty of nations, a series of secret pacts, constituting a more flagrant invasion of the liberty of nations than Napoleon ever dreamed of, were lying in the safes of the Foreign Offices of London, Paris, Petrograd, Rome, Bukarest, and Belgrade. And the young men of Britain were being called from the factory, the office, and the plough to fight and die for the noblest of ideals! Has such a betrayal of a people's faith ever been recorded?"

Let me again say that in his treatment of the case Mr. Morel sees that all these statements are fully documented. You can read them in pamphlets published broadcast throughout Great Britain. One other word from Mr. Morel:

In other words, it is not a case of Germany and her partner having spent far vaster sums than their potential foes before the war. Incidentally it may be remarked that although before the war the British people were supposedly the least "militarised" people in Europe, these secret commitments had made of them the *most heavily taxed people in the world for war purposes*. When the war came the average burden of taxation for war purposes borne by the British citizen was much heavier than the burden of the French, German, Austrian, Russian and Italian citizen. Thus the real combination which Germany and Austria had to face was a Franco-Russian-British combination. Yet, in the decade preceding the war, their expenditure in preparedness for war fell far short even of the Franco-Russian expenditure. And, almost to the last, the German government in its blindness was convinced that Britain would remain neutral.....But the most astounding fact which French publications reveal is that, when the war broke out, the French army alone was numerically as strong as the German!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If any hon. gentlemen doubt this statement they must consult the records. Mr. Francis Neilson in a book How Diplomats Make War, which can be found in the Parliamentary Library, has this to say on another point in connection with the pre-war preparations:

The story of the naval conspiracy is told with extraordinary and brutal frankness by Lord Fisher in his book entitled "Memories". Lord French, Colonel Repington and Lord Haldane all confirm the story of the secret military and naval conversations between the British and French Staffs, begun in January, 1906, without the knowledge of—consent of even—the British cabinet, let alone that of the House of Commons. The reports of German diplomats recently translated and published in England exhibit the course of Allied war preparations and of the progressive isolation of Germany. The reports of the Russian Foreign Minister, Sazonof, written in 1912, show the extent to which the Entente powers were even then pledged to one another and the evidence given by Marshal Joffre before the Metallurgic Committee in Paris in 1919, is conclusive with respect to the military understandings which existed among the British, French and Belgian Staffs.

Some hon. members would seem to be incredulous with regard to some of these statements. I do not wonder. Let me give an official statement concerning the question whether Great Britain was unprepared.

There is no doubt that the machinery for setting our forces in action had reached an order of completeness in detail that has no parallel in our history.

That is taken from the official documents issued by direction of the historical section of the Committee on Imperial Defence, and can be found in Naval Operations by Sir Julian Corbett. And again, Viscount Haldane says in his book Before the War:

To say, therefore, that we were quite unprepared is inaccurate.

Mr. Morel, whom I have already quoted, very well sums up the situation at the same time that he gives the source of the information, which I do not think has been very widely disseminated in Canada:

The story of British unpreparedness has vanished with the published admissions of Lord Fisher, Lord Haldane, Lord French, Sir Julian Corbett, Colonel Repington, Captain Peter Wright, and a host of others —not to mention Blunt's "Diaries". The legend of French and Russian unpreparedness was exclusively for British consumption; it was never advanced in France or Russia—indeed the feeling in French and Russian

official circles in the years immediately preceding the war was one of considerable confidence at the prospect of war. In any case, the legend has vanished with the publication of the Imperial Russian archives, the Belgian diplomatic dispatches, the book of the French General Buat, and that of M. Paleologue, the French Ambassador at the Russian Imperial Court, not to mention the extensive data now available concerning the Russian mobilisation and the character and composition of the Russian invasion of Prussia at the outbreak of the war. These publications and others which might be mentioned, above all the correspondence dealing with the conclusion of the Franco-Russian Alliance, have also finally exploded the myth of the "wanton attack" upon France.

I think that in view of the evidence adduced, of which I have given but a very brief summary, we must conclude that Germany was not solely responsible for the war.

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member has given us the opinions of very eminent men with respect to the cause of the war. Will he not honour the House with his own opinion as to whether or not Britain caused the war?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have given the opinions of eminent men, based, as I have said, on documentary evidence which may be obtained if any one takes the trouble to consult the books quoted. It is obviously impossible for me to bring into this Chamber and quote all the documents to which I have made reference. My own opinion would have been of very little avail in the matter. I think the House will agree with me in that. But I do say that the opinion of some of the authorities I have quoted cannot be disregarded

Mr. LADNER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman misunderstood my question. I asked him if after the explanations given he would not favour us with his own opinion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, that my own opinion on this particular case is of very little value to the House. I am not dealing with my own opinion, nor do I think the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) is very much concerned about my opinion in the matter. We are dealing with facts which are of a great deal more importance than mere opinions of individuals.

Now I come to the reparations as arranged for under the Peace Treaty. I presume that we have all read Mr. John M. Keynes' books on The Economic Consequences of the Peace and A Review of the Peace Treaty, in which he has made out a thorough case for revision. Perhaps it is hardly necessary for me to say that Mr. Keynes was the expert of the British Treasury at the Peace Conference at Versailles, and that his opinion has had the most profound influence upon British policy. Mr. Keynes states very clearly that Germany laid down her arms under certain expressed conditions, and he charges that these conditions were not lived up to by the Allies.

An hon. MEMBER: Well, well.

Mr. McMASTER: Everybody admits that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I hope hon. members will hardly question that statement. Let me summarize, or rather let me quote a paragraph or so from Mr. Keynes' book, because it is obvious that I cannot summarize the whole volume. He speaks of the conditions under which Germany laid down her arms. These were, among others, Wilson's Fourteen Points and some of the speeches that the then President of the United States had made, because it was following the assurances which he gave that Germany first began to treat with the Allies at this time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that this motion is out of order, and I refer you to rules 626 and 629 on page 168.

Mr. CANNON: What book is the hon. member quoting from?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. Rule 626 reads:

> This House will not proceed upon any petition, motion or bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown but in a Committee of the Whole House.

Then rule 629:

> The recommendation of the Crown is needed for such measures as bills relating to the extension of time for the repayment of the deposit which has become liable to forfeiture in the case of a private bill; the release on compounding of sums due to the Crown; the repeal of an exemption from an existing duty, as the burthen of the duty is thereby augmented; a proposal to repeal an existing drawback on export of sugar, as it effects an increase of charge upon the importers who desired to export sugar.

Therefore I submit that in the first place this motion cannot be considered except in the Committee of the Whole House; and, secondly, that it cannot be considered at all without the consent of the Crown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will consider the authority cited by the hon. member who raises the objection, and in the meantime the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) may continue his remarks.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Let me quote then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keynes' statement as to the conditions under which Germany laid down her arms. They were, among others:

The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

(4) Adeqnate guarantees, given and taken, that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

(5) A free, open-minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, regard being had to the interest of the population concerned.

(6), (7), (8) and (11). The evacuation and "restoration" of all invaded territory, especially of Belgium. To this must be added the rider of the Allies, claiming compensation for all damage done to civilians and their property by land, by sea and from the air (quoted in full above). (8). The righting of "the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine." (13) An independent Poland, including "the territories inhabited by an indubitably Polish population" and "assured a free and secure access to the sea." (14). The League of Nations.

Before Congress on February 11, President Wilson said:

"There shall be no annexations, no contributions, no punitive damages. . .Self-determination is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril . . .Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival states."

In New York on September 27 he laid down the following principles:

(1) The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just.

(2) No special or separate interest of any single nation or group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

(3) There can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

(4) There can be no special selfish economic combinations within the league and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion, except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

(5) All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

Mr. Keynes, after showing how these different principles have been violated by the treaty, concludes:

This was the atmosphere in which the Prime Minister left for Paris, and these the entanglements he had made for himself.

This was just after the Khaki election, I may say:

He had pledged himself and his government to make demands of a helpless enemy inconsistent with solemn engagements on our part, on the faith of which this enemy had laid down his arms. There are few episodes in history which posterity will have less reason to condone,——a war ostensibly waged in defence of the sanctity of international engagements ending in a definite breach of one of the most sacred possible of such engagements on the part of the victorious champions of these ideals.

And again on this subject let me quote ex-Premier Nitti in his Peaceless Europe:

The peace treaties are the most barefaced denial of all the principles which the Entente powers declared and proclaimed during the war; not only so, but they are a fundamental negation of President Wilson's famous Fourteen Points, which were supposed to constitute a solemn pledge and covenant, not only with the enemy, but with the democracies of the whole world. . .

But it will remain forever a terrible precedent in modern history that, against all pledges, all precedents and all traditions, the representatives of Germany were never even heard; nothing was left to them but to sign a treaty at a moment when famine and exhaustion and threat of revolution made it impossible not to sign it.

Germany has already consigned all her transferable wealth; the gold in her banks, her colonies, her commercial fleet, a large and even the best part of her railway material, her submarine cables, her foreign credits, the property of her private citizens in the victorious countries, etc., everything that could be handed over, even in opposition to the rights of nations such as are known in modern civilized states, Germany has given. She has also hypothecated all her national goods...

France had but one idea, and later on did not hesitate to admit it; to dismember Germany, to destroy her unity. By creating intolerable conditions of life, taking away territory on the frontier, putting large districts under military occupation, delaying or not making any diplomatic appointments and carrying on communications solely through military commissions, a state of things was brought about which must inevitably tend to weaken the constitutional unity of the German Empire. Taking away from Germany eighty-four kilometres of territory, nearly eight million inhabitants, and all the most important mineral resources, preventing the unity of the German people, and the six million and five hundred thousand of German Austrians to which Austria was then reduced, putting the whole German country under an interminable series of controls —all this did more harm to German unity than would have been done by taking the responsibility of a forcible and immediate division to which the Germans could not have consented and which the Allies could not have claimed to impose.

What is the present situation? I have quoted ex-Premier Lloyd George; let me quote one of his latest utterances, published on January 20, last:

France has once more jumped on the prostrate form of Germany and the sabots have come down with a thud that would sicken the heart of multitudes on both sides of the Atlantic whose friendship for France stood the losses and grievances of four years' war. But what good would it bring devastated France or her over-taxed Allies? The additional coal that would be wrung out of Germany would barely cover the direct cost of collection. Although Germany bears the extra cost, the expenses of these punitive measures must all in the end diminish the means of reparations and therefore fall on the victor.

Mr. CANNON: Is the hon. member quoting from articles written by Lloyd George and published in the Hearst papers?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am quoting from articles written by Lloyd George and published in our Canadian daily papers.

Mr. CANNON: Which paper?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think in the Montreal Star, and I believe I got my copy from the Ottawa Citizen. Once more permit me to quote from an article by ex-Premier Nitti, published in the European press:

In 1914 and the years immediately following, when the free and democratic peoples saw France apparently attacked by Germany, they took active sides against German imperialism. England, Italy and the United States of America stepped one after another into line and gave their blood and their economic resources to the defence of France and the rights of democracy. But later the Entente developed into nothing else than a system of violence (Gewalt-system). No German representative of the theory of might (Gewaltthrorie) has ever so glorified might as has the Entente since the end of the war. When one considers that the occupation of the Rhineland, partly by negroes, costs about four million gold marks a year and brings with it, in addition, every possible kind of evil, including the legal prostitution of German women to black men and men of other colors; that Upper Silesia, in open contradiction of the Treaty of Versailles and the mandate of the plebiscite, was dismembered; that it is to-day still considered possible by demands for senseless damages to bring Germany under an alien finance control like that endured by Turkey; that the most highly cultivated peoples of the world have been forced under the rule of the least,—when one considers these things one can stand only in horror before this vast catastrophe that is not merely of an economic but rather one of a moral character.

In view of this situation it seems to me we ought to consider our whole policy in regard to reparations. And again, instead of voicing my own opinion, let me voice the opinion of one who knows well the conditions which obtained during the war, one of our most eminent Canadian statesmen, the Hon. N. W. Rowell.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who?

Mr. DUFF: You could not call him an eminent statesman.

Mr. CANNON: He is a dead one.

Mr. POWER: De mortuis nil nisi bonum.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Speaking in Guelph before the Canadian and Rotary Clubs on January 26, Mr. Rowell said—I quote one paragraph:

Canada's substantial claim to a share in the reparations is based on the inclusion of pension and separation allowances in the Treaty of Versailles. Canada should relinquish all claims under those heads, as they are not covered by the agreement under which Germany laid down her arms, and should not be included in the treaty. Further, as it is now admitted that Germany cannot pay even sufficient to cover the cost of restoring the devastated areas, any payments which might be made to Canada in respect of pensions and separation allowances would necessarily come out of the amount which should properly go to France and Belgium. If, after these deductions, there remains any further sum payable to Canada, we should be prepared to follow the lead of Great Britain and forego this amount in the interests of a general settlement of the whole question of reparations and inter-Allied debts. Fortunately for us, the government of Canada, both during and since the war, has based our finances on the assumption that we would have to pay our own costs of the war, and the failure to receive any sum from Germany on account of reparations, will not involve any change in our financial program.

Now, on this question of our share in the reparations, let me point out that according to the original agreement, as Mr. Rowell has shown, the inclusion of pensions and separation allowances was not involved in the conditions under which Germany laid down her arms. There are one or two misapprehensions that should at this stage be removed. There are some who imagine that private claims for damages will be paid in Canada. I am told by those associated with the Reparations Commission that there is no intention whatever, nor was there ever any, that private claims should be paid. It is true that an advertisement was sent out asking that people in Canada who had suffered damages should send in their claims, but this was done in order that Canada might be able to estimate the amount of damages she should claim. It was not the intention that the money so procured from Germany would be turned over to private individuals. That policy was very clearly stated in the British House of Commons by Mr. Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer. In reply to a question on May 4, 1920, Mr. Chamberlain said:

His Majesty's government has given careful consideration to the position of individuals in respect of whose losses reparation will be claimed by His Majesty's government. It must be understood that the claims to be made are claims by the British government in respect of a wrong done to the state, and not claims by individuals in respect of private wrongs, and that the government do not act as the agents of any individual to put forward his personal claim. Any payments that may be received from Germany are therefore the property of the nation, and no individual will have any claim in law for any sum which the British government may receive from Germany in respect of reparation.

On one other point, too, I think there should be a statement made, and that is with regard to the closely related question of the property or estates of German nationals in this country which have been seized by the Canadian government and are now being held. I believe there is a trust of something like $40,000,000 which is being administered. On this point may I quote a few sentences from the annual report of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. The president of the bank says:

In all references to it authorities on international law make it clear that our right to retain enemy property which falls within our control exists only so long as the enemy country fails to honour similar obligations or to restore our property.

Further:

It is with reference to these exceptions that difficulties are being encountered, out of which there may arise the very unfortunate conclusion that in the treaty departure has been made from principles which have been respected for centuries.

And still further:

We must not in this matter be influenced by anything but the facts, and by that honour among nations which has been displayed for centuries. It is true that the property and business interests of the Allies were sometimes very wrongfully dealt with in Germany, at least in the early years of the war, but it is also true that Germans ready and willing to settle debts directly with British creditors have been unable to do so because of the terms of the treaty. Every merchant seeking to do business in foreign countries, and every banker considerate of the credit of his country, should remember that international trade and finance are built on good faith ,and that we must avoid the possibility of these unfortunate exceptions in the treaty causing injustice and thus involving Canada in discredit.

Another point made by Mr. Rowell to which I would call attention is that if we were ever able to collect from Germany for our pensions or separation allowances, such sums would really come out of the amounts that ought to go to the building up of the devastated districts of France and Belgium. I have not been saying anything to-night with a view to arousing any feeling against France. I think, on the contrary, we may well say that if we relinquish the amounts which we claim, they might possibly go to the help of Germany in paying the amounts which ought to be paid to France and hence those districts which have suffered the most severely would be built up.

Let me very briefly summarize a few points which I should like to leave with this House.

First of all, that our claims under the Treaty of Versailles are contrary to international law as international law was understood before the war. I was reading only the other day the international conventions with regard to the laws and customs of war by land as signed at The Hague in 1899. It would seem as if we in our peace treaty at Versailles had contradicted almost all these conventions which had been drawn up, and which at that time were supposed to prevail amongst civilized nations when they were unfortunately drawn into war.

Next I would appeal on economic grounds. Canada's prosperity as that of other nations is dependent upon the prosperity of Europe. We cannot have prosperous conditions in Europe until the peace treaties are definitely modified. On that point let me quote from one who, I think, will be considered an authority, Professor R. A. Seligman, Professor of Economics at Columbia University. In the New York Times of November 5, 1922, Mr. Seligman says:

What is the situation in the continental countries of Europe? They have no gold to remit. They cannot send us their land, railroads or factories. They have no more securities of foreign countries to turn over, as England did during the war. There is no likelihood of any substantial increase in the invisible items which they could transfer to us. On the contrary, in the present perilous economic situation there is slight probability of their receiving additional sums on foreign investments or profits on a larger merchant marine, or gains through developing banks or insurance companies; and the sums yielded by a possible increase in American travellers abroad or in the sums remitted by immigrants to this country would be only a drop in the bucket.

Again:

The truth is our debtors are bankrupt. They cannot pay now, and will not be able to pay in any assignable time. I have found no prominent business man or banker here or abroad who believes that there is any possibility of paying the debts. You cannot extract water from a stone.

But even if the Allies could pay, the final question arises: Should we demand that they pay now and forthwith? If they have the ability to pay, have we the capacity to receive?

Still again:

No explanation can obscure the fact that, despite the three-cornered trade, a nation's commerce must be envisaged as a totality. If the rest of the world pays a debt by exporting more goods, whether to us or to another country, it makes it harder for us to export the usual quantity of goods in return. The reason why, under normal conditions, exports are mutually profitable, is that the exporting country is thereby enabled to secure imports, that is, to buy commodities. It is a matter of give and take. But when, in order to pay an immense debt, the rest of the world has to increase its exports to us, there is nothing to call for imports in return; and with this cessation of our exports to foreign countries our factories will close, our industries will languish and a period of business depression will set in.

That is, we must realize that the world to-day is a unity, and that just as in the human physical system you cannot have one diseased part without its affecting the whole body, so in the world to-day we cannot injure one member without all the members suffering with it.

I do not know whether it is at all possible that I appeal on the higher moral grounds, that we take this stand in the effort to bring about better conditions in Europe. We may demand our pound of flesh, but all through the history of the world there has been another strain of teaching running that mercy is greater even than justice. We are nominally a Christian country. I wonder if we can ever learn to begin to put in practice those words which I heard no later than this afternoon from the lips of the Speaker: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive." I suppose it is bad form to say that. I do not often come into prayers, but I do not see why we should not begin to try to practise some of these phrases that are so often upon our lips. It is quite true that the amount involved, so far as Canada is con-

cerned, is not large. It may be true, as a good many have pointed out, that we will receive nothing anyway, but at least such an action of this kind on the part of Canada would be a certain gesture which might have some influence in other parts of the world. We read of an historic occasion on which a shot rang round the world. It is quite possible that action on the part of even a comparatively small nation such as Canada might have far reaching effects, and that our action may be followed by a somewhat similar action in other parts of Europe. Only the other day we were formally accepting the gift of a piece of land from France on which a monument might be erected to our men who fell at the front. I think none of us would withhold tribute to men who, from heroic motives, offered their all for what they believed to be the very highest and best, and yet one cannot but remember that the whole of Europe is strewn with monuments. I well recall some years ago spending a day on the battlefield of Waterloo and there seeing the great monument erected to the victors, Great Britain and Prussia, and in another part of the field a small monument, a most pathetic one I thought, an eagle with a broken pinion erected to the vanquished, France. Now the scene is changed. France is our ally for the time. Prussia has been our most deadly enemy. Before the monument is erected in France it may well be that relations between England and France may be most severely strained. I wonder whether, after all, we can best honour the memory of those who fell on the fields of France and Belgium by erecting monuments over there, or rather may we not do more by seeking to arrange our economic and social conditions in such a way that future wars will not be brought about.

You remember how Lawrence Housman seeks to give expression to the feelng of the men who fought at the front:

> We fought at Armageddon for the brotherhood of man;
> And safe within their fences the tricksters plied their trade.
> 'Twas the old fight we fought; and it ends as it began:
> The gamblers hold their hands till the last trump was played...
> And the freedom that we fought for is an unremembered tune.

Mr. Speaker, it seems, as we read history, as if the human race has climbed, by very small degrees, up the blood stained trail that has led to even the measure of civilization that we possess at the present time. Some recent developments have given to mankind a wonderful power, have given us control of machinery which might be used in the interests of mankind or, if used by one group in opposition to the other, may spell the very doom of our race. It seems to me that on an occasion of this kind we should try, at least, to rise above the passions and prejudices of the war, the passions and prejudices that have kept the peoples of Europe apart throughout these years, and that we at this distance, somewhat removed from the horrors and chaos of Europe to-day should, in a little more dispassionate way, resolve that as for us we could, we would, do our utmost to start things on a somewhat different path in the future. I would plead that the least we can do is to make what I have called a peace gesture and withdraw our claims to reparation from Germany.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) has raised an objection, calling in question the right of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) to bring this resolution to the consideration of the House. Let me direct attention to rule 78 which reads as follows:

> All aids and supplies granted to His Majesty by the Parliament of Canada, are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the Housce to direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

I also find in Beauchesne's Rules and Forms the following:

> 626. "This House will not proceed upon any petition, motion or bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown but in a committee of the whole House."

Now the resolution does not mention the Crown, but everyone will understand that moneys owing to Canada are moneys owing to the Crown.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Speaker, before you give your ruling, may I speak to the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly.

Mr. MANION: I do so, Sir, because it will be too late to speak after you have given your ruling. I have sat here listening for about an hour and a half to the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) discussing this question, and he has put before us all the arguments favourable to his contention. I do not know, of course, what your ruling is going to be, Mr. Speaker, but speaking personally I should regret very much if, after the hon. member's argument of an hour and a half in favour of this resolution, the

motion were ruled out of order, because I do not believe it would be in the best interests of Canada or of this House that the hon. member's statement should go unanswered.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would respectfully make the same suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to postponing my decision.

Mr. CANNON: In order that members who wish to address the Chair may know exactly when and how they may speak could we have an intimation as to when the decision will be given?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Minister of Labour has the floor.

Mr. CANNON: I am putting the question before the Minister of Labour speaks. I wish to find out from the Chair when the decision will be given in order that any member who wishes to speak may have that information.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in the hands of the House. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg having spoken and expressed his own views other hon. gentlemen are entitled to reply. I shall reserve my decision for the present.

Mr. SHAW: Speaking to the point of order may I suggest that the rules of the House in this connection be suspended which will prevent the necessity of you, Mr. Speaker, giving your decision in the matter. I understand such action can be taken with the unanimous consent of the House.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I can imagine no other condition or time under which it could be as conclusively proven that "time is a great healer." Hon. members in this House, imagine, if you can, four years ago to-night, sitting deliberately and listening to a statement from an hon. gentleman such as we have heard for the past hour and a half. I want to say only a few words in regard to this particular matter, and not of necessity dealing at all with the particular question of reparations, or the question of the sums owing to Canada by Germany. I care not personally whether the reparations ever come or not, but I do believe that there are some things that surely the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has either overlooked or else never experienced. He spoke of the great trouble, tribulation and hardship that would come to future generations of German children should there be insistence on the payment of these reparations. I imagine that I learned in my younger days and since from the same Book of Holy Writ as my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg, and in that I found conveyed the suggestion of an eye for an eye and that justice is eternal. Four years ago that would have been conclusively proven to my hon. friend and other members of this House, I imagine, had anyone even thought of such a thing as raising the question that we have heard raised to-night.

I wonder if my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg knows anything of the wounds in the hearts of tens of thousands of Canadian mothers that are being opened up afresh to-night, and that would, if his view carried, figuratively speaking, bleed with the injustice of the proposals that have been discussed before us. I think it can be very readily conceded that sentiment very largely rules the world, and, looking at it from every viewpoint of sentiment, I cannot but express the view that my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg has acted in entire disregard of the feelings of tens of thousands of Canadian mothers, yea, and of Canadian fathers, in making any such proposal or indulging in any such discussion as we have just listened to. My hon. friend surely overlooked the fact that mankind in all the ages, from the garden of Eden, has, we are told, been paying the penalty for sin, for injustice, for violation of the law, and does he appeal to us as human beings, thousands of Canadian citizens, with hearts still bleeding, and expect us to forget all of our conception of human justice and right, and do the work of forgiving, whitewashing, waving these things to one side, as is suggested in his resolution? The hon. member undertook, as I understood, to show that maybe Germany was not responsible for the war to the extent that was alleged, but I would submit to my hon. friend that were it possible for this resolution to pass, tens of thousands of Canadian mothers and fathers would hear the tramp of a nation run mad with the lust and desire for conquest, marching through Belgium, and that would be the only thing that they could see was the cause of the war.

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am personally concerned, I think the proposal of my hon. friend to-night is in entire disregard of the sufferings, the sacrifices and the feelings, present and future, of tens of thousands of Canadian citizens, and might I, in all seriousness, suggest that if my hon. friend is so sincerely desirous of bringing about peace and of obtaining harmony and co-operation, he will find wide scope in the

industrial field here in Canada, where there is ample opportunity for the exercise of his undoubted ability and great earnestness in this direction. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the motion should never have been discussed, because in my judgment thousands of our Canadian citizens will never be able to understand why we should, at this time, have listened to any such proposals as have come to us to-night.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I do not take objection to a discussion on the question of German reparations or the attitude that Canada should take towards it. I do object however, to the discussion of that very important problem under a resolution introduced in this form, and supported in a spirit and with language which, I think was inspired far more by a desire to discredit the great statesmen of the allied countries, rather than any desire to promote peace in Europe or throughout the the world. My hon. friend has quoted very liberally from what he is pleased to term great authority. I have read, and undoubtedly every member of the House has read many of the articles and books to which he has referred. I know of no work of literature from which one could not extract a clause here and there and distort its meaning, segregate it from its surrounding arguments, and make it serve some purpose to support some theory in many cases far removed from the subject under discussion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order. May I ask the hon. gentleman to cite at least one or two of the books from which I have taken extracts and distorted them or wrested from the context.

Mr. STEVENS: I have merely begun to state my argument. I have before me fairly copious notes of my hon. friend's remarks and it is my intention to give some consideration to his quotations. My hon. friend takes a purely business problem, an economic problem, a problem of a financial character between two nations, and one which could very properly, and undoubtedly would, come up under the budget proposals of the government, and uses it as the occasion of libelling the allied countries and, as I said a moment ago—and I repeat it—of deliberately casting aspersions upon some of the greatest statesmen in those countries, and above all—which I resent very much—upon the good faith of Great Britain and the British Empire. In the first place, my hon. friend referred, with a sneer in his voice, to the old practice, which unquestionably has been followed very widely, of trusting to Great Britain in the determination of foreign policy. I at once, Sir, agree that that might be a fitting subject for debate when some question was under consideration, as for example the subject of imperial conferences or any other allied question. But surely we can debate a question of that kind dispassionately and assert, if you will, a new and broader status for this country in imperial affairs without implying that Great Britain has invariably been wrong. My hon. friend went back to the South African war and raked around, showing to his own satisfaction that Great Britain had been wholly in error, without bringing forward any substantial proofs. My answer to him in connection with that South African argument is this, that General Smuts, who fought so valiantly against the British in South Africa,—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STEVENS: —is to-day the premier of South Africa and one of the most loyal sons of the Empire.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. member to rise to a point of order?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I deny that I ever made the statement—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member rises to a point of order he can speak only with the permission of the member who has the floor.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The hon. member made a statement which I absolutely contradict.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend next referred to the Lusitania incident, and without giving to the House any clear reasons for his insinuation, and carefully refusing on repeated occasions to give his own opinion when requested to do so, he insinuated that some recent revelations more or less excused—I will not say justified—the Germans for the enormity of that frightful act they committed in the sinking of that ship. It is true that with his subtlety of language, of which he is a master, he avoided coming out freely and saying that he approved of the German action. Nor did he come forward and say that the Germans were justified. But he did insinuate, in that manner, of which I say he is a master and which he has used time and again in this country amongst the Canadian people to stir up strife and discord, that there was a question whether the Germans were not more or less justified in that act.

Oh, he says, the German people for whom I am pleading to-night have repudiated the

war lords. That is true. But I ask him, did his red revolutionary friends in Germany support the prosecution of those war lords for the war crimes they perpetrated, of which there was ample evidence before the people of Europe? Have they done so? What did Great Britain do? Great Britain was the mover in this matter and she induced the Allies to deal on a level, fair and equitable basis with the war lords and the war criminals of Germany who were guilty of the most heinous crimes ever recorded on the pages of history. They were known to be guilty on the strength of evidence that was in the hands of the Germans to that effect, and Britain was fair enough to allow the German courts to try them. What has been the result? Will the hon. member or any one else in this House, in this country, or in Europe, assert that any measure of justice, but rather the most subtle and invidious type of evasion, was ever offered by the German people, the new Germany he speaks of, the revolutionary Germany he lauds to the skies? Have they in any measure sought to bring those war lords to justice? Not once! On the contrary, they have lent every energy, intellectual and physical, to blocking the way of attaining that end.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it possible for me to deny—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have never lauded Germany to the skies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can interrupt only by permission of the member who has the floor, unless he rises to a point of order.

Mr. STEVENS: I will answer my hon. friend by quoting his next statement. He pleaded on behalf of the little boys and girls of Germany. Well, what red-blooded man living to-day would not respond to a plea of that kind, whether the children were of Germany or anywhere else? But methinks there was a time when strong red-blooded men turned a deaf ear to the plea for children, boys and girls and babes. What about the advance of the German troops through Belgium and northern France? Outside of warfare waged by absolutely barbarous people, there has never been an instance in history in which there was such an utter disregard for the helplessness of childhood and the weakness of old age as characterised the advance of the German soldiery through Europe at that time. And yet my hon. friend comes to this House and says. "Let us think of the boys and girls of Germany". Why, certainly, I am prepared to meet him on that ground and discuss the resolution from that standpoint. But I think we ought also to think of the boys and girls of Great Britain, of France, of Canada, and other countries. Next, my hon. friend brought forward one of the stock arguments—well, it is not really an argument, rather let me say, one of his stock sneers at modern society, one of those soap-box references that we hear so often on the street corners, where men who have been toiling, or who perhaps are out of luck, or are misfits in society, are teased and agitated and aggravated into resentment. He trotted out the gibes about the great financial lords, and captains of industry. He based no argument on it, but he just introduced it in his speech —it will read well among certain groups of his followers and friends. They will say: Our great leader in the House of Commons has brought before the attention of his fellow members the iniquities of the financial lords of Europe.

Let me remind my hon. friend that his insinuation is baseless, for this reason. It was argued throughout the world that no great war could come. Why? Because the great moneyed interests of the world would not permit it. But I submit that in spite of the most bitter objections and in spite of all the efforts put forth by the great so-called "controlling influences" of industry and finance, this war broke out. I am not going to rehash the discussion of why the war broke out, but I answer his argument with that statement, which no one can, I think, gainsay.

Then he quoted as the greatest authority of all, and the most outstanding—whom? Mr. Morel. What is Mr. Morel's claim to notoriety? Simply that he defeated Winston Churchill. That is the sole reason why we should accept what Mr. Morel says. As my hon. friend put it very modestly: "My opinion is no good; I give you Mr. Morel's." Now, in the long quotation my hon. friend read Mr. Morel referred to the conferences between the British, French and Belgian military staffs. Will my hon. friend deny that he called those conferences a conspiracy? Hansard will show that he did. What does he term a conspiracy? That which was published in the White papers of every one of the allied nations; everything to which he referred to-night and suggested to this House as a secret revealed because the spotless Bolsheviks of Russia had secured the archives in Petrograd. That was my hon. friend's argument. "This conspiracy was revealed." Those were his words. Revealed!

My hon. friend ought to know that this so-called conspiracy was revealed in 1914 at the commencement of the war and again in 1915 showing the conferences that had been held between these staffs on questions of preparation.

Then as an offset to our charge that Germany had been preparing for this war for years what did he bring forward? Britain's preparedness! And he quotes the speech of one of Britain's statesmen in that regard. Everybody knew—and well for my hon. friend, for every hon. gentleman in this House, for the whole North American continent, and for other parts of the world was it—that the British navy was prepared. Winston Churchill – whom he so slightingly refers to, and whom Mr. Morel, one of his British communistic leaders, defeated in the last general election in Great Britain—Winston Churchill abov all other men was responsible for the preparedness of the British navy. Was there any secret about it? I recall perfectly well in March 1914 one of the most lengthy and exhaustive debates ever held on a British budget had to do with the navy vote in that year, and again in 1913. And yet my hon. friend says there was a secret conspiracy among these nations, and that Britain's preparedness was in the nature of a crime equal to the military aggressiveness of Germany. These are the arguments, Mr. Speaker, that make one resent the presentation of a purely business proposition.

Then my hon. friend, in reply to the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), who asked him very politely and in perfect parliamentary order, would he be kind enough to give the House his own views, shielded himself behind the rather clever practice of reading the views of others. From one end of his speech to the other my hon. friend never told us where he stood on this question. But I know this much. If he goes to the city of Vancouver where he spent a few years, if he goes to the city of Winnipeg where he also spent an active period—in these cities, if he can do it with an audience just suited to him, he will tell them in most violent language where he stands on this question. I know my hon. friend's position. In this House he has conducted himself with commendable reserve. I have watched him during last session and this, and I must say I admire him. Bnt, Mr. Speaker, the language in which my hon. friend would express himself on these problems under other circumstances would be of an altogether different character. And so he was afraid to tell this House frankly where he stood on this question. I challenge him, and I challenge everyone who belongs to that peculiar group of economic freaks, who owe allegiance to the Third Internationale in preference to the British Crown, to come out frankly and, through him, debate this question in the proper form—on the floor of the parliament of this country. If they have an opinion, this is the place to express it. I do not question a member's right to read other people's opinions on a subject while refusing to declare his own view. That is his privilege. But I do question a man's moral courage who will do it and then, under other circumstances peculiarly suited to himself, give vent to expressions of policies inimical to the welfare of this realm.

My hon. friend also addressed himself to quotations from Mr. Keynes' famous books on The Economic Consequences of the Peace and A Review of the Peace Treaty. I pay a tribute, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Keynes, whom I look upon as one of the most thoroughly versed political economists in Europe and, perhaps, in the world to-day, a man of exceptional ability and one who has given expression to his own views in a very frank and courageous manner. My hon. friend selects a passage here and there and dovetails them into his speech this evening. Mr. Keynes once applied his arguments either in his book on The Economic Consequences of the Peace or in his famous articles in the Manchester Guardian Supplement during the past year in the manner that my hon. friend has applied them to-night. Mr. Keynes does argue—and I want to say here very frankly that in a large measure I agree with him—that the French particularly are interpreting the Versailles Treaty in a somewhat harsh and exacting manner. That is Mr. Keynes' argument in a nutshell. He labours very industriously and very effectively to prove his position.

But my hon. friend paid most of his respects to Great Britain in his insinuations. Well, Great Britain is the one country that has stood out firmly against an extreme interpretation of the Versailles Treaty by the French. Why was not my hon. friend generous enough to say that the country which has offered him protection during the whole of his life has been honourable in this regard? Why has he not been generous enough to say that Great Britain has been more than generous with the Germans in regard to reparations?

Then my hon. friend quoted ex-Premier Nitti of Italy. It might be well for this House to pause for a moment and ask what became of Mr. Nitti. Has he the support

of the Italian people to-day? He certainly has not. He has been completely rejected by his people.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What about Mr. Lloyd George?

Mr. STEVENS: I was coming to Mr. Lloyd George, if my hon. friend will wait a moment. Mr. Nitti has been rejected by his people. My hon. friend quotes Mr. Nitti to bolster up his argument, and he states in a general way that the people, not the few, should rule. But have not the people of Italy recently put Mr. Nitti out of business? I will give you, Mr. Speaker, what I am quite convinced, from several addresses I have heard him make, the hon. member means by "the people." In his estimation, the people are composed of that group in each country which corresponds to the 500,000 Bolsheviks in Russia out of the 180,000,000 inhabitants of that country. In his estimation, an organized group with his peculiar economic and philosophic ideas, no matter how small it may be numerically, constitute the people of a country. We happen to believe in majority rule. While there are injustices under our present system, and lots of them, we believe that through it we get the best expression of opinion on the part of the people that up to the present it has been possible to get anywhere. No man who has followed with any degree of interest the history of his friends in Russia will be able to argue, no matter how finely spun those arguments may be, no matter how subtle and insinuating the language in which they are expressed may be, that there is anything approaching real liberty under the rule of the Third Internationale, in Russia.

Now, my hon. friend quotes Mr. Nitti. Then he says that Mr. Lloyd George used the phrase—and we all know that Mr. Lloyd George is perhaps the most apt phraser that we have on two legs to-day—that Germany was prostrate. My hon. friend seizes upon this little phrase and produces it before the House as an argument in support of his extreme resolution, yet he condemns the part played by Britain under the leadership of Lloyd George all through the period of war. I would also remind him that the very gentleman whom he produces here as an authority has been rejected by Great Britain, and particularly, Mr. Speaker, by Mr. Morel and a few other of his friends.

My hon. friend introduced another suggestion which was unworthy of him—and that is going some. He introduced that old shibboleth about the French-coloured troops on the Rhine. He is not in a position to give accurate information on that, nor am I. But this we do know, that a great deal of the agitation regarding the supposed occupation of the Rhine by coloured troops of France is mythical and false—is propaganda by the Germans themselves. There are more official reports excusing or justifying the French government than there are condemning them. I am not going to say for one moment that French troops occupying a territory like that have been blameless; it would be utterly impossible to pick out a group of men thus situated who would be free from any action that could be questioned. But to suggest, as my hon. friend has, that France has perpetrated a crime upon civilization in her occupation of the Rhineland, is, Sir, to present an argument that has no foundation in fact.

Then my hon. friend proceeded to quote a speech of Hon. Mr. Rowell. Quoting Mr. Rowell, he said: that Canada should follow Great Britain in the matter of a policy on reparations. In his opening remarks he jeered at and condemned Canada for following Great Britain in connection with the action taken at the outbreak of war; now he comes along and supports the statement of Mr. Rowell that we should follow Great Britain in the matter of reparations. The question whether a thing suits my hon. friend depends on whether the action taken suits his own particular mental distortion. If it fits into that peculiar state of mind into which he has forced himself in recent years, then it is all right; if it clashes with that state of mind, then it is all wrong and there is no justice, equity, reason, logic or anything else in it. "What is right is what suits my peculiar state of mind"—that was my hon. friend's process of reasoning in his speech to-day, as it is in all his presentations throughout the country—and they are many—with regard to economic problems.

Then my hon. friend makes a general sweeping charge of violation of the treaty by France. I admit very frankly, Sir, that there is ample room for differences of opinion in interpreting the Treaty of Versailles. The greatest minds of Europe and America have been struggling with that treaty for the last three years. But should we not pause before making rash and hasty assertions condemning a whole nation for its action? Should we not pause and consider the peculiar and intricate conditions under which this treaty was entered into? Here we have a world literally prostrate as the result of the war—all participants in a state of chaos. State after state completely disrupted; new governments and new constitutions created overnight. Under conditions

of that kind, a score or more of nations meet together to draft a treaty of peace; is it any wonder that this piece of machinery produced under circumstances of that kind should in after years, in times of comparative peace and coolness, be found to be more or less faulty? So it is with the Treaty of Versailles. There are very few, if any, who do not frankly admit that the Treaty of Versailles must in some respects be changed and modified. But that does not warrant my hon. friend's coming before this House with a libellous charge against the statesmen who made the treaty. I believe that with few exceptions, if any, the statesmen who engaged in the titanic task of trying to weave peace and order out of chaos did their duty faithfully and earnestly and with a common desire for peace. That they have not brought peace is something for which they cannot be blamed. It certainly will not contribute to peace to have such unfounded statements flung to the four winds as my hon. friend has made here to-night, and, unfortunately, is making on all possible occasions.

My hon. friend said also that this treaty and its enforcement violated international law. He did not tell us in what way it did so, but he said it violated international law as it was understood prior to 1914. I am not going to question the accuracy of his statement, but I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what respect there was for international law on the part of Germany and her allies? Was there any respect for it? Did not Germany openly declare and avow officially through her Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, that Germany would ignore international law; that it was in the interests of military tactics that Germany invaded Belgium?

Now I do not say that that justifies us in violating international law, but I would draw the attention of the House to the vast difference between the violation by Germany, and the supposed or alleged violation by France and her allies. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), suggests, how could a treaty violate international law? As a matter of fact, the whole question narrows down to this: Is the interpretation of the treaty by the Allies a fair and reasonable interpretation? Then the second question is this, and it is really the most important problem that this parliament and similar parliaments have to deal with: Assuming that we interpret the treaty correctly, and fix a given amount for Germany to pay, is that amount a reasonable amount under the conditions now existing, that is, can Germany possibly pay?

I would say this to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. After a great deal of thought upon this subject so far as my individual capacity would permit, I am prepared to advocate and support this in the House of Commons: That we should seek to determine as far as we can, and in a generous spirit, the extent to which the reparation amounts due under the Versailles Treaty ought to be reduced to meet Germany's capacity to pay. That is a fair question, and one which may properly engage the attention of every fair-minded and intelligent and unprejudiced person.

My hon. friend then says he appeals on economic grounds. His economic grounds were not stated. He did not disclose either his own opinion, or the economic grounds upon which he wished to support his motion. The only hint of an approach to economic grounds that he gave was a general, sweeping statement that Germany could not pay, that Germany was bankrupt. I would remind him and this House that up to perhaps six months ago Germany was the most prosperous country since the war of any in the world. It is true that about six months ago, or perhaps a little longer, this prosperity broke. The inflation of her currency and the devaluation of her monetary system has resulted in more or less of chaos in Germany to-day, but it is strange that only a day or two ago the German Reichstag asked the chief bank of Germany to release—what? A very huge sum of gold marks that they still held in their vaults, for the purpose of stabilizing the currency of Germany, and the bank refused to release that money. My hon. friend in his statement a moment ago said that Germany had no money, or words to that effect—that Germany was bankrupt, that she had no amounts of money, that all her gold and all her resources were gone. I would remind this House that in no single instance has the industrial machinery of Germany been tampered with except by my hon. friend's German friends, through sabotage and strikes, and in no other way. Germany's whole industrial machinery is intact, whereas France, as we know, was prostrated and devastated over very large areas, a great portion of which will never be restored, indeed cannot be restored. Mines have been wholly destroyed so that they can never be worked again. It is so with other parts of Europe other than German territory; but German machinery remained intact and is intact to-day. Does not the wealth of a nation very largely consist of the things out of which they produce, such as the land and the machinery, whether it be industrial or agricultural? Germany was never touched in one of these things.

Her farms, her mines, her machinery, are all intact. Her people were undisturbed except those who were fighting in the war. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, with Belgium and France and certain portions of Italy, with Serbia, with Roumania particularly, with Bulgaria and Poland. Compare the conditions in these countries with conditions in Germany, and you have a complete reversal.

Now let us turn for a moment to the situation as far as Canada is concerned. We are faced in Canada with a huge debt, and for the size of our population and our development that debt is an appalling burden. Some day in the near future I intend to discuss it at some length, but suffice it for tonight for me simply to remind the House that that debt rests with extreme weight and with grave possibilities upon the shoulders of the people. I am not prepared to say that we should forego the claims that we have against Germany; not at all, Mr. Speaker, but I again repeat that in so far as it can be shown, supported by intelligent and accurate information, that the reparation claims from Germany are beyond her economic possibility of payment, to that extent I am prepared to consider the reduction of our claims against her. But to come forward with a resolution such as my hon. friend has moved—I was going to say 'falsely' clothed, but perhaps that would not be parliamentary—inaccurately clothed in the argument that it is in the interests of world peace to present this resolution under present conditions, and to support his motion by such a speech as he has delivered, which was far more significant in what it left out and in what he insinuated, than in what he actually did say—such an appeal, I say, should not win any support from this House.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the mover of this resolution (Mr. Woodsworth), and also the last speaker (Mr. Stevens). They have both presented extreme views. I hope that those who will take part in this debate from now on will endeavour to keep to the middle road.

This discussion is one of the greatest importance, I believe, to this country. I do not think that anyone will disagree with me—I know that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) will not—when I say that the whole future of western Canada is wrapped up not only in economic peace but every possible kind of peace in Europe. If, therefore, by the cancellation of Germany's debt to us we can help to bring about that peace, or progress just one step towards it, we shall have done a great deal.

The Treaty of Versailles which has been referred to so frequently to-night has not, I think, been glanced over at all. Let us look at it for a moment. In that treaty Germany specifically accepted responsibility for all the damage which she and the countries associated with her had done to Great Britain and her allies. On the other side, Great Britain and her allies specifically acknowledged in the treaty that the resources of Germany were not adequate to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage. The treaty did not attempt to fix the amount of damage for which Germany was to make payment, but it did provide for an initial payment on May 1, 1921 of twenty billion gold marks. This payment was to be in gold, in commodities, in ships, or, otherwise as the Reparations Commission might decide. In addition to that the remainder of the reparations to be made by Germany were to be decided upon by the Reparations Commission and were to be announced to Germany on or before May 1, 1921. On January 23, of that year the Reparations Commission reported that prior to December 31, 1920, Germany had delivered in payment of the 20 billions of gold marks referred to a large number of ships, a great quantity of commodities—I have the list with me but I do not think I need weary the House by giving the details—and in addition all her submarine cables. The estimated value of these commodities varies very much but one thing can be said, and that is that the value fell very far below the 20 billion marks. On May 10, 1921, Germany under pressure, accepted an estimate by the Reparations Commission of the additional reparations payable which we fixed at 132 billions of gold marks, roughly about 33 billion dollars. These were to be covered by bonds in three series—A. amounting to 12 billions; B, amounting to 38 billions. Both of these, bearing 5 per cent interest, were delivered to the Allied governments. Series C, of 82 billions was non-interest bearing and was to have been delivered, by November 1, 1921. In addition, the Reparations Commission decided that annual payments were to be as follows: 2 billions of gold marks and a variable amount up to 26 per cent of the total value of German exports. These payments were only sufficient to pay the interest on the bonds of Series A and B, and 1 per cent for amortization purposes, but they made no provision whatever for meeting the bonds of series C.

Now Germany made the first payment of 1 billion on time, but she at once commenced to

assert her inability to make any further payments. Then commenced those conferences. Conference followed conference, failure followed failure, leading up to the situation that we are now faced with. No one with a heart, no one with the realization of France's suffering, of the destruction which she has experienced, of her loss in every sense, can resent her stepping across into the Ruhr. No one who looks at the matter purely from the sentimental aspect, or from the aspect of cold justice, will blame her for her action. We all have deep sympathy for France, but in so acting did she take a wise step? None of the premiers of the other countries think it was a wise step. Only in this morning's paper I notice that an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne is to be moved in the British House of Commons. I am not quite certain who is to move it, but the amendment, which is being prepared by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Asquith, advocates the appointment of a commission in which the United States would be invited to participate for the purpose of investigating Germany's capacity for reparation payments and the best methods of securing a quick settlement.

The last speaker referred to the inflated condition of the currency in Germany but did not dwell on the effect that that had on the possibility of Germany meeting her debts. May I quote in this regard the Prime Minister of England. The charge has been levelled, mostly I believe by France against Germany, that she deliberately inflated her currency for the purpose of avoiding the payment of her debt, but the British Premier speaking about this says:

> Honestly I cannot myself take that view and for this reason: It is perfectly true that by that method of passive resistance Germany can avoid her ever paying any indemnity, but it only means what is very like suicide for Germany. I can hardly believe that any sane government would deliberately adopt that course.

Yet that course was adopted and continued until it led to some extraordinary conditions. The position of Austria in this regard is a slight degree worse, but not very much worse, at the present moment. I read some little time ago of a mortgage that had been taken out in the year 1917 in Austria for the sum of 250 thousand crowns. The par value in dollars at that time was $50,000. That mortgage of $50,000 in 1917 was paid in August of 1922 in full for $3.12½. A pension before the war of 30 thousand crowns was equal to about $6,000. To-day that same pension would buy you a breakfast. In the middle of August $1 would buy about one thousand marks in Germany. In January of this year $1 would buy more than eight thousand marks. Now

France has marched into the Ruhr. The immediate result of that action was to reduce the value of the mark to the vanishing point. Between January 14 and 18, the mark declined by 50 per cent. To-day you can buy 1 million marks for $50. The result of that invasion was the immediate rise in the cost of living and it at once doubled the difficulty of the payment of German reparations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the position that Germany is in with regard to its ability to meet the reparations. The total of the European debts to the United States of America is about $11,525,000,000. Of this England owes $4,747,000,000; France $3,770,000,000; and Italy owes $1,891,000,000. The remainder is owed by 17 other European nations. Now even should series C amounting to 82 billions of gold marks be cancelled, the remaining 50 billions of gold marks, or 12½ billion dollars is more than the total owed by 20 European nations to the United States. Now if these nations, which have already received more than a billion in gold and several billions in value in commodities are unable or have not—with one exception, the proud exception of Great Britain,—been able to pay even interest it appears to be reasonable to believe that Germany may be unable to pay any large part of the reparations amounting as they do to so much greater sums.

Force has failed. I personally do not think there is any possible prospect of success in the French invasion of the Ruhr district. We have seen in the last few days the collapse of industries in Germany, and we have seen strikes and other disturbances started, the outcome of which I am sure every member of this House dreads.

On one point I must agree with the last speaker. We must give every credit to Great Britain for the magnanimous position she took at the Paris conference, and I desire to remind the House of it. The offer was that Britain woud cancel France's debt to her. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to note that Britain proposed that she should cancel her debt to France, provided France would consent to a reduction of the German indemnity, and would drop altogether the proposition of bringing economic and military pressure to bear on Germany. I read that statement in the Montreal Gazette of 13th December, 1922.

Now, might we not follow England's example? I do not think the exact amount of reparation due to Canada has even been announced. It must be a comparatively small amount, and it will make little difference to us. No computation has been made of what is due to us by Germany up to this time. If

we pass this resolution perhaps we may in some small degree help to eliminate the old hatreds that we see rising up, even around us in this House, and we may be able to assist European reconstruction. When we have a crippled horse, Mr. Speaker, we do not cripple it further. We put it in a stable, and take it out, and feed it, if we think it can recover. If we think it can be made to do any work in the future we feed it, nurse it and look after it. If we do not think so, then we shoot it and put it out of misery. If we could find out just exactly what Germany's capacity is, and decide once and for all whether she can pay or not pay, then we could either put her out of misery, as France appears to be prepared to do, or sacrifice our reparations.

Mr. ARTHURS: Before the hon. member finishes, will he tell us whether he is in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg that Canada should withdraw all claims against Germany?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would appeal to this House to support the resolution that Canada should withdraw all claims to reparations in the interest of European peace, in our own interest, if you want to come nearer home, and in the interest of agriculture, if you wish to come still closer home.

Let me suggest to hon. members that we are told to-day, when we protest against the price we are receiving for our grain, that the low price is due to the appalling conditions in central Europe. May I say also that I hope this House will, in the interest of humanity, in the essential interest of the economic reconstruction in Europe and of human welfare and peace, support this resolution.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I may say at the beginning of my remarks that I certainly cannot support the motion of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). It is true, Sir, that if things go as they seem to be going in Europe, it is very probable that this country will receive nothing in the shape of reparations. And yet, if my memory serves me correctly, the revised amount of reparations which under the Peace Treaty was to be paid by Germany was thirty billion dollars. Originally almost double that amount was proposed. Suppose the last revised figures amount to thirty billions, then by Keynes' latest works which I have consulted to verify the facts, if that thirty billions were paid, Canada would receive one per cent, roughly, which means that Canada would get about three hundred million dollars, and yet my hon. friend from Winnipeg, looking at it from a cold blooded business standpoint, suggests in a three line resolution that we pass a motion in this House to forego that three hundred million dollars. It is doubtful if Canada will ever receive very much reparations, but there is another standpoint from which to view this question, and that is this: The passing of such a resolution in this House would help to complicate the already very much complicated conditions in Europe for by such a resolution you say once and for all that you do not believe that Germany has any right to pay you anything. By such action you condemn France, who has recently gone into the Ruhr, and I may say here, though it has no special bearing on this subject, that I have very great sympathy with France in her action in going into the Ruhr. When you remember the conditions which France went through, the suffering which France endured when the Germans invaded that country in 1870, when you remember that at that time the German troops first went to Versailles, and imposed upon France the most humiliating terms of peace, and on top of that, a very heavy reparation, you can well understand and appreciate the feelings of the French people to-day. The reparation demanded then was considered very heavy. Considering the value of money at that time and the value of money at the present time, the reparation payment which Germany imposed on France on account of a war which only lasted about six months, was, I believe, nearly equivalent to the thirty billion dollars imposed upon Germany on account of the recent war, and when Germany imposed that payment on France, she stayed in France with her army until the money was paid. Therefore, I feel very sympathetic towards France in the action which she has taken at the present time.

However, laying that aside for a moment, I do not believe it is the duty of this country to be the first to complicate the already very difficult conditions which exist in Europe. That is my first reason for very strongly opposing this resolution. My hon. friend from Winnipeg mentioned the boys and girls of Germany,—and I do not say this with any desire to arouse passion—when he mentioned the boys and girls of Germany, one was forced to think of the boys and girls in this country whose fathers had died in order to bring about peace in the world. While I do not accuse him of doing this with this object in view the intention apparently was to let the little boys and girls in Canada

suffer so that the little boys and girls in Germany might be relieved of the pressure of debt which they would have to pay in the future. According to all the despatches that we read at the present time, while the conditions in Germany are very bad just at the moment because of the Ruhr invasion, yet up to recently they had been very good probably better than the conditions in any country in Europe at least, and perhaps even better than conditions in Canada. According to persons whom I have met, who have visited Germany within the last year or year and a half, there was practically no unemployment in Germany, and yet we have a large unemployment problem in this country. And certainly, so far as Great Britain and France are concerned, and particularly Great Britain, the unemployment situation is critical. Indeed, so severe is it in Great Britain that the British parliament, according to a despatch in the press to-night, was this very day debating the question whether they might solve the unemployment problem by getting the unemployed to emigrate. Now, when a condition is so critical in a country that the unemployed are asked to emigrate as the only solution of the difficulty, it is obvious that conditions generally must be very bad indeed. I have certainly never read any suggestion coming from Germany or any of its people that there are in that country such conditions of unemployment as would necessitate anyone emigrating from Germany.

I do not intend to waste the time of the House going into all arguments put forth, because many of them have been dealt with very ably by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). But with reference to Mr. Keynes, I have never read any statement of his suggesting that there should be an entire abandonment of all reparation claims. He did suggest that the reparation claims originally imposed against Germany by the Allies at the Versailles conference were too severe and he said that they should be cut down. But so far as I can learn Mr. Keynes suggested something like thirty billion dollars as possibly an amount which Germany could pay. He may have proposed a lower sum, but there has not been anywhere in his writings any suggestion that the reparation claims should be wholly wiped out. It is true that some of the men quoted by the hon. member who intoduced the resolution have probably taken that attitude.

In considering the stand which some men even in the British Isles have taken in contradistinction to the position held by the people of France, we must bear in mind that the conditions are altogether different in the two countries. In England we find a country that was dependent to a great extent on its trade in the days before the war, and much of that trade was with Germany. So that, looking at the matter absolutely from the materialistic standpoint, the British people would probably be glad, as most of us no doubt would be glad in the interests of the world at large, but the English people particularly would be glad, to see Germany rehabilitated in order that there might be a resumption of British trade with Germany and British industries be once again put on their feet. France, on the other hand, was not so great a trading nation as Great Britain. She is looking at the danger that threatens her northern and eastern border from a country which invaded her and Belgium in cold blood. France is looking to the future, and I certainly do not blame her for so doing.

I shall vote against this resolution and I shall certainly be disappointed if it receives any great support in this House. If you support it you are practically exonerating Germany from all blame for bringing on the war. And while I cannot work myself up into a passion of hatred against Germany, I for one shall not vote to exonerate her from responsibility for the war through which we passed. But not only would a vote for this resolution be exonerating Germany, it would appear to me to be a condemnation of the actions of this country, of France, of England, and of the United States, which quietly for a period of three years discussed the question before going into the war. It would be a condemnation of all our Allies; it would be a condemnation of our boys who went overseas and of those who died there. I do not think, therefore, that we should vote for any such resolution as this, and it would be a great disappointment to the people of this country if this House at the present time, in the present condition of our finances, in the present situation in Europe, should pass a resolution of this character. For these reasons I shall emphatically oppose the resolution.

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

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

CIVIL SERVICE—APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Mr MANION:

For a copy of all orders in council passed since January 1st, 1921, removing appointments or affecting the removal of appointments or promotions from the Civil Service Commission.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Friday, February 16, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Annual Report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Sir Lomer Gouin.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 18, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 19, respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.—Mr. Jacobs.

MAIN ESTIMATES FOR 1923-4

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1924, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

PATENTS OF INVENTION

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 20 to amend and consolidate the acts relating to patents of invention.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to call the attention of the House, in connection with this bill, to Rule 50 dealing with bills relating to trade, which reads as follows:

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

I find that bills concerning patents and copyright were once considered as relating to trade, but at page 499 of the fourth edition of Bourinot it is stated, after enumerating which bills come within the rule, that—

> Bills respecting patents and copyright have been presented without committee.

That is, without the usual resolution preceding their introduction. On the same page there is also the following footnote bearing on this point:

> In 1872 a bill to amend and consolidate the patent laws was based on a resolution. But this was an irregularity as the bill merely imposed fees.

I am informed by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) that the present consolidation is of the same nature; it will impose fees and nothing else. On this assumption I consider that the bill does not come within Rule 50, and therefore he may proceed with its introduction.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, we have a letter from the Law Clerks along the lines laid down in your ruling.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

TRADE MARKS AND DESIGNS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce), moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. ROBB: This is for the purpose of making our law uniform with international law governing patent rights and industrial trade marks and designs.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CONVENTION OF COMMERCE WITH FRANCE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance, moved that the House on Tuesday next go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that a certain convention of commerce dated the fifteenth day of December, in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, entered into at Paris by plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by the President of the French Republic be approved and to give effect to the provisions of the said convention.

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

Motion agreed to.

CONVENTION OF COMMERCE WITH ITALY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance), moved that the House on Tuesday next go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that a certain convention of commerce dated the fourth day of January, in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, entered into at London by the plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by His Majesty the King of Italy be approved, and to give effect to the provisions of the said convention.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with

the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

STAMPS ON CHEQUES

PRACTICE CONCERNING QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I should like to ask the government whether any new practice has been adopted in connection with questions on the order paper. There was a question put on the order paper as to stamps on cheques. I notice that it has been dropped. It was not answered by the government. It was answered in so far as the Department of Customs and Excise is concerned, but that is not the department which has to do with it. I should think that the department concerned was the Finance department.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The initiation of legislation in these matters falls within the scope and duties of the Minister of Finance; the administration of the law falls under the authority of the Minister of Customs, and I suppose that was the reason my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) answered it. If there is anything, however, which is not answered that comes within the scope of my department, I shall have the matter looked into, and assure my hon. friend that he shall have the information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that the ruling has been given without a doubt. I assume that the question may stand until fully answered.

ALLEGED CAMPAIGN AGAINST IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): The press announces that a certain number of delegates to a trade union conference have decided to start a campaign to fight the movement to attract settlers to this country. I notice that a protest has been lodged with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. It is pointed out by the resolution that this protest is to apply not only to city dwellers, but also to farmers and proposed farmers. I should like to know if the government has anything to say in the matter, and what their attitude is in regard to it.

Hon. C. A. STEWART (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I have no knowledge beyond what is contained in the press report mentioned by my hon. friend.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 16, to provide for further advances to the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners.

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

On section 2—the Crown may advance $5,000,000 to corporation.

Mr. LADNER: With reference to the word "necessary" in the last line but one of this section, I presume that refers to such terminal facilities as are deemed necessary by the corporation. The corporation lays out its plans, and then the next section provides for the approval of the proposed expenditure. Is not that the meaning?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is the language usually used in all these bills.

Mr. LADNER: It may be the usual language, but somebody may get a freakish or obdurate turn of mind—and this is a very important matter from the point of view of Vancouver. There is no reason why the law should not be explicitly clear. I suggest that the words "by the corporation" be inserted after the word "necessary".

Mr. LAPOINTE: Nothing can be done, of course, without the approval of the Governor in Council. I am a reformer, but in matters of language, especially the English language, I would hesitate to make any change in what has been the custom.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think it would be very inadvisable to change the language of this clause. The House cannot pass over to any harbour commission rights which are vested in this parliament.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

MOTION BY MR. WOODSWORTH FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CANADA'S CLAIMS

The House resumed from February 15 consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Woodsworth that it is in the interest of world peace that Canada should withdraw all claims on Germany for reparations.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate on the reso-

lution submitted by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), I may say that the hon. member was no doubt actuated by the best motives in proposing the motion that he did, although the effect has been different, perhaps, from what he expected. I have no intention of taking up any considerable time of the House in discussing this very important resolution. I rather regret a good deal of the language that was used by the mover in presenting his case—language that was unnecessary, arousing many strong feelings, harrowing our feelings, I might almost say, by recalling many of the things which happened in the past. The sufferings endured and sacrifices made by the people of Canada and many other countries in defence of their liberties are too recent to enable them with calmness to hear them lightly passed over at this time. When we think of the sacrifices that were made, when we remember some of the early scenes in 1914 and 1915 when Germany began her march across the plains of Belgium; when we remember the stories of atrocities and other accounts that appeared in the papers of that time, many of which we know to-day were true, we must realize that this is not the time to begin to say we must forget everything and be just as we were before. I do not think anything can be gained by keeping alive the smouldering fires of hatred; it would be as well for the world if we could forget some of these things, though it may be hard to do at this time, and look toward the future and toward a brighter and better and happier condition everywhere throughout the world.

I do not think any good purpose would be served by my speaking at length on this subject. I may say, however, that in many respects I am not exactly in sympathy with the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). I have known that hon. gentleman for a great many years, but I believe that in this case his point of view is altogether wrong; the end he seeks will never be accomplished by the method he has taken. At the same time I believe him to be in earnest and, although mistaken, working in the best interests of the common people. I want to say that in justice to the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg. I know that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is very patriotic, and no doubt he meant all he said, but as he warmed up his patriotic sentiment got uppermost and he lashed the member for Centre Winnipeg in a very vicious manner. I am ever willing to forget and forgive, and I do not think any good purpose is served by that kind of debate in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made that statement, I can only say that I feel I must vote against the resolution; and I am sure I speak for a great many hon. members on this side when I say that we wish to dissociate ourselves from some of the sentiments that were expressed by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this resolution until I listened to the tremendous outburst of hysteria which took place on both sides of the House last evening, but having listened to that outburst with a good deal of sadness at heart—because I do not think it was creditable to the Parliament of Canada—I feel that I have to say a few words. I shall not enter into any prolonged debate upon the economic aspect of the question; that would be wasted effort. But I do wish to express a few opinions on the resolution itself and some of the arguments that were advanced. Hysterics in my opinion are the expression of argumentative penury. It gets us nowhere. It is an incentive to a spirit which leads away from truth rather than towards it. The Minister of Labour made a passionate plea which, to my mind harked back to the days of savagery.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: What savagery?

Mr. IRVINE: I shall proceed to indicate what it was—"An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth", was the spirit of the hon. minister. This appeal was placed—and here is the tragic part of it—in the name of the faller heroes of Canada. I think I shall have to mention here something which otherwise I should certainly hesitate to do. Among the names mentioned by the Prime Minister of Canada the other day that appeared among the missing I happened to have a brother and so if it is necessary, and I regret that such seems to be the case, that a man must speak from behind the blood of his relations before he can escape the imputed motives of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) and the Minister of Labour—of course, I must do it. If then it is a matter of whether I want to sell my brother's blood for a few German marks—which we will never get,—or whether I am to sell my brother's blood for the world peace for which he died, then there is no argument, or there is only one thing, and that is leave the marks out of consideration. Mr. Speaker; to place falsely, in

the name of patriotism, the blood of Canada in the scales and place on the other side the German mark is to my mind beneath the Canadian parliament, it is unworthy of the sacrifice our men made, and I certainly wish to dissociate myself from the sentiments that were expressed by the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in this regard. The latter gentleman indulged in a good deal of animosity which was entirely uncalled for. I believe, Sir, that there are certain rules in this House which prohibit a member from using certain words, but there does not seem to be any rule which prohibits a man from making certain inferences which, if expressed in words of a certain character, would be quite out of order. It seems to me that a great deal of animosity bubbled out from beneath the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, and he seems to think that the resolution as proposed by the leader of the Labour party (Mr. Woodsworth) could only come from a gentleman who was the victim of an economic freak. Did the hon. member for Vancouver Centre give us an exhibition of economics that would warrant us in the view that he has got enough of economics to constitute even a freak? I do not think he did. There was no evidence of any economic wisdom in his pronouncement. I think I can, perhaps, answer the verbosity of that hon. gentleman by a quotation from Emerson and thus save myself a good deal of mental effort. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre put out the historic argument of the Conservative which Emerson states so forcibly in the following words:

> The conservative alone remains the only evidence of his own faith, and we are compelled to discount even him. While his mind remains fixed it is compelled to defend different things.
>
> Conservativism took its original stand in favour of a primeval taboo, but since then it has defended the utterances of the Delphic Oracle, the Athanasian Creed, the inquisition, the geocentric theory, monarchy by the grace of God, witchcraft, slavery, war, capitalism, private property, imperialism.

That is the noble history of Conservativism, and I think the House will agree with me that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre upheld the traditions of his noble party last night in his tirade of implications against the leader of the Labour party, and in his decided opposition to the "new world" policy which substitutes reason and goodwill for blood.

Now, the resolution is really, after all, a most harmless resolution stating it negatively, and positively stated it might lead to a very great deal that would be desirable not only on the part of Canada but on the part of the world. I am not certain that I agree with the

leader of the Labour party's method of introducing it. Personally for the moment I do not care who started the war, we are dealing now with the results of it; and I imagine if we dug down to find out who started it we would have just about as much trouble as we have in deciding who won it, and that seems to be causing the world a great deal of speculation. We have in the causes of war, of this and other wars, a circle a century or two in circumference, and within that circle we have a veritable polyglot of influences which it is impossible to trace to their sources and all of which have a bearing upon the causes of war. I am not going to deal with that; I repeat that I care not for the moment who caused it; I am dealing with the actual situation with which we are confronted at the present time. And what is the question before us? The question before us is that Canada's sons, as was pointed out by the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, died that the world might have peace, died in a war that was going to end all wars. The question is, then, shall we help the cause for which they died the better by the forswearing of our claims upon any indemnity from Germany, or shall we help that aim forward by insisting that she pay to the last farthing whether by force of arms or by force of economic pressure? That is the question we are considering, and while I have a good deal of sympathy with the expressions of the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke), just now, yet I think, perhaps he is missing an opportunity here, for we must not allow any sentiment which we may have against any member of the House to interfere with our intelligent and reasonable analysis of the resolution itself. Which course will lead toward world peace is the crux of the question. Taking the thing on its highest possible ground we do not wish to haggle over marks when the world peace is in the balance. The resolution may be considered from two angles. First, it is economic. I refer you to the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), with regard to the economic side of the question. The other phase of the resolution has to do with obtaining the aim for which we fought in the last war. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada could see her way clear, regardless of carrying out the doctrine of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, burying as deep as hell the animosity that seemed to spurt from the Minister of Labour, and could see her way clear to be magnanimous in the interest of world peace, we should be

doing a more glorious thing for those who died and a greater thing for Canada and for the world. That is my position on this resolution.

I would refer, in closing, to an incident of last session, which is pertinent to the present discussion. We had an honoured professor from Oxford who came to this parliament last year and was introduced by the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons. They sponsored this professor, and what was his plea to us? Those of us who took the trouble to be present will remember that he outlined the whole economic situation in Europe. He showed us the hopelessness of trying to extract the indemnity from Germany, and he finished in words that were both dramatic and prophetic, suggesting what a great thing it would be if Canada could take the very course which this resolution asks that we should take. I think we can lay aside all animosity, and all unfair criticism and face this resolution on its own grounds. We know that the whole world is affected by the economic situation in Europe. We know, if we know anything, that the war cannot be paid for to the extent that is hoped by those who are entitled to receive indemnities, and most of us know that if we draw a tooth from Germany to-day, or pluck an eye from the Kaiser, to satisfy the hon. the Minister of Labour, that some day they will probably draw a tooth or pluck an eye from some other nation. We know also that, if we have that magnanimity of spirit which is worthy of our Canadian dead, we will say to the world and to Germany specifically: We will not have your marks, they are worthless anyway, keep them; we will not ask you to pay anything, but we will foreswear our share of the indemnity in the interests of that world peace for which our Canadian soldiers died.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): We must all admire, Mr. Speaker, the Christian sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman from Calgary East (Mr. Irvine), but I am at a loss to understand why such a resolution as this should be presented to a Canadian parliament at this time. Are we pressing for reparations? Are we in any way oppressing these poor Germans, whose ardent friend from Winnipeg is trying to protect them before they are attacked? Why bring in such a resolution as this? Is it his desire that this parliament should give a lead to Europe and to the Imperial parliament as to how it should deal with reparations? If that is his purpose I do not think that the Imperial parliament would be inclined to follow in his footsteps. So far as reparations are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Dominion of Canada might very well follow the lead given to us by the Mother Country and its government, and wait for developments before we begin to express our friendship for the poor downtrodden German. I am not concerned about the reparations, but I must confess that it vexes me considerably to have a man stand up in the House of Commons and tell us that Great Britain and France were as much responsible for the war as Germany. That is substantially the statement made by the hon. gentleman for Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). He read a number of quotations last night, among which I find the following:

> The British and French General Staffs had been in active collaborations for war with Germany ever since January 1906.

Does he mean to tell the House and the country that France and Great Britain had contemplated war against Germany in 1906? If that is what he is trying to make us believe, I think he has a task on his hands in which he will fail. There can be no doubt in the minds of men who followed the circumstances attending the beginning of the war that Germany was solely responsible for the war. He referred last night to what Austria and Hungary had done. Austria and Hungary did what the German Kaiser and the German government compelled them to do, and they had to do that right up to the time of the armistice. He knows, if he knows anything at all about the war, which I doubt, that Austria and Hungary would have ceased fighting long before if the Germans had permitted them to do so. But to come into this House and attempt to excuse Germany I cannot regard as anything but a little piece of German propaganda, designed perhaps to create opinion in Canada, and as far as it goes outside of Canada, that these poor people are being oppressed. If that is his object, I want to utter my protest against the House of Commons being used for such a purpose. The hon member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) answered his argument about the poor little children. I need not go into that further than to point out that whenever a man commits a crime his little children and his family are the sufferers, and when the leaders of the government committed that unparalleled crime they brought suffering upon the poor people of Germany.

I would like to draw another thing to the attention of my hon. friend when he is talking about reparations. There is only one argument that a German can understand, and that is the argument of force, and the best

guarantee that Germany will not again invade France is that France has gone in and taken hold of the Ruhr district, and I hope that France will keep it until every last cent of reparations is paid. I never had stronger sympathies in my life than I have for the people of France to-day for what they suffered in the war and what they are suffering yet. The question is whether France will be ruined or whether Germany will be ruined. If that is the issue, then my preference is that it shall be Germany. As far as my stand is concerned, I am with the French, and notwithstanding all the economists who may speak on this question, if I were a Frenchman I would glory in the action of the government of that country. I would tell these economists—who do not know half as much as they think they do—because these are the fellows that told us the war could not last three months, that the economic conditions were such that it was impossible to continue it, but it lasted over four years—I would tell these economists that I have great hope that France will win out in the contest that is now going on in the Ruhr. May I also point out to hon. gentlemen that every fifty years of the Christian era France has been invaded by this power, and why should we take our stand now by the side of the invading power and against our ally by adopting a resolution of this kind?

My hon. friend from Calgary East says he is as much troubled now in deciding who started the war as he is in deciding who won the war. Well, I think, Sir, that his mind must be entirely devoted to metaphysics and must be clear of all the practical questions of the day if he finds so much difficulty in deciding that question. I want to associate myself with those who would make Germany pay the cost of the destruction of France and Belgium. I protest against a motion of this kind being brought into the House because it can serve no good purpose and is designed, in my judgment, clearly to try and find a reason in the minds of some people in this country for exonerating Germany for its dreadful conduct in starting the war. What was the cry? "World power or ruin!" That was the issue that the German people under their leaders made. If they had succeeded in getting world power, what would this country be to-day? A colony of the German Empire, and my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth) would not be permitted to stand in the parliament of this country and say against Germany things that he is able to say on the floor of this House against the British Empire. Liberty, as we have it, would not exist in Canada if this were a German colony. Germany made her choice—world power or ruin. She is pretty well ruined. Still, I think, whether these reparations can be paid now or later on, they should be paid, and the payment of them is the only means by which the people of that country will be educated as to their iniquities and the unwisdom of war.

A provocative motion of this kind should have no place in parliament. I think I understand the peculiar and distorted mentality of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg, and I sympathize with him that his mind, which might have been bright and practical, and of value to the people of this country, has run off until he has become, I think he would not object to my saying, a Bolshevist. If his opinions are not of a Bolshevist turn, I do not undertsand what Bolshevism is. I do not think he would object to that characterization, and I am extremely glad that throughout this Dominion of Canada there are so very few of his type.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are four conferences, the proceedings of which should, I think, be considered in connection with the resolution of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). The first was the conference of Versailles, at which the Treaty of Versailles was drafted and signed by the different countries involved in the war. The second was the conference at Spa, held in 1920, at which the reparations which, under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany had admitted she should pay to the allied and associated powers were allocated as between the different powers. The third conference was a conference of inter-allied representatives, held at London in 1921, at which conference the proportion of the reparations to be assigned to the British Empire and others of the allied and associated powers, was definitely fixed. The fourth was a conference held in London in 1921, between the British government and the prime ministers of the different dominions, at which conference the proportion of the reparations which Canada and the other dominions and Great Britain were to receive, was determined. For purposes of record, may I mention one or two relevant particulars with respect to these conferences?

Under article 231 of the treaty of Versailles, Germany admitted responsibility for all loss and damage to which the allies and associated governments and their nationals had been subjected as a consequence of the war. Ger-

many's signature stands to-day to a treaty in which she admits that she was responsible for the war and for all the damage that grew out of it. That should answer for all time the question of the responsibility of the war.

Mr. GOOD: Could it possibly be said that that signature was secured under duress?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is unnecessary to answer my hon. friend's question. Article 232 states that the Allies recognize that Germany is unable to pay the full amount of these damages; it is further provided that the allied and associated governments require, and Germany undertakes, to make compensation for all damages done to the civilian population and their property.

Under article 253, the amount of these damages was directed to be determined by the Reparation Commission. The category of damages which Germany undertook to pay was set out in the annex following article 244.

At the conference of the inter-allied representatives, held at Spa in July, 1920, the amount payable by Germany was allocated between the different allied powers, 22 per cent being the amount receivable by the British Empire.

At the conference of the inter-allied representatives held at London in 1921, the amount of damages payable by Germany was fixed at one hundred and thirty two billion gold marks. The provision of the treaty that the amount be fixed by the Reparation Commission was at that time superseded.

At the conference of the British government with the prime ministers of the dominions in 1921, at which conference I think my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was present, Canada's share of the amount to which the British Empire was entitled, was fixed at 4.35 per
4 p.m. cent of the 22 per cent to which the British Empire was entitled. Seeing that the British Empire at the time that the question was being decided as to what amounts Great Britain and the several dominions were to receive, acted as one; that all the different parts were taken into consultation, would it not appear in every way right and proper, and indeed the only thing that is fitting, that, before any alteration is made by any one part of the British Empire on this question of reparations, they should all have opportunity of conferring together with reference to that question? I will not take second place to any hon. member in this House as to a desire to see Canada manage her own affairs, maintain in every way and at all times her identity and individuality; but there are occasions when not only is it right and necessary, but when any other course would appear to be wrong and improper, that all parts of the British Empire should act together as one. In regard to a settlement such as this, dealing with a matter of war, in which different parts of the Empire fought together, in which their sons died together, where the matter was originally determined in common conference, the only proper way in which to deal with the question at issue namely that of reparations would appear to be by all parts acting together as they did at the time the agreement was made as to the proportion which each should receive.

Indeed, only a few days ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain, speaking in France, made reference to the possibility that at some time the British Empire might consider what could be done in this very matter of reparations. But Mr. Bonar Law was careful at the time of making his statement to say that whatever Great Britain might do in the matter, would be done only after consultation with the different British dominions. I think it will be the wish of the British dominions throughout the Emipre to adopt precisely the same attitude towards the Mother Country in this matter as the Mother Country is prepared to adopt towards us.

My hon. friend who has moved the resolution says that his purpose is the furtherance of world peace. I believe he is quite sincere in so stating his position, but I would say to him that I fear the effect of his resolution, if adopted by this House, would be entirely the opposite of what he would wish it to be in that regard. We cannot as respects any resolution passed by this House dissociate the effect of its interpretation outside of and within the House; we cannot dissociate its effect beyond the boundaries of and within our own country. My hon. friend says that this would be a gesture. I am very much afraid it would be a gesture which would be construed as anything but favourable to France, and rather strongly in favour of Germany at this particular time. As my hon. friend knows, the relations between France and Germany at the moment are severely strained. The most serious situation that we have in the world at the present time exists because of those strained relations. Is it conceivable that this parliament at this moment could pass a resolution which has a bearing upon that situation without it being construed abroad as an expression of our attitude in that very serious situation?

I would say to my hon. friend that I hope when he reflects upon the views which have been expressed here, when he reflects upon the possible bearing of his resolution in its relation to the situation overseas at this particular time, he will see well to withdraw it altogether. But if he does not see fit to take that course, I hope this House will see well to defeat his resolution, because I fear were it passed its purpose would not be understood in any such sense as that in which he says he has put it forward.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have no particular desire to address the House and to in any way pretend to add to the importance of this resolution. At the same time I do not want to be even seeming to attempt to evade any part of my duty or responsibility here.

The resolution may be viewed from the standpoint of its own merits and debated. To its being so presented, I have not any particular objection. But even so presented, disrobed of all the other trappings with which it was introduced, I would oppose it.

But the resolution has been presented in a speech which sought to press its acceptance on grounds that reflected on the bona fides of our country and of our Allies in the war from which we have emerged. It would take an assertion of fact pretty hard to overcome, to secure my support after it had been paraded before us to accompaniments of that kind. I cannot, I am sorry to say, agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the way he meets the suggestions of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). I do not base my belief in the good faith of Britain and of France, in the complete and absolute accountability of Germany for the war, on any admission exacted from Germany under the pressure of the Conference of Peace. I would not regard even a voluntary admission by Germany as of much value or as necessary at all. I base my belief on facts that the world knows, facts that have been flared before the face of this generation so clearly that none except those of kinked and super-heated minds can doubt their manifest and eternal import. There is some weight attaching to the statement of a man who, like Prince Lieknowsky, who sitting as a German ambassador at the very centre of events, watching the course of Germany, of Great Britain and of France throughout the crisis, had the courage to state that, knowing what he knew, his own country was solely the cause of the conflict, the aggressor from beginning to end. But this matter does not admit of discussion. Do not let us in any way ennoble the suggestion of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg by discussing the matter of the accountability for the Great War that scourged this country.

Now, taking the resolution itself, aside entirely from what has been urged in its support —apparently with some measure of acceptance to the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine)—it proposes that Canada should now assert to the world that she abandons all claim to any share of reparations. The argument in its favour, aside from what I have already described, is that it is going to aid world peace, that it will be an exhibition of mercy, an acceptance of some scriptural injunction, and in that way be an evidence of the high moral standing of this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, it applies to France, it applies to Britain, and it applies to Belgium just as clearly as it would to this country. If the right way to bring about world peace is to take the man who, with uplifted arm, enters your house to slaughter your family, and say to him: Now, we forgive you, go and sin no more;—if we have come to that day in this world, all right, let that be general. We do not find that course possible in this Dominion nor anywhere else in the world. Penalties are still the law of this universe, and no man entitled to enjoy liberty and be at large would suggest that any other principle is possible in the conduct of the affairs of men.

Why, if it is right at this time to say to Germany: You were wrong, but we forgive you, we do not ask that you pay for any of the damage that you committed;—well, my idea is that we place the biggest premium possible on the repetition of German aggression. Germany escaped unhurt from the consequences of her crime of 1870; she escaped unpunished from the consequences of her crimes of 1862 and 1866. And because she so escaped—the aggressor in all those instances—though she exacted a penalty from France, when the time came again that she thought she could strike, she was again the aggressor. In 1914 France, which just forty years before had been called upon to pay an indemnity of a billion dollars, stood at bay until German arms were raised, and until France knew that unless she rose in her own defence she would suffer a repetition of the woes of 1870. If Germany had been made to pay for her crime in 1870, there would not have been a war in 1914.

Now, I ask hon. gentlemen just to reflect. How would you like to stand to-day in the face of the people of France and say to those people: There are your cities desecrated; there are your young children murdered; there are your women folk outraged;

there are your sons slaughtered—for no cause attributable to you at all; there is your country to-day, a desolation—now be good enough just to restore all those ruins yourselves and let the destroyer pass by unrepentant and unpunished. What kind of suggestion would that be to make to France? Well, by just the same argument it is an outrageous suggestion to make to this country. I know we have not suffered as France has; our measure of reparation is that much less than France's, but our right is just the same as theirs. To ask this parliament, then, to abandon that right, to throw it away, is indirectly to suggest the same thing to Belgium, to Poland and to France.

I do not want to be understood as saying that this country is probably going to collect the measure of reparation that now, under the covenants, is our due. I do not think myself that that is probable. But, parenthetically, I am not quite able to understand the contention that it would be a great and noble thing to give up our right to all reparations, when followed by the assertion that the reparations are no good anyway because German marks are useless. I cannot follow that argument.

I am going to give my idea of the principle on which reparations should be founded. There is no doubt that German damage in this war is beyond all power of Germany to pay. If I go out and commit damage, of course I ought to pay for it all, but if I go on a rampage and destroy the city of Ottawa there would be very little use in assessing me for the value of the city. I should, however, be made to pay all that by the power of my hands and my mind I can bring to production in the course of my life. In my judgment the same principle should apply to the aggressor in the late war. Germany should be made to contribute all that the German people can stand; all that they can by production turn over to those who suffered by their wrong. Now, there is a point—and I admit it is very difficult to find—beyond which if you add to the burden you destroy the capacity to produce; you turn the country down the hill rather than over the hill and disable it from performing its contract. The best minds of the world should address themselves to the task of finding as nearly as they can where that point is, and, that done, let all the Allies see to it, by whatever means are essential, that up to such point Germany pays without abatement.

I find myself wholly in accord with the Prime Minister in his statement that before we set about to determine just what we should insist on, we should meet with the other countries of the Empire and seek, in concert with them, to come to a decision applicable to all. In fact, I would go further than by the terms of his speech the Prime Minister indicated he would go to-day. I am one of those who believe that in all matters affecting the common concerns of the Empire, of which this is only one, it is fundamental and contributes to world peace if we sit down with the other nations of the Empire and seek in conference with them to find a common course. But applying the principle only to this, it is evident that before any step is taken now in derogation of what we did in association with the other nations of the Empire, we should sit with them and see what the wisest step, having regard to the interests of all, may be.

That we should do, but when we get there I hope the attitude of this government—and I believe it is the will of this parliament that such should be the attitude—will be that they will endeavour to find, in the light of the best evidence that the economists of the world can produce, the utmost limit that it is possible for Germany to pay in satisfaction for the damage she caused this world, and thus commence the colossal task of restoring those countries, the restoration of which is not only an act of justice for which the world is longing but as well an event of vital importance to this Dominion. You are not going to restore Europe by taking Germany's burden and putting it on the back of France. You are not going to restore Europe by virtually saying to every citizen of Germany: Any time you want to repeat the outrage of 1914 you can count upon us, after the war is over and we are weary of it all, to say to you that the penalty is entirely revoked. No, you will not restore Europe in that way. There must be left in the minds of all the people of the world a sense of justice done before the first essential, the corner stone of restoration, is put in place. If something is done that forever will rankle in the mind of France as an injustice to her; rankle in the mind of the British taxpayer, whose trials are only in short measure understood; rankle in the minds of these people as a gross iniquity born of soft-minded flabbiness on the part of the nations of the world, then you have only postponed the day of a reconstructed and a rehabilitated Europe.

Yes, Germany signed the peace treaty. Germany, of course, signed it under duress; I fully admit that. Germany's signature to my mind means this and this only: she decided it was better to sign it and undertake its obligations than to accept the only alternative. That is why Germany signed.

I place no importance whatsoever upon her signature as an admission. I judge of Germany's obligation not by what she signed, but by what she did, and so far as it lies in my power, I shall support the view that there should be no remission beyond the point of Germany's capacity to pay.

There remains an argument that perhaps I might refer to—there are some who hold it, and, I think, hold it conscientiously—that the exactions made of Germany under the treaty went beyond what could reasonably to read into the Fourteen Points promulgated by the President of the United States; that the President of the United States having stipulated that only civilian damage should be held as that for which Germany should account, and Germany having ceased fighting on those stipulations, it was not fair to include in civilian damage the capitalized value of separation pay, and, I think, of pensions as well. This matter was argued at the Versailles Conference. I understand the United States representatives for a time took a stand against the inclusion of those items, but after argument and the fullest debate they conceded the point, and as a consequence those were included. Such was the judgment of the majority—I think it was the unanimous judgment—of those who attended that conference. Such judgment has not been reversed, and I have never been able to persuade myself that it should be reversed. If it could be shown that to include these classes of damages was in any way in derogation of the stipulations on the faith of which Germany laid down her arms, then, whatever the prior crime of Germany, I would be prepared to abide by the real meaning of those stipulations. This as yet has not been shown; until it is shown I think the only principle that should govern is the principle that I have just sought to elucidate to the House. At all events, that is the course I would pursue.

I propose to vote against the resolution, but I do not for a moment suggest that the government of this country should not take its place among the nations of the Empire, or if necessary among all the Allied nations, and seek to have a composition of the whole subject of war reparations, so long as in that composition the principle I have sought to emphasize is not forgotten.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I do not intend to delay the House very long this afternoon in the observations which I propose to make on this very important resolution. It seems to me that the quiet, weighty and reasonable remarks of the Prime Minister will find a responsive chord in the hearts of nearly all of us present, and I trust that those responsible for bringing the resolution before the House will feel it incumbent upon them to comply with his courteous request.

But things have been said in this debate which I do not think should go without some observations being made thereon. I have been pained at some attacks made upon the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). I do not believe he deserved those attacks. I believe he brought this resolution before the House with the best of good will, with absolute sincerity and conviction of the righteousness of what he brought forward. It has been the glory of British people, Mr. Speaker, that at all times in the nation's history here and overseas there have been men who have been prepared to stand up for what they thought was right, even if it went against the current of popular opinion at the time. Fox withstood Pitt and argued against the continuance of war with France a hundred or more years ago. At the time of the Crimean war, John Bright fulminated against Great Britain's stand at that time, and history has said that he was right. A few years after, it was the turn of Richard Cobden to protest against the Opium War in China. We should always courteously listen to those with whom we disagree, even if they say things we might not consider wise, or if wise which we consider unpalatable.

Now, that Germany was the immediate aggressor, I think we are nearly all in accord. But if Germany was the immediate aggressor in the Great War—and dearly has she paid for her aggression—does anyone in this House composed of intelligent men, believe that Germany was solely responsible for the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the war came because the European peoples had for years followed a false system. They tried to find security in military preparedness. I grant you that it was enormously difficult when one nation had set the pace for others not to keep step with it. Once Germany believed that Russia was arming against her, it was difficult for Germany not to prepare. Once England believed that Germany was arming against her, it seemed only the part of wisdom to prepare for war and to seek alliances; and we found before the Great War broke upon this world that Europe was divided into two great armed camps—the Central Empires on the one side, who relied at that time upon the adhesion of Italy,

which failed them when the time came, and the Entente Powers, Russia, France and Great Britain, on the other. What appeals to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the lesson for humanity which we derive from seeing this war in its operation, seeing what led to it, and seeing its consequences, is the utter futility for mankind to try to protect itself against violence by military preparation. Surely that is a lesson of the war which has been driven home to all of us. What I would ask this House to consider is, not men who have been our enemies, not men who have been our friends, but suffering humanity, the victims rather than the authors of what has happened to them. That seems to me the frame of mind in which we should approach this question.

I have little more to say. I believe that the great cause of the war was the conflicting imperialisms of Europe, nations striving to extend the ambit of their power, particularly in parts of the world which were only semi-civilized or not civilized at all. The conflicts of imperialisms in Africa and other parts of the world were, I think, the cause of the war which has its roots far in the past.

I do not know what the mover (Mr. Woodsworth) proposes to do. I hope that he will withdraw this resolution, not because the resolution is wrong in essence, but because it is liable to be misunderstood. Why should we be willing to give up any part of our reparations? Not because we think that France should give up reparation, for I think we are all convinced that Germany which devasted northern France owes by every rule of ethics, law and justice, the obligation of restoring those devasted portions of France, and it is but fair to say that the German trade unions have offered to restore northern France, and that that offer has not been accepted.

I have little more to say on this occasion. What I do wish to protest against in all good spirit is the attacks that have been made against a man who has tried to say what he thought right and what he thought in the interests of peace. We may agree with him or we may not agree with him, but let us be charitable one to another. I think that in the last ten years what has happened in this world has shown the truth of what John Bright said fifty years ago in connection with the Irish question, that force is no remedy, and this old world will not have peace and concord until force as an ultimate solution is abandoned and men will rely upon good will and justice to settle their disputes.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I wish to associate myself with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in requesting the mover of the resolution (Mr. Woodsworth) to withdraw his motion. Personally I find myself in very large agreement with his point of view, but I would find it very difficult under the circumstances to vote for his resolution, for various reasons which have already been outlined, particularly by the Prime Minister. I think that a vote taken under the circumstances would not be a vote on the merits of the question which the mover has in mind, and therefore I think it would be unfortunate to call for a vote.

I wish also to protest, as did the hon. member for Brome, against the spirit of hostility displayed, and against the sneers and jeers that have been uttered in this House, in this debate. I know that this is a question which it is almost impossible to discuss without heat, animosity and prejudice, and sometimes it is wise, although not always perhaps, not to risk arousing prejudices when you are pretty sure that what may be said will only result in inflaming feeling

I do not think I have anything further to say. I do believe that we ought to remember the old truth that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword. That is something that we ought to take to heart nationally, but I am not going to discuss that question. I would once more request that the mover of the resolution do not press for a vote upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the mover closes the debate, the Chair must give its ruling, which I thought was awaited with considerable anxiety. The point was raised last night by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) that this resolution, under rule 78, was out of order and could not be proceeded with. The resolution is couched in vague language. It reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interest of world peace that Canada should withdraw all claims on Germany for reparations.

As I stated last night, Canada here means the Crown and the Crown has claims against Germany. The rights of Canada are clearly stated in the Treaty of Versailles. Canada was represented at the making of that treaty, Canada's representatives signed the treaty, and the reparations which Germany was condemned to make are set forth in Articles 231 to 244. Annex I enumerates claims that could arise out of those reparations. For instance:

> Annex I
>
> Compensation may be claimed from Germany under Article 232 above in respect of the total damage under the following categories:
>
> (1) Damage to injured persons and to surviving dependents by personal injury to or death of civilians

caused by acts of war, including bombardments or other attacks on land, on sea, or from the air, and all the direct consequences thereof, and of all operations of war by the two groups of belligerents wherever arising.

(2) Damage caused by Germany or her allies to civilian victims of acts of cruelty, violence or maltreatement (including injuries to life or health) as a consequence of imprisonment, deportation, internment or evacuation, of exposure at sea, or of being forced to labour, wherever arising, and to the surviving dependents of such victims.

(3) Damage caused by Germany or her allies in their own territory or in occupied or invaded territory to civilian victims of all acts injurious to health or capacity to work, or to honour, as well as to the surviving dependents of such victims.

(4) Damage caused by any kind of maltreatment of prisoners of war.

(5) As damage caused to the peoples of the allied and associated powers, all pensions and compensation in the nature of pensions to naval and military victims of war (including members of the air force), whether mutilated, wounded, sick or invalided, and to the dependents of such victims, the amount due to the allied and associated governments being calculated for each of them as being the capitalized cost of such pensions, and compensation at the date of the coming into force of the present treaty, on the basis of the scales in force in France at such date.

(6) The cost of assistance by the governments of the allied and associated powers to prisoners of war and to their families and dependents.

(7) Allowances by the governments of the allied and associated powers to the families and dependents of mobilized persons or persons serving with the forces, the amount due to them for each calendar year in which hostilities occurred, being calculated for each government on the basis of the average scale for such payments in force in France during that year.

(8) Damage caused to civilians by being forced by Germany or her allies to labour without just remuneration.

(9) Damage in respect of all property wherever situated belong to any of the allied or associated states or their nationals, with the exception of naval and military works or materials, which has been carried off, seized, injured or destroyed by the acts of Germany or her allies on land, and sea, or from the air, or damage directly in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war.

(10) Damage in the form of levies, fines and other similar exactions imposed by Germany or her allies upon the civilian population.

As the House will readily see, Canada has various claims against Germany, and when Canada is invited to relinquish such claims it is a matter which affects the public exchequer. Therefore it comes under the rule which was quoted last evening by the hon. member for New Westminster. Under that rule in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms I find the following:

626. This House will not proceed upon any petition, motion or bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown but in a committee of the whole House.

Then I find further:

629. The recommendation of the Crown is needed for such measures as bills relating to the extension of time for the repayment of the deposit which has become liable to forfeiture in the case of a private bill; the release or compounding of sums due to the Crown; the repeal of an exemption from an existing duty, as the burthen of the duty is thereby augmented; a proposal to repeal an existing drawback on export of sugar, as it effects an increase of charge upon the importers who desired to export sugar.

I also find in May 12th edition, at page 461, the following:

In pursuance of standing orders Nos. 66 and 67 a petition praying directly or indirectly for an advance of public money; for compounding or relinquishing any debts due to, or other claims of, the Crown; or for remission of duties or other charges payable by any person; or for a charge upon the revenues of India, will only be received if recommended by the Crown.

And so on. So that the principle of rule 78 is clearly laid down, in May. In Bourinot I also find the following:

Referring to this right of members to move such abstract resolutions all authorities agree that it is one "which the House exercises, and should always exercise, with great reserve and only under peculiar and exceptional circumstances." Such resolutions are considered virtually "an evasion of the rules of the House, and are on that account objectionable, and should be discouraged as much as possible."

It might be said that the resolution is only the expression of a pious wish. I grant that in an ordinary matter the Speaker might ignore the rule and acquiesce in a debate such as has taken place since last evening. But here we are face to face with a very serious matter. In my humble judgment, if the House of Commons of Canada, under the present circumstances, adopted this resolution it would have far reaching consequences. Internationally speaking, it would be a notice given to the allied powers that Canada relinquishes her share of the reparations. Therefore, I think I am only doing my duty in adhering to the rule and in following the precedents which have been adopted in Great Britain and in Canada, precedents which have received the support of the best parliamentarians in our country such as Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. Holton and Mr. Blake. As Bourinot says:

Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. Holton, and Mr. Blake pointed out the necessity of considering with the fullest deliberation all propositions which may involve an appropriation of the public moneys.

An appropriation of the public moneys or relinquishing debts or claims owing to the Crown is the same thing in my humble judgment and consequently, following on these authorities, I declare that the point was well taken and my ruling is that the resolution is out of order.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TAX EXEMPT BONDS

Mr. NEILL:

What is the aggregate value (calculated at par) of all bonds issued by the Government of Canada, exempt from income tax?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Bonds and domestic issues, exempt from Dominion income tax, $1,103,972,550; of New York issues, $50,874,000.

In addition, $160,000,000 of bonds issued and payable in New York are exempt from Dominion taxes except when beneficially owned by persons residing or ordinarily resident in Canada.

MINISTERS' AND OFFICIALS' TRAVELS

On the question of Mr. Stansell being called:

Mr. STANSELL:

1. What Ministers of the Crown have been absent from Canada since the close of last session?
2. What were the several tours taken by each Minister so absent, and what was the object of each trip?
3. What were the names of those who, at the public expense, accompanied each Minister, and what was the purpose?
4. What officials of the various departments have been out of Canada since the last session and for what purpose in each case?
5. What were the several tours taken by each official so absent, and what was the object of each trip?
6. What has been the cost to Canada of such trips by Ministers and officials, and those who accompanied them?
7. What has been the cost to the Dominion of the various trips made by Ministers and persons who accompanied them since the last session of Parliament: (*a*) within Canada; (*b*) out of Canada?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the question was dropped yesterday.

Mr. FIELDING: I said the hon. gentleman should convert it into a motion, when it would be more conveniently dealt with. I did not say "dropped."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not think the hon. minister said "dropped."

Mr. FIELDING: But that was my answer. We were not prepared to answer in that way, but if he would convert it into a motion we would deal with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could it not stand as an order for return?

Mr. FIELDING: No, not in its present form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will leave it as it is.

Mr. FIELDING: I have given the answer of the government, and I would prefer if the hon. member would bring it forward as a motion, because we desire to give him information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask what is the matter with the question?

Mr. FIELDING: The question occupied some space and would call for poscsibly a good deal of information. At all events in the judgment of the government it should not be dealt with in that form. We are perfectly content to bring the information down if he will move for it. There is nothing remarkable in that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only course the government has to pursue in that case is to have it stand as an order for return.

Mr. FIELDING: But suppose I do not want it to stand in that form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What other alternative has the government?

Mr. FIELDING: I propose to move an amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To the question?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I cannot do that, but I can move an amendment to the motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then, there is no motion.

Mr. FIELDING: If there is no motion, only a question, I could not answer it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman says he will not answer it—

Mr. FIELDING: I have given the answer. If it is converted into a motion it will then be considered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it stands, as an order.

Mr. FIELDING: No, it does not stand as an order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does it not? Has the hon. gentleman a right to strike a question off the order paper?

Mr. FIELDING: No, but I have a right to answer the question. The judgment of the government in that respect must be accepted. The hon. gentleman can proceed to move, but he cannot compel me to answer the question in any other form than that which seems to us to be proper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. Minister of Finance assert that he can stand up in the House and say "We will not answer the question", and then ask the clerk to record that as an answer?

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say I would not answer. I said I had answered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says "I will not answer", and then says, "I have answered".

Mr. FIELDING: No, I did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: His words are down and his words are "We will not answer it in that form".

Mr. FIELDING: Exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And then he says, "I have answered".

Mr. FIELDING: That is the answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the government is entitled to do that, I think, Mr. Speaker, your well known capacity to hunt for precedents will be taxed in vain. If he says, "We will not answer it in this form", and instructs that the records of the House show that that is an answer, then the whole practice of questioning falls to the ground, and the government has it in its power to deny everything, giving no reasons whatsoever.

Mr. FIELDING: Most certainly—

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is a matter of length, if the minister has said the answer is going to be too long and entail too much work, then the government can say, "Stands as order for return", and the House has no alternative. That is the only reason the minister has given for his very strange attitude. If that is the objection to the question, all right, the government has its alternative, it can stand as an order for return, but the government has no right to say "We will not answer it in its present form, we do not like it, and we say that is our reason—"

Mr. FIELDING: I am surprised at the hon. gentleman. It is in his power and in the power of any member of the House to frame a question as he pleases, and it is the right of the government to say whether they will answer it in that form or not. We take the liberty to say that if this is put in the form of a motion we would bring down the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the same thing as having it stand as an order for return.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference?

Mr. FIELDING: As a question I can not amend it, but as a motion before the House I can ask the House to amend it. That is the difference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not of the nature of a motion. It is in the nature of an inquiry.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I have answered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman is satisfied, I do not think he will be proud of the record when it appears in print.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. members will look at Rule No. 37, paragraph 3, they will find the following:

If in the opinion of Mr. Speaker a question on the order paper put to a Minister of the Crown is of such a nature as to require a lengthy reply, he may, upon the request of the government, direct the same to stand as a notice of motion, and to be transferred to its proper place as such upon the order paper, the Clerk of the House being authorized to amend the same as to matters of form.

Para. 4. If the question is of such a nature that in the opinion of the Minister who is to furnish the reply such reply should be in the form of a return, and the Minister states that he has no objection to laying such return upon the Table of the House, his statement shall, unless otherwise ordered by the House, be deemed an order of the House to that effect, and the same shall be entered in the Votes and Proceedings as such.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite prepared to abide by either one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then my ruling is that it comes under paragraph 3. It will stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For return?

Mr. SPEAKER: As a notice of motion. The other one is in the form of a return. One is the notice of motion, and the other one is the form of return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it stands as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER: It stands as a notice of motion.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE DISBURSEMENTS

Mr. BOYS:

1. What expenses, payments or disbursements of any kind have been made since April 1, 1922, out of other moneys than those included in the amounts voted by Parliament for the Department of Militia and Defence in respect of items or charges paid in the fiscal year 1920-21 out of moneys voted for the Department of Militia and Defence?

2. Under what authority were such moneys so paid from other votes, and why was the change made?

3. Were objections offered by the Department of the Auditor General to payments being so made or to other attempts to make similar payments? If so, in what cases?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think this question was called yesterday and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) asked that it be allowed to stand so that he could really understand what the hon. gentleman wished by his first question. He asked the hon. member to put it in different langauge, so that he would be able to give him the information. The question does not quite convey what is desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have looked over the question since the Minister of National Defence made the statement the other day. The question seems clear to me. If I were to put it in other words than those which appear on the order paper, it is this: what the hon. member desires is a statement of payments made charged to other departments than the Department of National Defence, in the present fiscal year, in respect of expenditures that in former years were charged to Militia and Defence. I could illustrate that by an example. Presuming that in the fiscal year 1921, the rent of a building used as an armoury was paid and charged to Militia and Defence, and in 1921 paid and charged to Public Works, that would be such an item as would be covered, and asked for by a return to the House.

Question stands.

WINNIPEG SAMPLE MARKET

Mr. Millar:

1. How much grain has been sold on the Winnipeg Sample Market in each of the last four years?
2. What amounts have been received by the Government from the proceeds of terminal elevator overages for the last year, for which returns are available?
3. Did the Government propose towards the close of the 1922 shipping sesaon to waive the regulations forbidding foreign boats carrying Canadian grain between Canadian ports?
4. If so, did any Canadian carrier or carriers make objections, and what are the names of such objectors?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: This question must stand until we can get the return from Fort William.

Mr. SPEAKER: As an Order for Return?

Mr. ROBB : No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question stands.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

MOTION BY MR. POWER FOR REPEAL OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to repeal chapter 12, 8-9 George V., an Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with this resolution which stands in my name on the order paper, I should like, through you, to ask the House to allow me to amend the resolution by adding after the words "Civil Service of Canada" the following words:

and to restore, in so far as circumstances will permit, the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908.

Mr. SPEAKER: This can be done only by unanimous consent. I take it that the House agrees to the amendment to the motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the hon. member should proceed with his motion to-day under an amendment just introduced. I think I understand the effect of the amendment, but there certainly might be hon. members a shorter time in this House who would not.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the unanimous consent of the House is required, I take it that the hon. gentleman will not proceed on his amendment. He may, however, proceed on the motion unamended.

Mr. POWER: I am surprised that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has not seen fit to allow me to proceed with my amendment. If, however, I understand parliamentary practice, it will not be very difficult for me to induce some of my friends to move to the resolution an amendment somewhat similar to that which I have suggested. I had intended moving this amendment in order to reassure a number of hon. members who were under the impression that the resolution as placed on the order paper was somewhat too radical and would have the effect of bringing about chaos in the Civil Service of Canada. The effect of the amendment will be that one piece of legislation will be repealed, and that immediately another act, which is, to my mind, far more advantageous, will replace it. There are certain portions of the act of 1908 which, of course, would not apply to the circumstances of the case at the present time. For instance, if my memory serves me well, a schedule of salaries is attached to the act of 1908. These salaries are in many cases much lower than those which at present obtain in the Civil Service, and they would naturally have to be increased. It is not my intention in any way to urge upon members of the House the advisability or expediency of diminishing the salaries of the public servants of Canada. I feel that the cost of living has increased so much in recent years, and that the salaries paid are in many cases so low, that it would be impossible or, at any rate, most ungenerous, for us to ask that these be diminished.

This proposed resolution of mine has received a certain amount of criticism, some of it very harsh, some of it, perhaps, a little ungenerous, in the press and even in this House of Commons. We have heard from some hon. gentlemen who sit directly opposite, an ultimatum delivered to the government warning the Prime Minister and his colleagues not to allow impious backbenchers of the Liberal party to lay their sacrilegious hands on the sacred Civil Service Commission. In order that the responsibility

for this resolution may lie where it properly belongs, allow me to tell my hon. friends that the resolution was drafted and 5 p.m. placed on the order paper without my having entered into any consultation whatever with the leaders of the party to which I have the honour to give my allegiance. Permit me to say, too, that I await with some little anxiety the announcement of the point of view which the government intends to take on this subject. I am here, however, to represent, in so far as I can, the opinions of the constituents who elected me, provided always that their opinions and views are consistent with and conducive to the best interests of Canada. So far as I am able to judge from the frequent and sometimes rather forcible representations which have been made to me, I am inclined to believe that the great majority of my constituents have not for the Civil Service Act or for the Civil Service Commission the respect and admiration which a large number of my hon. friends seem to have. They do not seem to wish to perpetuate in our statutes as a monument of wise legislation, as a law not to be altered nor assailed, the act of 1918. And it is to represent their views as well as I can that I propose this resolution to-day.

My objections to the Civil Service Act are based mainly on two grounds, which I might call constitutional and practical. From a constitutional standpoint I am and have been a firm believer in the doctrine of ministerial responsibility. I believe that the duty of our ministers is to carry out the wishes of the people, and to be responsible to the people for their every act and deed. There has been a tendency in recent years in this Dominion, as in other countries, to urge that national affairs will be best administered by those who are not responsible to the people, that it is well that those who pay taxes should not have direct control and management of the national purse to which they contribute. This tendency has increased considerably in recent years, and as a consequence we have had a perfect avalanche of boards, bureaux, and commissions, all administering in some degree the affairs of the people, and many of them in no way whatsoever answerable to the nation.

It seems to be generally accepted that whatever may have been his previous record, the moment a person is appointed to a position of public trust where he no longer has to answer for his stewardship, he immediately becomes clothed in a kind of mantle of grace and gifted with all wisdom, and that his decisions, however injurious they may be to the public, must be accepted as infallible. With this theory I must respectfully beg to differ.

A number of hon. members in this House and a number of people throughout the country have been preaching democracy, the government of the people by the people, on the one hand, while on the other they have been urging the country to take the administration of the people's money out of the control of the people. This tendency increased perhaps more during the war than at any other time, due, I think, to the theory that a democracy was unable to carry out great undertakings without first sacrificing the very principles upon which it was built and had its being. We heard throughout the days of the war, and we have heard since, that it is impossible for any great democracy to be victorious in war. Sir, we have only to go over the history of the last few years to find that the two most democratic nations on earth, England and France, after four years of struggle emerged victorious over the two most bureaucratic nations of Europe, Germany and Austria. However, in spite of this vindication of the views of those of us who hold that any encroachment upon or curtailment of the rights of the people is dangerous, we have had in Canada the strange spectacle of public-spirited men, men of standing in the community, urging upon us the advisability of allowing our national affairs to be administered by boards, bureaux and commissions.

These attacks on what to my mind is the proper theory of democratic government, namely, representation so far as possible of the people by those responsible to the people, reached their culmination in 1918, when our parliament created the most irresponsible body which has ever been known in the history of Canada. This commission—of course, I refer to the Civil Service Commission—which has power almost of life and death, at any rate power of affluence or starvation, over thousands of our fellow-citizens, and power to expend millions of public money, is not directly or indirectly answerable to parliament. It makes appointments to positions of public trust, fixes salaries, awards bonuses, and distributes favours of all kinds, without being obliged to accept any suggestions of the representatives of the people and without even taking into consideration the recommendations of those best fitted to make them.

Mr. SHAW: May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman a question? When speaking about the creation of the Civil Service

Commission, is he referring to the commission under the act of 1908 or under that of 1918?

Mr. POWER: I am afraid I did not make myself quite clear. The Civil Service Commission was created in 1908—my hon. friend is quite right; but the exceptional powers which it received in 1918 are those to which I object. I was saying that this commission is under no obligation to accept even the slightest recommendation from those who are in the best position to know the wishes of the people and to state what in any locality under any given circumstances should be done. The commission goes even further, as do its friends, and contend that no recommendation of the people's representatives can be acceptable to it—a contention in which they take great pride. As I understand it, we have been called here to advise His Majesty the King on the carrying out of the affairs of state and to vote supplies for the administration of the country. When we by our own act neglect to carry out the duties which are imposed on us by our mandate as members of parliament, I do not think we are faithful to the trust which has been placed in us by the constituents whom we represent. We allow an independent body to usurp the functions which should, properly speaking, belong to those who advise in the administration of the country and those who should vote supplies for the carrying on of the government of the country.

It is true there are a number of us who say we do not wish to be bothered by patronage; that we only make enemies by distributing patronage; that if we give a position to one we offend ten others who are seeking the same position. I submit, Sir, with all respect that we are not doing our duty unless we fearlessly tackle all the problems which confront us. To shirk our responsibility by saying that we do not wish to have the burden of patronage is, to my mind, unworthy of our position.

It will be said, I think, during the course of this debate that the present act, the Act of 1919, was endorsed by the electorate of Canada on two occasions. Sir, I think you and any of those who took part in the election of 1917 will readily admit that other issues were involved; that public opinion was more agitated by other questions than it was by those which had reference to the Civil Service of Canada. It will be said, perhaps, that the 1921 election was an endorsation of the Civil Service Act of 1919. Permit me to recall to your memory, Sir, the fact that during the whole course of that election the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his colleagues appealed to the people from every platform throughout the length and the breadth of the land to free them from autocratic and bureaucratic control. To my mind it was due in large measure to those appeals, and to the fact that there was in Canada a reaction against the arbitrary methods of ruling which had been employed during the war and shortly after, that the Liberal party is in power today.

The present system of making appointments under the Civil Service Commission is, as I have said, impracticable. I should like to quote a few words spoken by a man who is, without doubt, one of those most experienced in the public life of Canada. In a speech which he made when this 1918 act was first proposed in the House of Commons—a speech which might have been made after instead of before the advent of the present commission—the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding, speaking on the Civil Service Amendment Act, on April 12, 1918, said:

> I think we are getting away from the purpose for which the Civil Service Commission was created. It was never intended to be a patronage distributing body, but a body with distinct purposes, a body to hold examinations and to take means of guaranteeing the qualifications of applicants for the public service.

He goes on further:

> Where is the Civil Service Commission going to get information regarding all the virtues of this man who is to fill the office of postmaster away out at Blankville, in Cape Breton County? I do not know what the experience of others has been, but I have had some of the worries of my life in getting a capable man to accept the position of postmaster, and how these excellent gentlemen in the city of Ottawa are going to get a postmaster for Blankville better than any one of us, I fail to comprehend.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) at that time failed to comprehend how the Civil Service Commission was going to make these appointments and make them properly. I think he will admit that in the light of experience it has been found that the Civil Service Commission is not able to make these appointments properly and judiciously, and that every word he uttered on that occasion has proved to be true.

I have here also, in order that my hon. friends of the opposition may not be disappointed in my not quoting from some of their leaders, the words of a gentleman with whom I have had occasion to differ at times, but for whose capacity, energy and fighting ability I have the highest regard; I speak of the Hon. Mr. Edwards. He said:

> I also, Mr. Chairman, want to repudiate the suggestion that I am one wrapped up in the theory that "to

the victors belong the spoils." . . . . But I say that I do not see how it will be possible for the Civil Service Commission, sitting in Ottawa, to ascertain the proper persons to appoint to these positions without applying to those who might be reasonably expected to know who were qualified for them. I repudiate the reflection which I maintain is to a certain extent thrown upon members of parliament generally by the wording of this resolution and by some of those who are supporting it. In effect, you are saying that no man who has been chosen as a representative of the people to sit in this House can be trusted to make an honest recommendation or to select an efficient man to fill a vacancy in the Civil Service. ....That is putting members of parliament on a very low plane.

The history of the commission since that time has, I think, fully borne out the predictions made by the gentleman whose remarks I have just quoted. It has been found to be practically impossible for the Civil Service Commission to make the impartial and judicious choice which was had in mind when the commission was appointed. They do not, either from choice or through fear of adverse criticism, wish to take into consideration the suggestions and recommendations of those who by their local knowledge are best fitted to understand the situation in any given locality. They are thus forced to call in and to take counsel from persons who in many cases have neither the confidence nor the respect of the inhabitants of the locality, and in a number of other cases have themselves been appointed to the positions which they hold from partisan motives and in order to increase the prestige of some political party. The result of this system is that instead of what was formerly called patronage we have a species of nepotism,—a kind of series of family compacts spread over the length and breadth of the land. Instead of the appointments being made by someone who is responsible to the constituency in which the vacancy occurs, the appointments are made by officers or by outsiders many of whom do not understand the conditions of the locality and are not fit in some cases to make any recommendations.

It is not my intention to ask that competitive examinations be done away with altogether. In fact, my understanding of the act of 1908 is that in a large number of cases competive examinations must be held, but I do contend that there are certain positions for which competitive examinations, written or oral, are unnecessary and in many cases useless. When it devolves upon the commission to choose a man for a position requiring certain technical or professional knowledge, I contend that the Civil Service Commissioners are not qualified to judge whether or not the applicant has the necessary qualifications, and when it comes to the appointment of manual labourers I contend that the Civil Service Commission cannot, by written or oral examination held in Ottawa, judge which man should be selected and which rejected in, say, Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

There has been some question of economy brought into this discussion. It is not the intention of those who support the resolution to ask that any more positions in the civil service of Canada be created. Their intention is simply to ask that appointments be made on a more impartial and more judicious system than has obtained during the last five years. I contend, Sir, that the efficiency of this service was just as high, that the public servants did their duty just as well, and probably better, five years ago than they do to-day. Almost since confederation we have had what might be called political appointments, and I think that, generally speaking, the public service of Canada was as efficient under that system of political appointments as it is to-day under the present arbitrary system. I cannot understand how it could be otherwise. The business administrative head of a department, the deputy minister, can surely not obtain from his subordinates, those who work in his department, the same loyal support and the same steady work under a system which gives him no right to punish, as he would get when he was absolutely and personally responsible for carrying on the affairs of his department. I contend that owing to this system under which appointments are made by someone who has no interest whatsoever in the efficient carrying on of the work of the department. discipline has slackened, the morale has been lowered, and the esprit de corps, of the department lessened. Would any hon. member —and I appeal particularly to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), who was laughing a short time ago—accept, in his own business, appointments made by someone outside of the executive head of his business? Would he accept from a third party, say, the manager of his business, particularly when he had no confidence whatsoever in that third party? I think my hon. friend will agree with me that if we are endeavouring to have business government in this country we must carry on government on business principles, and if we are seeking to obtain the most efficient service possible, let those who are in charge of this service have perfect liberty to choose those in whom they have the greatest confidence and who, in their opinion, may be best able to do the work.

Before taking my seat I should like to refer to the fact that in 1921 a debate took place on

a resolution somewhat similar to this. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance smiles again. I will tell him that on looking up the Hansard, I find that I did not vote on that occasion. However, I do not intend to hide behind that kind of an alibi. Had I voted I would undoubtedly have voted against the resolution contained in what was then called the Spinney bill. I will be quite frank with the House: I should have voted that way because I mistrusted the Tories. We were on the eve of a general election, and knowing my Tory friends I was under the impression that they would make of this bill an instrument of political corruption. I was not aware at that time that every nook and cranny of the civil service had been filled chock-full, so that not another man could be got into the service anyway. Had they wished to appoint any more they would have had to create new departments and build an annex to nearly all the public buildings.

I want to protest against the feeling which seems to be prevalent throughout the country that politics should be eliminated from politics. We have heard from platforms innumerable that there is too much politics in Canada. Now, as I understand politics, it is the science of government, and politicians are those who devote more or less of their time to looking after the affairs of the public. There has been throughout the country, and more or less on the part of certain. hon. gentlemen,—I speak with particular reference to some of my hon. friends directly opposite—a certain amount of desire expressed to do away with politics and politicians, the implication being, I presume, that my hon. friends themselves are not politicians but statesmen. Now, I have no ambitions to reach the unattainable, and in this parliament and in this country I would like to reach what I think I can attain. I think that by considerable study, by hard work, and by paying some attention to the wants of my constituents I may some day be adjudged a good politician. My constituents themselves will no doubt judge whether I am or not, and the results of elections will show whether my ambitions have been attained. But to endeavour to reach a higher category, that of statesman, is I think somewhat more difficult because I know of few statesmen who ever attained to that high grade in the public service until they had passed beyond, and then purely mundane appreciation is not of very much use to them. So, I would ask my hon. friends to be a little more charitable to those of us who are mere politicians; to give us the benefit of the doubt and to imagine that we sometimes try to do our best in the country's interests; to recognize that the interests of this country are to some extent connected with the interests of the parties which we sometimes uphold; and to feel that there is no great virtue in being the only person to hold an opinion, but that rather one can obtain greater credit by being able to carry out urgent reforms or to work in the best interests of the country, and submerge at times one's own personality and one's more extreme opinions. I ask my hon. friends in all sincerity, and I ask other hon. members also, to give to those of us who are what might be called "party men" the credit for thinking that we are doing our very best in the interests of the country, and that we think the country's interests will not suffer by carrying on a system of party politics.

Now, Sir, in conclusion may I ask hon. members to view this question free from prejudice, to discuss it calmly and quietly and not be carried away by the shibboleths of the moment, such as we have heard, that there should be no party politics, and to discuss with us the question as to whether we would have a more efficient service under which the country's business would be more properly carried on, and whether we are remaining more true to the real spirit of our constitution by keeping the law as it stands at present than by repealing it.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sorry that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) could not see his way to permit the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) to present his resolution to the House in the form which most appealed to his mature consideration and best judgment. I think that privilege ought to have been accorded my hon. friend, because it must be apparent from his remarks to which we have just listened that the intention as expressed in the resolution as it stands is different from the intention as it would have been expressed had he been allowed to offer the resolution in the amended form suggested. As the resolution stands it is a motion for the abolition of the Civil Service Act. I need hardly say that in that form his motion would not be acceptable to the government. I think it would be a great mistake to repeal the Civil Service Act. The Civil Service Commission, of course, is the main feature of the act and, I imagine, the one to which attention is being particularly directed. On the other hand I should like to associate myself with my hon. friend in much that he said about the importance of maintaining ministerial responsibility, and having government by a respon-

sible ministry and not by irresponsible authority.

I would like the hon. members to consider this whole question in the calm and deliberate manner in which my hon. friend has suggested they should, and in particularly the fundamental question of government by commission or responsible government. We all know that during the period of the war the business government was very greatly increased. Cabinet ministers could not begin to give attention to many matters in connection with their departments, in connection with the work of public administration, which they would, and should, be able to give in normal times, and through the period of the war there were a very large number of new commissions created and the powers of some existing commissions considerably extended. Speaking of the experience that I have been privileged to have in the administration of public affairs during the time that I have had the honour to hold my responsible office, not a very long experience it is true, I should like to say that it has become wholly apparent to me that in many particulars the government is being held responsible by the country for certain aspects of administration over which it has no control whatever, and that as a consequence the ministry is being put in an entirely false position.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend to tell us in what regard he finds himself in that position?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will answer my hon. friend immediately. No need has been stressed so strongly in this House as that of economy. I say, without any fear of contradiction whatever, that had the government in the framing of its estimates been free to act in accordance with its own judgment in the matter of appointments it would have been able, in the case of a number of departments, to have administered the affairs of the country with fewer servants than there are in the public service at the present time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not the truth that the salaries are fixed by order in council and not by the commission, and that it is also the truth that the government can abolish any position they desire?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question of classification, is one quite apart from the competency and the suitability of the individual who may be filling a particular position—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is not my question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—and the government finds itself—I speak now from the knowledge of the difficulties with which the ministers of the different departments have to contend—the government finds itself continually in the position of being obliged to endeavour to carry on the work of the country with clerks who are sent to the government by the Civil Service Commission but who do not possess the qualifications which if the minister himself were free to make the appointment, he would see were possessed by whoever was appointed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not a fact that under the law as it now stands the ministers can get rid of those men they do not think are competent? They are only sent there for trial.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might point out to my hon. friend, just in connection with what he has said, that after getting rid of a clerk fresh application has to be made by the deputy minister to the Civil Service Commission. As a consequence the correspondence that is necessary to be carried on between the department and the Civil Service Commission is very considerable; in other words, there has been added to the Civil Service of Canada a not unappreciable number of employees, necessitated solely by the increased amount of correspondence that has to be carried on between the different departments and the Civil Service Commission before any appointment can be made, or before any change can be made or any particular work undertaken.

During the recess between the last session and the present, the government has made a sincere effort to effect economies in the public service. It has endeavoured to work with the existing machinery of government in the most effective way, and to make that machinery just as effective as possible. In that regard, two conferences of particular importance were held; one conference was with the Civil Service Commission itself. The other conference was with the deputy ministers of the departments, who are the permanent heads. The members of the Civil Service Commission and the deputy ministers came into conference with the government to discuss the act, and its workings, in the light of experience. At these conferences the view was expressed by both groups that the act in its present form is not as workable as it should be, that it was capable of amendment and improvement. The deputy ministers themselves have, in joint conference, gone very carefully into the whole matter, and they are unanimously of the view that the act as it stands at the present time is in some of its aspects embarrassing public service, that it is in-

creasing the cost of the service, and that if it were amended all the good that is in the act might be obtained and very much of the evil eliminated.

In view of that circumstance, I should like to suggest that it is in the public interest that some consideration be given to the necessity of amendment of the Civil Service Act as it stands. I would not for one moment support any proposal for the repeal of the Civil Service Act, but I do think it is in the public interest that that act should be made to serve the ends of economy and efficiency to the fullest degree, and as it stands I do not believe it begins to serve these ends as it should. What I would suggest is this: Instead of proposing an amendment to the resolution at the present time, as has been suggested by my hon. friend that some one of his colleagues might propose, it would be infinitely preferable that a committee of this House composed of members of all groups represented here should be appointed for the purpose of considering the Civil Service Act, hearing the members of the Civil Service Commission themselves, hearing the views of the deputy ministers, and after having carefully considered the existing measure, make to the government what recommendations may be deemed advisable in the matter of its necessary improvement. I would suggest that course should be adopted and followed by hon. gentlemen, instead of support being given to any motion to abolish the Civil Service Commission, or to any motion at this stage to amend the act in any particular. If a committee of this House thinks well to suggest an amendment as a result of the opportunities of inquiry it may have, the necessary amendment may be expected to meet with the general approval of the House.

I have a further reason for suggesting that a committee of this House should have an opportunity of going carefully into this whole matter of the Civil Service Commission. I believe the government has been put in a very false light before the country as to its relations with the Civil Service Commission. Looking at the reports that have from time to time appeared in the press one would gather the impression that in some way the administration had tried to influence the commission in the matter of appointments. I should like every hon. member of this House to have an opportunity before a committee of this House of asking the members of the Civil Service Commission just what the relations between the government and the Civil Service Commission have been. If there ever was a government that sought to work loyally with another body, this government has sought to do that with the Civil Service Commission. I think the commission will be the first to make apparent to hon. members of the House wherein much that has appeared with respect to an alleged endeavour by the government to get back to what is called party patronage is entirely erroneous and misleading.

May I assert, speaking of patronage, that patronage cannot be abolished by statute. It is impossible to make appointments to the public service unless they are made by some body. The Civil Service Commission as constituted to-day is a body of three or four men. Hundreds of appointments—yes, thousands of appointments—have to be made to the public service. Those who favour appointment by commission must remember that these gentlemen have the determining as to who is to fill particular positions. They have patronage, as long as they have to make appointments. But while they have the patronage they are responsible to no one. The government is without patronage, as matters stand at the present time, but is held responsible for appointments with which it has nothing whatever to do. That is not in the interests of the public service. I believe that the act as it stands is working out in ways that were wholly unforeseen. I will support any measure that will help to free the Civil Service from anything in the nature of favouritism on the part of those who are at the head of departments, and in favour of anything that will give increased security to those who are in the service, to see that justice and fair play are carried out in the matter of appointments, promotions and the like, and I would favour strongly the maintenance of a body which would see that such appointments as are made are made on the basis of efficiency and on the basis of merit, but it does not follow that because some particular body with no ministerial responsibility sees fit to make an appointment in one way rather than another, that such is going to be the method that will produce efficiency or economy in the long run.

As an illustration, I draw the attention of the House to the facts concerning an order in council of which a good deal of mention has been made, under which a large number of positions were withdrawn from the operation of the Civil Service Act. I venture to say there are many hon. members who think that in some way the withdrawal of hundreds, possibly thousands, of positions from under the operation of the Civil Service Act was the result of some action on the part of the government. I have in my hand the order in council to which reference was made. It is not an order originating with the government,

it is an order based on a recommendation of the Civil Service Commission itself, with which recommendation the government had nothing whatever to do. It came to the government from the Civil Service Commission and this is the language in which it is worded:

Section 38B of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, prescribes:

In any case where the commission decides that it is not practicable nor in the public interest to apply this act to any position or positions, the commission may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, exclude such position or positions in whole or in part from the operation of the act, and make such regulations as are deemed advisable prescribing how such position or positions are to be dealt with.

The Civil Service Commissioners are of opinion that the following classes of positions should be exempt from the operation of the Civil Service Act under the above section, namely:

1. All positions where the salary does not exceed $200 per annum. (The Order in Council P.C. 1694 of the 19th August, 1919, is hereby cancelled.)

2. All positions for which the compensation provided is fees of office and positions of an honorary character to which no compensation is attached.

3. Positions of orderly in the office of the Governor-General's Secretary.

4. Positions of Indian interpreter, Department of Indian Affairs.

5. Positions of physician performing the duties of port physicians, under the Department of Health at the following points: Province of Nova Scotia, province of New Brunswick, province of Prince Edward Island, province of Quebec, province of British Columbia.

A large number of centres are enumerated.

6. Positions in the following classes of skilled and unskilled labour and domestic service.

Then follow two or three pages of different positions, all of which are enumerated and which run up into hundreds. What is said in regard to these positions? This is said not by the government, but by the Civil Service Commission, as a result of its experience of the act as in operation:

The Civil Service Commission is of opinion that it is not practicable to prescribe a system of competitive examinations or tests as required by the Civil Service Act.

In other words, the act as passed, placed upon the Civil Service Commission the duty of making all those appointments. The commission struggled with it; they sought to fix examinations and competitive tests for those classes, and after having struggled with it for months, they come of their own accord and ask the government to exempt those positions inasmuch as they find it is not practicable to prescribe a system of competitive examinations for such appointments. If the Civil Service Commission itself makes an appeal to the government to free from the operation of that act thousands of appointments in the public service of Canada, there is, I submit, strong justification for what my hon. friend has just suggested, that the act requires some revision, and I think it is very much in the interest of the country as well as of the Civil Service Commission and the government that a committee of this parliament have an opportunity of discussing with the commission and with the deputy ministers, as the government has done, the various phases of the act, in order to see whether in some particulars amendments cannot be made which will help to make the act more efficient, more economical in administration, and of greater service.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was making mention of a few reasons which seemed to me to justify the consideration by a joint committee of this House of the present Civil Service Act, with a view of seeing if it were not possible to have the act amended in a manner which would make it a more efficient and economical instrument of government. I was making particular reference at the time to a recommendation from the Civil Service Commission, in virtue of which a number of classes of employees were removed from the operation of the Civil Service Act, and I pointed out that a good deal of misconception had arisen in the public mind as to the attitude of the government towards the Civil Service Commission, largely as a result of references to that particular recommendation.

I hope I made it very clear that I would strongly oppose any move to abolish the Civil Service Commission. I think some commission or other body should have the power to see that the members of the Civil Service are duly qualified for their positions before being appointed to them, and that those who are already in the service should receive promotion and salaries in accordance with merit. This is wholly in the public interest, and I would do anything in my power to prevent any amendment to the act which would destroy those all-important considerations. On the other hand, I believe that the Civil Service Act as it was placed on the statutes in 1918 went lengths which have rendered it in many particulars far from workable and have caused it to operate in a manner quite the opposite to that which the framers of the measure either intended or expected.

In reply to the question put to me by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) as to wherein the Civil Service Act has increased the expenditures of government, I cannot give a better example than by again referring to the particular order in council passed on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, which I have already mentioned, removing from the operation of the act large numbers of classes of employees to be appointed to the civil service. The last recommendation from the commission came to the Cabinet on the 14th December last. In other words, with the exception of the last few weeks, during the whole of the past year, the Civil Service Commission had been making appointments of different classes in accordance with the methods which it adopts but which it has found to be impracticable. These methods imply competitive examinations, advertising the positions, correspondence between the departments and the commission as to the necessity of particular positions, followed by further correspondence between the commission and the departments advising them of the persons whom it is about to recommend for appointment.

Hon. members will see that all this means a large amount of work for the staff of the commission. I need not re-enumerate the many classes of which these particular recommendations make mention, but I should like the House to bear in mind what I have just said, as respects all of them: that if the commission had been doing its duty in accordance with the terms of the act it would have been advertising the positions, setting examinations for those who were seeking to be appointed to them, and conducting all the correspondence necessary in connection with such examinations. Up to the end of the year, after having pursued their own methods for that length of time, the commission comes to the government—it was not a case of the government going to the commission—and says: In our opinion these many classes of employees should never have come under the Civil Service Act, and we ask the government to withdraw them from its operation altogether.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if those classes of employees had never been put under the act, and if the commission had not had to advertise those positions, examine the various applicants and correspond with the departments in reference to them, we would have saved many thousands of dollars which have been simply wasted as a result of the measure being in the form in which it was originally drafted. If that is true—and it is beyond gainsaying—in regard to these classes, why may it not be equally true in regard to certain other classes which are still under the act?

As a matter of fact, more than one recommendation was made by the Civil Service Commission to the government to withdraw certain classes from the operation of the act. I have here a further order which came before council, in which the Civil Service Commission recommends:

> That the Order in Council above mentioned (P.C. 1053) be amended by adding to this list, the classes of fireman, fireman's helper and fireman labourer, the commission being of opinion that it is not practicable to prescribe a system of examinations or tests as required by the Civil Service Act, 1918, for making appointments to positions of this nature.

If the experience of the commission itself during the past year has shown that the act as drafted goes too far, I think it is reasonable to assert that in other particulars as well the act may go further than was intended, and that it would be very much in the public interest, as well as in the interests of the commission itself, that its workings should be made the subject of examination by a committee of this parliament.

I have another reason, Mr. Speaker, for suggesting that parliament should have an opportunity of inquiring fully into the methods by which the commission is carrying on its work and the relations between government departments and the commission as well as between the government and the commission. There are grounds for believing that there has been commenced in this country an insidious campaign the purpose of which is not to improve the working of the Civil Service Commission but rather to undermine the confidence of the Civil Service and of the public in the government in its relation to the Civil Service Commission. I think that the sooner the gentlemen who are associated with this movement have an opportunity to state before a committee of this parliament the grounds on which they base a view of that kind, the better it will be for all concerned. That hon. members may have reason to feel that what I am saying is not without justification, I would remind them of an article which appeared in a Toronto paper, and which has been largely quoted throughout this country, with reference to an address that the chairman of the Civil Service Commission was supposed to have delivered before the Rotary Club in Toronto in December last. A Toronto paper, reporting this alleged address, came out with the heading:

> "Strong Element Favours Patronage. Doctor W. J. Roche Expresses Fear regarding Future of Civil Service."

The article says:

Dr. W. J. Roche, chairman of the Civil Service Commission of Canada, speaking before the Rotary Club at yesterday's luncheon, expressed fears for the future of the Civil Service system in Canada and stressed strongly the necessity for the formation in Canada of a league in support of the merit system for federal, provincial and municipal governments.

A little later in the report the following appears in quotations as coming from Doctor Roche, chairman of the commission:

"The fate of this law". . .

That is, the Civil Service law.

. . . "however, is beset with dangers due to the insidious, unseen and silent manipulations of the adherents of patronage in political life," he said. "Slowly, but surely, the politicians will gain back to their own control more and more of the service by the process of exemptions. On June 29 last an order in council was passed exempting from the operation of the merit law a great many positions, which affects in all 10,000 persons out of a total of 50,000 employees, thus placing back into patronage one-fifth of the whole public service.

The effort at present is aimed at the return to patronage of the system of promotions which at present has been so splendidly developed by the Civil Service Commission. Technical positions are also under immediate attack, and there can be no doubt that the whole merit law is in danger unless the strong arm of public opinion is organized to oppose its attack.

Now, there is a very serious charge, and if time would permit and, it were desirable to do so, I could show to hon. members of this House not dozens but hundreds of editorials and articles based upon that particular report which have appeared in the press throughout the country. I have here editorials from and communications addressed to the Ottawa newspapers headed, "Return to the Spoils System," and the like, all of which enlarge upon the seriousness of the situation which has developed in consequence of what is supposed to have been the statement of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Let me now read to the House a letter which I received from Hon. Dr. Roche, the chairman of the commission which was sent without any previous communication on my part to him, without mention on my part directly or indirectly to anyone of the particular address which he was supposed to have delivered and from which I have read alleged direct quotations. The letter is as follows:

Civil Service Commission of Canada

Ottawa, December 22, 1922.

Office of W. J. Roche, chairman,

Dear Mr. King,—

Some days ago I received an invitation from the Rotary Club of Toronto to give an address before that club on the question of the Civil Service of Canada, which invitation I accepted and delivered the address last Friday.

It appears that Principal Grant, of Upper Canada College, who takes a great interest in Civil Service matters, before my visit to Toronto supplied certain material to the press of Toronto, the contents of which I was absolutely unacquainted with, with the request that the respective journals would give publicity to the same either by way of editorials or otherwise, and suggesting that an appropriate time would be when my address was being reported in their columns. Apparently neither the Globe nor the Star had a reporter at the function, but taking it for granted that I would deal with the matters contained in the memorandum supplied by Principal Grant they framed up a speech that I was supposed to have delivered on that occasion. In this instance, however, they made a very bad guess for I did not touch upon a single subject that both the Globe and Star credited me with, with the exception that in the last few minutes of my address I stated that if we had in Canada a Civil Service Reform League similar to the league in the United States it would be of great advantage in the public life of Canada. I made no mention of exemptions, orders in council, promotions, technical positions, the amount of money expended in public utilities, etc.; in fact I was most careful in my remarks not to reflect upon any party or any government past or present, dealing merely with general principles and the necessity of educating the people to take a greater interest in matters pertaining to the Civil Service of our country.

I am enclosing you copy of Principal Grant's letter which I received this morning which will bear out my statements, and in view of the Ottawa despatch sent out by the Globe reporter, which appeared in yesterday's Globe, in which it is reported that a member of the government "speaking for many of his colleagues" has expressed his indignation at the remarks I was supposed to have made, I think it only right in justice to myself that my explanations of the press bungle that occurred in this connection should be made known to yourself and colleagues, who I trust will credit me with a sufficient sense of propriety not to indulge in criticism of the character attributed to me in the Globe article.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. J. ROCHE.

I direct the attention of the House to this particular sentence in the letter of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission to me:

It appears that Principal Grant, of Upper Canada College, who takes a great interest in civil service matters, before my visit to Toronto supplied certain material to the press of Toronto, the contents of which I was absolutely unacquainted with, with the request that the respective journals would give publicity to the same either by way of editorials or otherwise.

Such is the work of this new organization that has been formed, known as the Civil Service Reform League of Canada. The gentlemen connected with the league have assumedly very much at heart the interests of the Civil Service and the work of the Civil Service Commission. Doctor Grant is apparently a leader in the movement. I think hon. members will agree in view of what the chairman of the commission has said, that there is ample ground for believing that this so-called reform league is not in the nature of a league the purpose of which is to help and improve conditions in the Civil Service, so much as an organization formed for political reasons, the hope being to undermine public

confidence in the government by creating distrust with respect to its relation with the Civil Service Commission.

Lest the statement of the chairman of the commission itself is not sufficient, may I read the letter which Dr. Grant wrote to Mr. Roche, and I need hardly say that the chairman of the Civil Service Commission has given me his authority to quote these communications in any way which I deem to be in the public interest. Dr. Grant's letter reads as follows:

Upper Canada College,
Toronto, December 21st, 1922.

The Hon. W. J. ROCHE,
Civil Service Commission of Canada,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Roche,—

I see in this morning's Globe (21-12-22) that a "prominent member of the government" takes you to task for your recent speech before the Rotary Club of Toronto. Should this criticism be really worth notice, what would you wish me to do, as the man responsible for the invitation to you to speak?

The items complained of were not in your speech at all, but in a memorandum circulated by me on my own responsibility, and sent to the press on the day before your address, in the hope of stirring up interest in it, and in the possible formation of a National Civil Service Reform League, which I have much at heart. The Globe reporter, who had your speech as an "assignment", evidently acted in a way familiar to all journalists, and wrote his report from my memorandum; the report consequently bears no relation to your speech as actually delivered.

Your speech contained no reference whatever to the "10,000 civil servants exempted from the operation of the act". It was a model of good taste and reticence. No human being could have told from it that you had ever belonged to a political party or whether your relations with the present government as chairman of the Civil Service Commission were better or worse than they had been with previous governments. Personally, I had a natural longing for a little more "spice".

If you wish to show this letter to the Prime Minister, or to anyone else, you are at fullest liberty to do so; or if you wish me to write along these lines to the press you have only to let me know.

I am,
Yours sincerely,
(Sgd) W. L. GRANT.

May I say to Principal Grant's credit that he did write to the press along those lines, but for one man that read his communication in the press there are thousands in this country who have never seen it. As for the statement that was attributed to Dr. Roche which would lead the public to believe that some ten thousand civil servants were taken out from under the operation of the act because of a desire on the part of this government to return to patronage, there is possibly not one man of a hundred who has read that who will ever learn the truth of the situation.

I should like again to draw the attention of the House to the grounds on which this particular movement is supposed to rest. Dr. Grant says that he did what he did in the hope of stirring up interest in the possible formation of a National Civil Service Reform League which he has very much at heart; of adding "spice." All of what have been shown to be false representations were, he says, of his own creation. This civil service reform movement is supposed to be a reform movement, a moral reform. This is a strange kind of morality, to stir up antagonisms by false representations concerning the government, then claim that such a movement is helping along the cause of morality in this country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a principal of a college of young men will lend himself to that kind of false representation with respect to any branch of the public service in this country, the time has come when a committee of this House of Commons should give to gentlemen of this character an opportunity to appear and make good their assertions. I would ask my hon. friend who has brought the resolution before the House, in order to give hon. members a chance to debate this subject, to accept the suggestion I have made and let us have a committee of this parliament, with representatives on it from hon. gentlemen opposite of both camps, and representatives from this side of the House as well, with power to bring before that committee any person and every person, so that amongst other things we may get at the truth as to the relations between this government and the Civil Service Commission and the need for civil service reform.

Let me say just this word in conclusion. For eight years I was myself a member of the Civil Service of Ottawa, and I had the privilege of learning something of the needs and of knowing something of the aspirations of the members of the Civil Service. As long as I have the privilege of being in parliament I shall at all times endeavour to do what I can to cause the Civil Service of this country to feel a sense of security and justice and right in the discharge of their duties, which as a most important part of the administration of this country they are entitled to have. As I stated a moment ago, I shall not at any time lend myself to any movement that in any way may threaten the standing of the Civil Service nor any movement which may tend to put into positions men who are not qualified for the positions to which they are appointed, nor any movement which will lend itself to favouritism on the part of those who are in a position of authority, nor any movement which will deprive those already in the

service of promotion on the ground of merit and right. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, if we are to have merit recognized and the measure of justice which we should have for the service, if we are to have that economy and efficiency in the public service which we should have, we shall have to get back to where the government has a larger measure of responsibility for how the public service is carried on, where it will have some substantial authority and will not be manacled and shackled by regulations and rules of a body that is responsible to no one but itself, and that in many cases makes appointments not by itself, but, as can be shown if the commission is brought before a committee of this House, by its own appointees who conduct examinations and make recommendations. I think this subject is deserving of the fullest inquiry this House can give it, and I must thank the hon. member, though I shall strongly oppose his resolution in the form in which it stands, for introducing the subject for discussion in the House. I hope every member of the House will express his views very plainly in order that the country may know the truth of the situation.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The House has been plunged with remarkable suddenness into what appears to be nothing more or less than a crisis in connection with the entire public service of this country. The motion, of course, of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), if it had been suspected to be really a motion inspired by the government, would of itself have put the House in a state of warning and premonition.

Mr. POWER: I stated at the beginning of my remarks that the members of the government had not been consulted with reference to this motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember that. What I said was, if there had been any reason to believe that this was a motion that had in any degree whatever the inspiration, or if my hon. friend prefers it, the sympathy of the government, we would have had some premonition of what was to come. Apparently, judging not so much from the motion as proposed but from the speech of the Prime Minister, the government has made up its mind to destroy the merit system. The government has made up its mind to get rid for all effective purposes of the body of men, and the organization under that body of men, which is now entitled to the making of appointments and promotions, and to return that power to itself. If the meaning of the Prime Minister's words is different from that, then I am sorry I could extract nothing but that conclusion from his speech.

Mr. BUREAU: You only extract what you want.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He stated that a body not directly responsible to this House has the matter of promotions and appointments in its hands. He objected to that. He said such a power must be in the hands of the government which is responsible to parliament and responsible to this country for the administration of affairs. Can any hon. gentleman tell me what the difference is between that and the old patronage system under which this country laboured for forty years? That is the purport of his address. It does not matter what the resolution is: The resolution is only the road they purpose to follow, it is only the pathway the government has in its eye in order to reach the goal of patronage and satisfy the hunger of its followers. The resolution proposes to repeal the act. The Prime Minister says "I would oppose it". If I had in mind, if I had averred to this House, the opinions the Prime Minister has averred, I would support the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec South. That is precisely the way to take from an independent commission control of the appointments to the service of Canada and of promotions, and bring them under the control of the government. That is precisely the way embodied without any amendment in the resolution of the hon. member.

Now the government proposes if I understood rightly—and I hope I will be corrected if I am wrong, because I did not get the very first part of the Prime Minister's address—the government proposes an amendment to this resolution which will provide for a committee of this House to consider amendments to the Civil Service Act. That I understand to be the official position, that I understand to be the method of treating the resolution, and it proposes to force that policy before this House. But I ask hon. members to remember, the accompaniments with which that amendment was pressed. I ask them to keep in mind the declarations of the Prime Minister. It is with a view to securing the results that he has in mind, as stated in his speech, that this amendment is now proposed.

The Prime Minister in the latter part of his address sought to convey the impression that what he was after was to delve into certain charges which, he said, had been levelled against the administration, a certain movement that he described as surging over this country to undermine confidence in the

administration and its relation to the civil service, and particularly to bring to book a gentleman whom I fear he considers "an undesirable citizen,"—the Principal of Upper Canada College—to bring him to book and make him pay dire punishment for some alleged offence. Well, that is a wholly different thing. If there are charges made inside this House or outside this House which the Prime Minister wants to inquire into nobody here is going to stand in his way. Let him have an inquiry made into Dr. Grant's charges, into the Globe charges, into the Star charges, into the charges of all these other offenders who he says are trying to undermine confidence in the administration in connection with the Civil Service Act. That is one thing. But to start on the pathway to the return of patronage is something wholly different. To appoint a committee whose commission from the government will be to so amend the act as to bring about the results which the Prime Minister describes is another thing altogether.

Now let me make a confession of ignorance while I am on my feet. If there is a movement on foot to organize dissatisfaction and accumulated grievances arising out of the civil service law and its operation—to organize those in an attack on the administration and consequently for the benefit of the opponents of the administration I am bound to confess such is a phenomenon that I never knew of at all. I do not think I ever met Dr. Grant—to the best of my knowledge I never have. I never knew Dr. Roche had delivered the address in question; I never knew Dr. Grant had written the article referred to. I never read anything of the kind in the Globe or in the Star. I never knew of any Civil Service Reform League in Canada—never heard such a league suggested. If all these are movements of the opponents of the administration they have managed to display their support of the party which I lead without any knowledge of mine.

Now let us come back to the concrete matter which from the speech of the Prime Minister, is before this House. It is necessary to go some years into the past in order fully to understand just the course that has been traversed, just the mountains that have been scaled in the long pathway of civil service reform. I do not know that I can give it to the House with particularity. I am certain I cannot give it with accuracy—but so far as I give it at all I will endeavour to be accurate. Patronage was unrestrained, until an act was passed, under the Laurier administration, applicable to the Civil Service at Ottawa—applicable to what was known as the inside service, which, I think, in practical residuum meant only a part of the Civil Service in this city. A commission was then appointed which had very limited power even as regards that limited section. I think in essence the law was this—that the government made the appointment, the government looked around and chose its man, they got such recommendation as they desired, but before the appointment could be confirmed—that is before the man could be really permanently in his office—he had to have the imprimatur of that commission. Perhaps I have done the law over-justice, perhaps I have done it under-justice—but such is my recollection of its main provision. An agitation became—I will not call it an agitation—a feeling became pretty general throughout this country that there should be an extension of that principle. An extension of it not only to the inside service—an extension of its applicability and operation there, but,—as well, that the outside service should be covered by the reform, and that political patronage as such should disappear from the service of this country.

The road was not an easy one to travel. It was surrounded with difficulties of an almost insuperable character—difficulties that for years proved insuperable at the hands of purely party governments. No matter how desirable a party government might have been of ridding itself of the incubus of patronage, it found itself powerless to extricate itself from the bondage because of the strength of the influences which surrounded it. But on the formation of Union government—and I am not saying this at all to boast of Union government—a juncture of circumstances took place which, under the stimulus of the war feeling, enabled the government to reach its goal. I doubt, whether if there had not been a war such a course would have been possible, but political patronage took on a darker hue before the public of this country, in the light of the war itself, and as a consequence the government of the day, formed in 1917, took the courageous, the final step. In this regard I want to say that one of its chief proponents, one of its most determined advocates, was the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), lately the leader of the Progressive party in this House. Another of its foremost defenders through every crisis—because you cannot get these reforms without crises—one of its foremost defenders was the hon. member for Halifax, the senior member from that city (Mr. Maclean). He is absent from this House to-night. I wonder what would have been his feelings had he

listened to the astonishing speech from the Prime Minister this afternoon. Not only did these men stand valiantly in battle for us but others of hon. gentlemen opposite did as well and I think I may include—although I speak subject to correction, the Finance Minister of this government. Ah, yes, and more—hon. gentlemen opposite as a party when in opposition were in favour of that reform. Hon. gentlemen opposite looked with jealousy and suspicion on every move which ventured to infringe by the thousandth of an inch the integrity of our Civil Service Act. It is easy to so act in opposition; such a course is no evidence of character or principle. I do not pretend to any particular exhibition of moral strength because I opposed when in opposition this plan for the renewal of patronage. But standing in power it is a difficult thing. It is different when you have the responsibility of office and have around you all the influences and pressure that office entails. Then it is a difficult thing to stand by this reform; and this government—weak in every fibre, weak in heart, pitifully weak—has surrendered to these forces and has consented to throw overboard all the achievements that these years have brought about.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the right hon. gentleman oblige me by mentioning one sentence of mine which intimated, directly or indirectly, any desire in any way to change the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say the Prime Minister proposed to change the commission, but the sentence the Prime Minister uttered, not once but twice at least, means the results exactly which I have described. It is not nominally whether there is a commission or not, that is not the essence of the problem. The real question is, what is to be the power of that commission? The Prime Minister said that an irresponsible commission must not have power of appointment and promotion; that a commission not responsible to parliament—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg pardon, I made no such statement. I do not wish to be understood for one moment as saying that the commission shall not have the power of making appointments and promotions. There are ways of arrogating to it control in the matter of promotions or appointments, regardless altogether of the needs of the situation, which can be most embarrassing to the country and the government. I think it is proper those should be looked into, but I have never suggested that the commission as a body with power to see that certain qualifications are met in the matter of appointments, and that merit is duly considered in the matter of promotion, should in any way be interefered with.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will have to plead my own density but I do not know where the Prime Minister is. What is the difference between saying they shall not have power to appoint and promote, and saying that the commission has now a control which it should not have and can arrogate to itself authority which it should not arrogate and that such power might well be taken away? Really I do not know what he means. If you leave the appointing authority in the commission, you leave it, over such an area of appointments and promotions as the government and the commission think wise. If you leave it there, you leave it, and if you take it, you take it, and I venture to say if you take it, you take it one place and no other, you take it right into the hands of the ministers and restore the conditions from which, after a struggle, we emerged some years ago. Very well. Such became the law in 1917. The difficulties this government battles with now, are the same as every government has battled with. And less and less are the difficulties as years go by. The British government, which has the merit system, has not anything like the struggles it had years ago. These difficulties we encountered too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say the British government has the civil service system we have here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not precisely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the patronage system is gone in England, and the patronage system cannot be gone if the government responsible to parliament is to take to itself appointments and promotions. In 1921, the government of which I was the head introduced a bill into the House of Commons—I have the statute before me—sponsored by an hon. gentleman at that time member for Yarmouth, N.S., then minister without portfolio, Mr. Spinney, and the bill was commonly known as the Spinney bill. Its effect was, as far as I can remember, just about the same as this motion would be if it were amended as proposed. We proposed then to submit the bill to a committee of parliament, and we urged that the authority of the commission should be left intact, so far as the committee felt it right that the commission should operate at all. We believed that, in the opinion of the commis-

sion itself, there were certain classes of appointments which would be better not under the purview and control of the commission, which were not of sufficient consequence, attached to which the salaries were not large enough, in respect to which the duties were not important enough to warrant the care that the commission necessarily takes under the law in the matter of appointments, to warrant the machinery that the commission erected to take care of them. As a consequence a committee sat and heard evidence for some time, and on its recommendation an amendment was put through, which I have before me, chapter 22 of the statutes of that year, under which it was provided that the commission may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, exclude such position or positions, in whole or in part, from the operation of the act, as in the opinion of the commission could not practically in the public interest be filled under the Civil Service Act. There was another amendment put through of very little consequence, but this important amendment was recommended by the committee and became law, and thereafter where, after the experience the commission would have, the commission itself felt there was any class of appointment, or single appointment, of a character that could be filled by the government, and not by the commission, without any fundamental return to patronage, where in a word they deemed on account of the rather cumbersome machinery they had to apply, there was not sufficient cause for its application, they may recommend to the Governor in Council exemption and if the Governor in Council approves, that particular position or class of positions becomes exempt.

To show that the government of the day did not contemplate any invasion of the Civil Service Act, let me say we were in power for eight or nine months after that law was passed, and I am not sure that any recommendations were ever made to the government, or any order in council passed exempting positions from the operation of that law. I am not saying there were none made. It is possible there were, but if so they were very few; they were indeed negligible. But after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, in the month of June of this year a recommendation came from the Civil Service Commission, quite within its power—and for the moment I do not criticize it; it is not necessary to criticize it here—a very sweeping recommendation which, though in the main it did apply to minor offices, did cover a tremendous area of appointments a very wide field. I do not say it covered ten thousand. The Prime Minister does not say how many it covered. I doubt if there is a member of the government who can say, but if it covered ten thousand I do not know what was wrong with the statement of the principal of Upper Canada College. He estimated the numbers at that figure. Evidently such is his opinion; I do not know. At all events the recommendation was sweeping The recommendation, I need scarcely tell the House, was eagerly accepted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon, it was not eagerly accepted. My purpose in rising was to answer my hon. friend in the matter of Principal Grant's statement. There was no exception taken on the part of the government to the figures that Principal Grant gave. The exception I took to his statement was that Principal Grant said that these exemptions were brought from under the act at the instance of the government, whereas it was at the instance of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the recommendation was from them, and I have no reason to say—I have never suggested to anyone myself—that it was at the instance of the government, and I have no objection to the government appointing a commission to find out at whose instance it was. I add that I will attend such a commission with considerable interest and curiosity as well. A large area was made exempt, a very large number of classes of positions. From that day forward the government became entitled to make those appointments. The Prime Minister says the government was not eager to accept this duty at all. Well, if not, the government has suddenly changed its opinion since June, 1922, if the Prime Minister's words to-night represent the concerted opinion of his administration. How could anyone listen to his speech this afternoon and come to any other conclusion than that the government very eagerly accepted the recommendation of the commission for the exemption of large classes from that act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The recommendation was made in June and it was accepted in December. I do not call that eager.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Accepted in December?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman sure of that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have the order in council here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I sent for the order in council last midsummer, and I do not remember exactly what the date was. I

thought it was June. However, I suggest it was accepted pretty early. I have before me now the order in council itself. The hon. gentleman says December. The order in council is marked "June."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Which one is that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The one the hon. gentleman sent over.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is one in December.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is "29 June." I will read it. I recollect now the Prime Minister said it was June the other day in answer to the question of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Duncan). I will read the order and the House can decide.

The committee of the Privy Council—

This is dated June 29, 1922.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The one of December was lying on my table. I have sent it to Hansard. That was the last order that came over.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The December order is an addition and exempts only a very few. This one is the big sweeping order in council and it was passed in June. The government was far more eager than the Prime Minister knew:

The committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration the following report from the Civil Service Commission, dated 14th June, 1922—

I do not know when they received it. Perhaps, it would not be cruel to suggest that it was the evening of the 28th of June.

—submitted by the Secretary of State;

Section 38B of the Civil Service Act, 1908, as amended, prescribes:

And then it quotes what I read to the House from the Statute a moment ago. It goes on to say:

The Civil Service Commissioners are of the opinion that the following classes of positions should be exempt from the operation of the Civil Service Act, under the above section, namely:

1. All positions where the salary does not exceed $200 per annum.

2. All positions for which the compensation provided is fees of office and positions of an honorary character to which no compensation is attached.

This is the one which the Prime Minister himself read:

3. Positions of Orderly in office of the Governor General's Secretary.

4. Positions of Indian interpreter, Department of Indian Affairs.

5. Positions of physician performing the duties of port physicians under the Department of Health at the following points:

And then a list of classes is given, covering the whole of a page:

Positions in the following classes of skilled and unskilled labour and domestic service.

[Mr. Meighen.]

I will not weary the House with reading them all; but the House will see, as I raise the paper, that the classes of positions cover the first entire page. Then following is another page with classes of positions exempted from the Civil Service Act, and then there is about one-third of a page more. So I was emphatically correct when I said that the vast number of exemptions were made in June of last year, and if not made eagerly, were made at least with remarkable promptness upon receipt of the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

I call attention in this connection as well to the fact that the recommendation upon which the government acted lacks the signature of the chairman of the commission, and hon. members of both sides of this House, who have known the chairman of that commission for many years, who have had to do with him, men of all parties and of all persuasions, know that the chairman of the Civil Service Commission is a man of high status and authority in this country, a man who has performed his duty with absolute fidelity and undoubted capacity. Hon. gentlemen in this connection may recall that when the government of 1921, of which I was the head, suggested a committee, the object being to secure authority in the commission, where it thought wise, to rid itself of appointments, even then apprehension was felt, and either the chairman of that commission gave a statement to the press or his opinion was announced in the press in opposition to the course which the government contemplated pursuing. Thus it was indicated that Dr. Roche at that time, just as to-day, guards jealously the integrity of the act, and in guarding jealously that integrity, he is no respecter of political parties.

9 p.m.

Under the law of 1921, all those positions have been exempted, as recommended, and the Prime Minister's argument is this: "Why, if it was wrong to put those in, it may have been wrong to put others in." Well if it was wrong to put others in, there is a way to get them out. If the government is to be allowed to take out all it wishes, then there is no more Civil Service Act. If the commission believes it to be in the public interest to do this, it can recommend so under that act. No, this, however, is not the purpose of the government. The purpose of the government is to restore to those who are pressing them at this hour the control which that law took from them in the interest of the Civil Service and of this country. Consequently, because I believe the amendments of 1921 are ample,

under which to correct any working out of the law that may be thought desirable, ample for all purposes; moreover, because of the speech delivered by the Prime Minister in which this resolution is launched before this House, and because of the clear purpose the government has in view in having this committee appointed, I oppose altogether its appointment.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), in introducing this resolution, undertook to give the members in this part of the House just a little lecture about the position that they took in the political life of this country. I do not know whether we are politicians or statesmen. I do not think we make any pretences along those lines; I think, perhaps, we are anxious to do the best we can in the interest of the public life of this country, irrespective of what name we may be tagged by.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speeches that have been delivered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I am sorry to have to confess that I am not as familiar with this subject, with the whole history of the Civil Service Commission as hon. members who have been speaking this evening. I know something, however, about the old system, what we used to call the "spoils" system, and I hope no one in this House will ever, for a moment, think of returning to that bad old system. I noticed that the leader of the Opposition stated, what I already knew, that the Civil Service Commission came into existence through the efforts of the Union government. It may be rather a sad commentary upon the state of public life in Canada that we know it would have been almost an impossibility for any political party to carry through that measure, unless it had been some sort of coalition like the one we had during the time of Union government.

I am not going to take up very much time to-night in discussing the "spoils" system or the system of patronage, because I think we are all ready to condemn that system. What was it? It was simply a lever that politicians who were in office could use to keep themselves in power. I can remember a time some years ago when public servants spent a good deal of their time working for the party in power, simply in order that they might retain their positions, and we all know that when a change of government occurred, there was generally a clean sweep made of those same public servants. The Prime Minister, in speaking to-night, stated that public servants should be judged by their efficiency. I cannot understand how it would be possible to have efficient public servants, were they to know that their remaining in the public service was dependent upon the fact of the party which put them there remaining in power. If you are going to have a really good Civil Service, public servants must feel that they have some security of position. I have here a short extract taken from an editorial, in regard to the old country Civil Service. It reads:

> "We serve the State", is the motto of the British Society of civil servants, and it might well be adopted, with all it means and implies, by those engaged in the Civil Service of this country. But to serve the State best, those so employed must be contented and efficient.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that we can never have an efficient public service until our civil servants enjoy security of tenure in their positions. We know something about the degrading effects upon public life that the old patronage system had, and I can assure you, Sir, that, speaking for myself and those in this section of the House, we view with a good deal of alarm any attempt to infringe upon the powers conferred upon the Civil Service Commission by the present act.

I understand that a short time ago a committee of the House did examine into the operation of the act, took evidence and made recommendations. I do not know what has happened since then to cause some hon. members to be of opinion that a further exhaustive examination into the workings of the act should be made at this particular time. The Prime Minister has pointed out some defects in the present act. The government has been in office for some time, and if they have discovered certain weaknesses and defects in the Civil Service Act, it is quite within their province to come before this House and tell us what is wrong with this legislation. We will then examine what they put forward and give our opinion whether we think they are right or not.

I was surprised to hear the Prime Minister state that we ought to have a committee of this House to deal with the Civil Service Act because a certain newspaper in Toronto commented upon a speech which the chairman of the Civil Service Commission had delivered. I do not think for a moment that this House is going to authorize the formation of a committee to investigate the Civil Service Commission or any other department of the public service just because some journal makes certain statements that are not just exactly correct. Indeed, I do not consider it at all necessary

that a committee should be apppointed on such grounds.

After all, the main question is: Have we got an efficient Civil Service? If not, what fault have we to find with it? The Prime Minister has stated that the government must not be manacled and shackled. Well, what does it mean? Does it mean throwing the whole service open again, with the government empowered to make and unmake civil servants just as they please? I do not see any other alternative. We must either have a civil service commission with sufficient power to function properly, or we might as well not have any civil service at all.

It is apparent from the evidence we have had to-night that there already exists a way of making some reforms in the methods of the Civil Service Commission. We have seen the long list of positions which have been withdrawn from the operation of the act upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission itself. If in the opinion of the commission that list is too small, it seems to me that there is a way to enlarge it.

When the Prime Minister first spoke I thought there might be something in the suggestion to appoint a committee for the purpose of examining into all the conditions surrounding the civil service. But I did not know at that time that there had been a committee examining into the same matters in 1921. It seems to me that the proper course for the government to take now is to recommend to this House what changes they think should be made in the act, and we will then give those recommendations due consideration, examine into their merits or demerits, and give our decision.

But I do not believe that at the present time it is in the public interest to appoint a committee to inquire fully into the operation of the Civil Service Act. I cannot help being suspicious when I realize the character of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). It was only upon the suggestion of the Prime Minister that it was amended. This shows that there may have been some thought of blotting out the Civil Service Commission altogether. Therefore I am just a little afraid that this may be the thin end of the wedge, the taking the latch off the door to reintroduce the old spoils system, although I do not believe for one moment that the Prime Minister really intends such a radical change. However, I am afraid it would lead in that direction, and I am therefore opposed to the appointment of a committee as proposed.

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend allow me to correct a misapprehension he is labouring under? I did not like to interrupt him while he was speaking. He mentioned that he understood there had been no Civil Service Commission until the Union government was formed. As a matter of fact a Civil Service Commission was appointed in 1906 by the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That commission was confined entirely to the service in Ottawa. The Union government extended its operations to the outside service.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Speaker, I understood that perfectly well. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) made it very plain that the first Civil Service Commission was appointed by the Laurier government. But its powers were very limited, and it never had any wide powers until the Union government was in office. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. BUREAU: It never had the arbitrary powers.

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa): I think it is a rule of this House, Mr. Speaker, that when it pleases you to name as the seconder of a resolution one of the hon. members that may be sitting next to the mover of the resolution, it is not to be taken as an expression of his concurrence of opinion therein. I say that at the outset because I want to dissociate and free myself from some of the opinions that the hon. mover of the resolution has given expression to. The resolution as it now stands is that the Civil Service Commission be abolished. To that I cannot subscribe. I would willingly subscribe, however, to the motion as amended, namely, for a return to the act of 1908 as far as present circumstances may warrant.

Having made that clear, there is another point I want to establish, and it is this. There is no thought in my mind at present, and there will be no thought in my mind during the course of my remarks, that can be construed in any other way than as simply, sincerely and honestly wishing for the promotion of and the maintenance of efficiency in the Civil Service. I say that because it has pleased a number of hon. members sitting opposite to lightly use the term "distorted mind," and I, Sir, will not allow that anyone with a distorted mind should read into my own thoughts ideas that I do not entertain. Therefore, I wish to say clearly that I stand on this particular occasion as I have always stood in the past on the question of civil service reform, namely, that any reform

should be on the basis of merit and efficiency alone.

Now, let us for a moment review this legislation and see how the Civil Service Commission was established. The present act is the outcome of legislation that was passed in 1882 and came into force on the 1st of July, 1883. The body then appointed was called the Board of Civil Service Examiners, and, if I recollect correctly, the operative section of that act was Section 3, which appointed a board of three examiners whose duties were to establish tests for the admission of candidates into the Civil Service. Under that old system, as hon. gentlemen will remember, a large number of appointments were made, and I must say to the credit of those now in the Civil Service who were appointees under that regime that to a large extent they constitute the backbone of the Civil Service to-day. That legislation was carried down until 1908. Now, it has pleased the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), to say that we wish to destroy the merit system. That thought is far from my mind. It has also pleased him to say that the government made the appointments under the act of 1908. May I point out that the working section of the act of that year, section 10, said:

> The duties of the commission shall be—
> (a) To test and pass upon the qualifications of candidates for admission into the service and for promotion in the service.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has stated that these appointments were made by the government and that the Civil Service Commission ratified them. Well, section 13 says:

> Appointment to positions in the inside service. . . . shall be by competitive examination, which shall be of such a nature as will determine the qualifications of candidates for the particular positions to which they are to be appointed, and shall be held by the commission from time to time in accordance with the regulations made by it and approved by the Governor in Council.

So that under that system appointments were not made purely and simply upon the recommendation of the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman not admit that under those two sections the basis for the commission's ratification was provided, but that was all? The appointment was with the government, so far as those two sections were concerned at least.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Speaker, I am reading the law; unless the commissioners of that day disobeyed the law, then I fail to see how these appointments could be made otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman understands me, but if he does not I would like to make myself clear to him. So far as those two sections go—and I do not dispute that he has read them aright—the appointment was still left with the government. The commission had no power of appointment under those sections. In the exercise of whatever duty it had—giving a certificate to the candidate—it based the certificate upon the examinations referred to in those sections. I hope that is clear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I fully appreciate the right hon. leader of the Opposition's point; but section 18 will answer that. Before I proceed with that, however, let me call attention to this provision:

> Immediately after the examination the commission shall make out a list of the successful competitors thereat for each position, in the order of merit, up to the number computed in accordance with scetion 15.

Now, here is section 18:

> From the said list the commission, on the application of the deputy head, with the approval of the head, of any department, shall supply the required clerks, whether for permanent or temporary duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that not leave it to the head or the deputy head?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It says that the commission, on the application of the deputy head, shall furnish the required number of clerks. That is, on application being received from the deputy head for a clerk, the commission shall send a clerk to fill that position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But would the head or the deputy head not designate whom the commission should send from that list? I just want to know.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not under that act.

Mr. SHAW: May I ask the hon. member what is his interpretation of the words in section 18, "with the approval of the head of any department"?

Mr. CHEVRIER: That means that under the old system, when a stenographer or a bookkeeper or an accountant was required, the deputy minister would ask the Civil Service Commission to send a stenographer or a bookkeeper or an accountant. The Civil Service Commission would then select from the list of eligibles a person to fill the position and would send him on, and on the approval of the deputy minister or the minister—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is all very well for hon. members to laugh, but that is the law. If they fail to see it, it is not my concern.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the law to-day? You can put a man out if he does not suit.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is how it stands.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the law to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have to take that responsibility.

Mr. BUREAU: We always did take the responsiblity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not under the old law.

Mr. BUREAU: We did before you tried to shift it. We are willing to take it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The act of 1908 applied only to the inside service; the outside service was not then under the jurisdiction of the commission. In 1918 the government of the day proposed certain changes in the Civil Service Act for the purpose of placing the outside service under the Civil Service Commission. That was a commendable idea, because in the outside service there are a number of clerical positions, a number of higher positions, that should quite properly come under the operation of the Civil Service Commission. But here is where we disagree: the act of 1918 does away with the responsibility of the deputy ministers in the matter. Under the old act the deputy minister was really responsible for the administration of his department. As it is now, he has nothing to say in the selection of the clerks that make up his staff; he has no say in the matter of promotions, of statutory increases or sick leave, nothing to say in regard to many things that have to do with the adminstration of his department.

I have no great quarrel with the act of 1918, but that act stipulated—and this is a point that has not yet been touched upon—that the Civil Service Commission should proceed with the organization of the departments and then take up the work of classification. But what was done in that case—and this will appeal to hon. members who sit immediately opposite to me—was to put the cart before the horse; the Civil Service Commission, instead of proceeding with the organization of the departments, proceeded with the classification. That may seem very innocent in itself, but the result is most apparent in the chaotic condition of the civil service to-day, in the turmoil and the trouble and dissatisfaction that exist in the ranks of the Civil Service. This condition, I say, is due to the fact that the commission proceeded with the classification before proceeding with the organization. They should have proceeded with the organization first. That is; they should have said that a given department should consist of a minister, a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister, if the work required it; a secretary; an assistant secretary, if the work required it—so many divisions and so many clerks to take care of the work. Then you say these divisions carried with them a salary of so much; but they did not. Unfortunately the service has grown up in various departments each practically separate one from the other, with an administration different in each, and requirements in the one that could not fit the other, and so forth through all the departments. You could not apply to the departments any rigid classification, any iron rule. There had to be a certain amount of elasticity in the classification, but the foreign experts were unable to see that, accustomed as they were to classify only large industrial concerns. When the classification came down the government found that it could not apply it under the Civil Service Act as it stood then, because the schedules of salary that had attached to the act of 1918 divided the service into certain well defined categories, few in number, with clear-cut divisions in salary: the act of 1919, section 42, was passed for the purpose of bringing in that classification. Whilst I am on that subject, great faith did the legislators of that day have in that act when they had to embody in section 42 that "the Civil Service shall as far as practicable"—note that—be classified in accordance with this classification. But that was not sufficient. They found out that that classification was a monstrosity, and so they proceeded to say:

> The commission shall hereafter as it may from time to time deem necessary establish additional classes and grades and classify therein new positions created or positions included or not included in any class or grade and may divide, combine, alter or abolish existing classes and grades.

You would have thought that after all the years that had been spent on it and the enormous amount of money that had been squandered—and I use the word squandered because the results show that that was the fact—they would have brought down a real classification, but we found that the classification was not yet a classification. The last report of the Civil Service Commission for the calendar year 1921 shows this: The classification approved by parliament in 1919 contained 1,729 classes. You would think it was a pigeon-hole business or something of that kind. It has since been found necessary to add to these classes that were established. You would have thought after the amount of time and money that had been spent on that classification, that that would be an end to it, but we find according to the Civil Service Commission's report that

it was necessary to add 587 new classes, to revise the salary range of 515, to amend the definition of 205, and to abolish 158. The net increase at that time was 429 classes, or a total variation in two years of 1,470 positions.

Let us be serious about this, because this pertains to the Civil Service Commission. The leader of the Opposition has spoken of a large number of exemptions, and I shall refer to that in a moment. I hold in my hand what I called last year "the joke book," the civil service classification. This will appeal to hon. gentlemen sitting directly opposite to me, who in a very commendable spirit are always preaching economy. This first volume, after having been translated into French, was destroyed, burned as it was not satisfactory, after thousands upon thousands of dollars had been squandered upon it. The second edition is now in my hands, and I have also brought in here as an absolute physical demonstration the supplements that have been added to this joke book. There are now four volumes each bigger than the original volume, containing over two thousand additions, modifications, alterations and combinations of that classification.

Does it not seem that it is time for us to stop? As one hon. gentleman sitting directly opposite well said last year, we have created this commission as a machine without a brake. The expenditure goes on perpetually increasing and money is squandered just because of the lack, not of administration, but of a proper legal determination as to what the civil service law should be. I say that those who make the appointments should be responsible to someone. If the commission would undertake to follow out every word of that law of 1919, I have not very much to say, but I say that they cannot, and more than that, they have not in the past stuck to the wording of the statute. If we are going to have a statute and it is not going to be obeyed, then I for one voice my protest as a legally trained man, for I am not going to be an accomplice with regard to a statute that we break every day. I say in all sincerity that the commission is doing the best it can to administer the law, and let me say right now I have the greatest faith and the greatest confidence and the greatest respect for the civil service commissioners. I have received nothing but courteous treatment and considerate attention at their hands every time I have had anything to do with them, and I say that also of the officials of the commission. It is not to them that I am looking. It is not to the law, and I blame those who put that law on the statute book in that way, just as I would blame myself if having an opportunity to change that law I did not change it, and for what? Again I repeat, and I challenge anyone to find in my speech of last year or my speech this year anything but the thought of keeping efficient the Civil Service and promoting its best interests. This act says that all appointments to the Civil Service must be by competitive examination or by demonstration of skill. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition would undertake to make all appointments in that way, I would agree; but the commission have found, quite loyally and sincerely found, and I give them credit for it, that there were certain portions of that act that could not be administered in the way in which the law was put on the statute book, that there were certain appointments that could not be filled by competitive eaxmination or demonstration of skill. Would the right. hon leader of the Opposition appoint a charwoman upon a demonstration of her skill or by competitive examination? Would he appoint a bricklayer upon a demonstration of his skill, or any other of these labouring positions? If he would, then again I have nothing to say. But the commissioners in their wisdom, in their loyalty and sincerity, and I was not responsible for the placing of these gentlemen there, have decided that they could not hold a demonstration of skill for the appointment of people to these positions, and making use of Section 38 of the act, which after all the government of that day was responsbile for introducing, they proceeded to hand back to the departments the positions which could not be administered by the commission itself. True there were exemptions made last year. But let me recall to the memory of the leader of the Opposition that all labourers all assistant labour foremen, all labour foremen, all charwomen—now mark the category—all labourers, all assistant labour foremen were exempted by an order in council passed on September 21, 1921. Then all positions carrying an annual salary of not more than $200 were exempted on August 14, 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why was it done again in 1922?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I beg the leader of the Opposition's pardon. I have here Sessional Paper No. 102 of April 7, 1922, giving the report for the year 1921 of positions excluded, under the provisions of section 38b, from the operation of the Civil Service Act 1918. Now let me answer the leader of the Opposition further: In those positions which were set out, and which he held out to this House were a number of positions that were included in the category released previous to the

elections. All the positions contained in these schedules were labouring positions—blacksmith, boiler maker, cabinet maker, carpenter, caulker, cooper, etc., those were all labouring positions and they had been exempted, but the Civil Service Commission proceeded to classify them and then put in the list the names of positions that were formerly included under the word "labourer;" and you have repeated here positions that were excluded on September 21, 1921. You also have in this list, this formidable list, the positions that were excluded by the old administration in August, 1919.

Now the leader of the Opposition has said that if you leave authority to the commission you leave it. But, as I have said before, under the present system you do not leave it. Under the present system the labouring classes have been removed from the operation of the act. I do not propose to criticize or destroy without suggesting anything to take its place, but let me analyze this further situation and then I will proceed to constructive criticism. As it is now when you appoint a postmaster, a local postmaster, one of the sub-agents of the department—he may be an honest man, he may be one of the best officials of the department—proceeds to the constituency and selects, makes inquiries and reports that the man has made satisfactory answer to the requirements of the statute and of the regulations; but he might have asked him, "Who is your leader?" and he might have said. "My leader is the right hon. leader of the Opposition." He might have been asked "what day of the week is this?" and he answered satisfactorily that it happened to be Wednesday. He has made satisfactory answer, therefore the officer reports back to the commission that the man has made satisfactory answer and the commission, acting in a bona fide manner, are bound by the statute, bound by the regulations, and they make the appointment on that report.

Now then if the Civil Service Commission desires to appoint a legally trained man as an assistant counsel, or as a medical officer, what action do they take? You cannot expect the Civil Service Commissioners to be conversant with every trade, or to be learned in every profession, but what do they do? They simply appoint a board to determine the qualifications of the candidates. Now let us consult the report of the commission as to that, because the commissioners, I think, do everything above board and are honest in their desire to serve the public well. I have here the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for the year 1921 and on page XVI is to be found the following:

> The Civil Service Commission desires to express its grateful appreciation to the individuals mentioned below who have willingly, and often at personal inconvenience, rendered valuable service by acting on examining boards in a number of the special competitions held under the direction of the commission.

Now what do I find? I have no fault to find with these gentlemen, or with these ladies that happen to be on this list but all appointments to the Civil Service must be made by competitive examination or demonstration of skill. Now then, is this a demonstration of skill or a competitive examination by the commission? Let me read the names of some of those who acted in the capacity referred to:

A. J. Ames, Managing Director, Instruments, Ltd.
Mrs. Andrews, Member of Public School Board, Victoria, B.C.
Chas. S. Bennett, Lawrence Dairy Supply Co.
J. Arthur Bourbeau, Superintendent of Crabtree Co.
C. Franklin Brownell, Artist.
H. H. Claudet, Consulting Mining Engineer.
G. F. Coleman, Canadian Pacific Railway, Montreal, P.Q.

I will not trouble the House by reading the entire list of 47 names of people who may be well learned in their own trades, or callings, or professions, but who are not responsible to this House or anybody else.

Mr. LEWIS: Would you substitute the minister of any particular department for any of the people whose names you have read?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Most decidedly. If a minister or a deputy minister is paid a salary over and above the others there must be some responsibility attaching to the position. I would let the deputy minister select the appointee provided that the latter had passed a proper qualifying examination for that position. But the hon. gentleman would not do this; he would not let Mr. Claudet, or Dr. Lafortune, the president of the Poultry Association at Gatineau Point, for that purpose say to him how to find out the best hen in his barnyard. But the hon. gentleman would take the recommendation of his managing director, or the president, or the vice-president of his company; they would be responsible to him. That is what the hon. gentleman would do if he is a business man, and I think he is.

Mr. IRVINE: Do you not think that a commission appointed, say, from the heads of departments of the Civil Service, would be more efficient than any authority recommended under your proposal?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have not yet said what my proposal is.

Mr. IRVINE: You have just suggested that the minister or the deputy minister would be better than the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If I am not wearying the House I will come to the point my hon. friend mentions later. I am afraid I have already spoken at too great length, especially as I went fully into this matter last year. But now, I think, the time has come for constructive criticism on my part. It is now impossible to make appointments to the Civil Service in the case of these minor positions, of these labouring or manual positions, by a demonstration of skill or competitive examination. The only way that it could be done would be by having a board composed of bricklayers, charwomen, boilermakers, and the like, who would put these applicants through the respective tests and grade them in the various categories. I say that the appointment to these positions should be handed back to the department and not to anybody else; that the deputy minister should then arrange a scheme whereby these positions could be handled through his department, and he should carry the responsibility. Now I will be asked in regard to this category, as I will be in regard to the third category: If a member of parliament makes a recommendation, should it be followed? Why should it not be followed? If the deputy minister is the responsible individual in charge of his department, he will obey that suggestion or he will not. If he obeys that suggestion and makes a good appointment, nobody will suffer. If he obeys that suggestion and makes an improper appointment, then the deputy minister is responsible to parliament and he should be censured.

Mr. HOEY: In view of the fact that the hon. member is familiar with the Civil Service in a sense in which some of us are not, would he tell us whether there are many such positions outside the present exempted list?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not speaking for the Civil Service Commission, but I think I say what is right when I state that there are now within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission the categories of elevator men, caretakers and watchmen. All the other labouring positions have been returned. Why in their wisdom they have kept the elevator man who runs the elevator purely and simply by putting on and shutting off the power, and why they have released the highly technical qualified electrician who makes the repairs to that elevator is more than I can say. Why they have kept the caretaker and watchman and have released, say, a bricklayer who earns six or seven dollars a day, I cannot say, but just at present I think I am speaking correctly when I say that there remains but those three categories within the Civil Service Commission. And then we are told that we are going to disrupt the whole Civil Service.

Now, I come to the second class, that of positions of a clerical nature. I say that all positions of a clerical nature, no matter what the salary may be from the start, where the minimum salary is $800 or $900, up to a standard where they cease to be ordinary clerical positions, and become technical positions, where the salary is about $2,400 or $2,500, should be filled after competitive examinations. All appointments to the Civil Service in those categories should be made by competitive examination, by special board under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and paid by the government. This board would be responsible for the holding of examinations and responsible to this parliament. All the appointments to these positions would be by qualifying examinations. As a result of these examinations those who came up to the required standard would be placed on the list of eligibles. Here now is where we again part. The deputy minister should assume the responsibility of his office, and from that list of those who have passed the qualifying examination, who have a standard of the minimum marks, the deputy minister would be at liberty on his own responsibility to select the clerks that he thinks are best fitted for the particular positions for which he requires them. Again, I will be told that that is a return of patronage.

Mr. HOEY: Would he have the power of dismissal?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The deputy minister would have the power of dismissal. the power of promotion, and the duty of looking after statutory increases and sick leave. I am coming to all those points. In regard to those particular classes I recognize the necessity just as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, of introducing into the Civil Service of Canada only such men and women as are capable of filling the positions for which they are fitted, and I can say for the credit of the Civil Service that the vast majority are in this category, and it ill behooves hon. members of this House, or any other person, to criticize blindly, and to use the pet phrase of certain people, and say that the Civil Service of Canada is overmanned and overpaid. That is one reason why I urge that a commission should be appointed—to amongst other

things dispel this idea. All these appointments to this second category should be by competitive examination. Now I come to the third containing those that I term technical, professional and administrative positions. For those positions I unhesitatingly say that the deputy minister should assume the responsibility. Again, if the deputy minister listens to the recommendations of a defeated candidate, or to a member of parliament, he may go astray or may go right. If he goes wrong there will be no more harm done anyway than there is at present, when Mr. So-and-So makes a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission and is responsible to nobody, and if he is right there is no harm done.

Mr. LADNER: I should like to ask the hon. member, divesting his remark from any confusing words and returning to plain language, does he favour a return to the old party system of patronage?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have endeavoured to state my position. Probably I cannot use the King's English to the satisfaction of all hon. gentlemen, but I have endeavoured to make it as plain as I can. True it is that there is no legislation in this or any other land that is absolutely perfect, but we would be getting nearer to perfection, and I think we should get away from the present system. We can modify our system. There is no law that cannot be modified with a view to making it better, and when a modification is suggested hon. gentlemen say it is a return to patronage. It would not take the hon. gentleman very long to find out—I do not care where he places the responsibility—that to-day there is much more patronage under the present system of irresponsible patronage than there would be under the old system, and those who are familiar with the working of the Civil Service Act, as we are bound to be, living near the seat of government, can understand how it works out. You can only ascertain that by a very close study of the act and by coming into close and daily contact with the administration. I am not going to enter into any personalities, and I am not going to cite individual cases in order to prove that, but I make the assertion, to use a word which is very familiar and highly prized by hon. gentlemen, that there is distorted patronage to-day, and no responsibility attaching thereto.

Mr. GOOD: Would the hon. gentleman give us some idea as to how the patronage is operated at the present time? I cannot quite grasp his meaning.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. gentleman would investigate all of the appointments to the Civil Service that have been made—I have named a few and I might go a little further—he would grasp the idea. When a postmaster is appointed, the subagent himself makes a recommendation. Is that not patronage? Let him call it patronage, or by a better word if my hon. friend wants to use a better word. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." When Mr. So-and-So, Mr. So-and-So and Mr. So-and-So, three legally trained gentlemen are used in Ottawa, or Montreal, or Toronto to appoint to the Civil Service a legally trained man, the Civil Service Commission do not make that appointment by a test of skill or competitive examination. That is patronage. When a technical officer is appointed, and the recommendation for his appointment has been made by Mr. So-and-So of the Royal Institute of Architects, that is patronage, and it is not responsible patronage. Last year I spoke for over an hour on this question, and the word "patronage" never crossed my lips or entered my mind. I would not have mentioned the word "patronage" to-night, but that hon. gentlemen are full of it.

Mr. BIRD: I understand the hon. gentleman wants the responsibility placed with the deputy heads. I notice in paragraph 13 and also in paragraph 16 of the act that a very considerable selective power is conferred upon the deputy heads; also in paragraph 28 a very considerable selective power is conferred upon the government.

Mr. CHEVRIER: From what act is the hon. gentleman quoting?

Mr. BIRD: An act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, chapter 12.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the date?

Mr. BIRD: Assented to on the 24th May, 1918. What is the hon. gentleman's opinion as to those sections of the act?

Mr. CHEVRIER: My hon. friend is a year behind, and the portion of the act to which he is referring is repealed. We are operating now under what may be called the 1919 act. If my hon. friend had followed my reasoning, he would have understood that the 1918 act was amended, and that, Sir, is another proof why there ought to be a committee of this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman right? The act of 1921 is an act entitled, "to amend the Civil Service Act of 1918." If the Civil Service Act of 1918 was repealed, the act of 1921 would not read that way.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Civil Service Act of 1918, was amended by chapter 10 of the statutes of 1919, second session. That, is, this act may be cited as the Civil Service Act of 1918, amended in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the one we are operating under, and that act—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The act of 1918?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is called the 1919 act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, it is just a rose by any other name. There is no section 16 in this act. Section 16 of the act of 1918 is headed "promotion," is it not?

Mr. BIRD: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the hon. gentleman will look at the amendment passed in 1919, he will see that the government of that day repealed sections 15 to 21, namely, those referring to professional and technical positions, and those sections do not now apply.

Mr. BIRD: What is the hon. gentleman's opinion as to section 13?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Section 13, which is now carried through this act, the act under which we are now working, covers simply the matter of probation. That is all right; I have no quarrel to find with that. When the Civil Service Commission send in an appointee, the minister has a right, within six months, to disapprove his appointment. But that does not refer to promotions; it does not refer to anything but the power to refuse within six months. Section 13 of 8-9 George V is now carried through the present act, which is the same as the act of 1918, except that sections 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the act of 1918 were repealed in 1919, and those sections are not now in force.

I come now to the technical positions. These positions should be under the jurisdiction of the deputy minister himself, because he has a knowledge of the requirements of the situation. He knows just what is wanted. Let him assume the responsibility of placing in that position the man or the woman who, he thinks, is best suited for the purpose. If he does not select the best one out of the list of eligibles, then he is accountable to parliament. I think I have made my stand clear on that point.

10 p.m.

There remains but this. Promotions should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the deputy minister, and transfers should also be under the deputy minister. Why? How do the Civil Service Commission make these promotions to-day? Do not let hon. gentlemen run away with the idea that the Civil Service Commission do everything in an angelic mood or manner. I do not think they are moved by any sentiment; I give them credit that they do not want to do anything that is wrong; but they are good artisans working with very poor tools, which do not give them the power they should have. Are hon. gentlemen aware that these promotions are made by the Civil Service Commission, who have no means of inquiring into the various positions except that they must rely to a very large extent upon the reports of the heads of the various branches. In very few cases do they get first hand information. They send experts; they send clerks of their own to investigate, and they report upon the recommendation of the heads of branches. The deputy minister can do nothing; but the head of a branch, if he wants to be dishonest, if he wants to boost a friend in that branch, can make the recommendation to the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission, in the exercise of its greatest good faith, may make that recommendation for promotion, acting upon that fraudulent representation. In that case you have a miscarriage of justice. On the other hand, if a deputy minister looked after his business himself, he would have knowledge of what was going on in his department, and he would make the proper recommendation. In matters of transfers, why should all this red tape and loss of time and money and energy take place? If the Minister of Finance is satisfied to take a clerk from the Minister of Public Works, why should he not be allowed to do so, if both are satisfied? To-day the Civil Service Commission has to examine into all the details, consider the positions, make reports, recommend transfers. This takes weeks, months. You cannot blame the commission for that, for to-day they are in possession of this cumbersome and unwieldy machine. There is no better way of illustrating the point than to say this. When I was in the Civil Service in 1907, in one of the largest departments, it took one clerk about a day and a half to prepare the list for recommendation to council of those who were entitled to statutory increases once or twice a year. Now it takes two clerks thirty days to make up the list because of the unwieldy machinery which the Civil Service Commission has to work with and because the experts in efficiency turned everything upside down in the service. For each and every clerk in the department—and there are 1,400 of them—a large sheet, on which are questions just as

silly as those mentioned in the classification book, has to be filled up, three copies of it made, or 4,200 sheets in all, to which must be added the carbons. Instead of the deputy minister signing a report, as he did in the old days, he O.K's one of those sheets, and the other 4,199 are marked with a rubber stamp. These 4,200 sheets are then sent to the auditor general and the treasury board, where they are again manipulated. Thereupon 1,400 of those sheets are returned to the Civil Service Commission, 1,400 files are taken out of their respective places, those sheets are attached, and then those 1,400 files are replaced. You will see, Sir, the immense amount of work involved. I am not blaming the Civil Service Commission, for that is the heritage they have succeeded to under this law. That is one of the many instances I could produce to hon. members to show that there is something unwieldy and cumbersome under the Civil Service Act which ought to be weeded out. That cannot be accomplished by simply arguing the matter on the floor of this House. I am confident that if hon. members who have sat in this House for two sessions would investigate the operations of the Civil Service Commission,—not with any idea of turning things upside down, not with any idea of hostility, they would immediately say that there is something wrong.

Another instance will suffice for the present. Last year the auditor general's report showed that there were 280 odd clerks in the Civil Service Commission drawing salaries amounting to $291,000. For 1921-22 the temporary employees of the commission received $77,-391 in salaries. Did hon. members of the Progressive wing ever sit down and realize how much it costs to run the Civil Service Commission? Last year it cost a total of $342,000. The year before it cost $524,000. In all these remarks I have endeavoured to be frank, and I will at once explain that that total includes about $130,000 for the machinery used on the reorganization of the Printing Bureau. But last year it cost this country $342,000 for the administration of the Civil Service Commission. Hon. members would be well advised to look into the Auditor General's report. The setting of examination papers by outsiders has cost $1,000. That amount has been paid to outsiders. We cannot blame the Civil Service Commisison for that expenditure because they did not have these men in the office. Why not have on their staff examiners composed of college professors, technical and professional men, and pay them reasonable salaries to act as an examining board which would be responsible to this parliament? Last year the stationery and printing account runs to $26,700, telegrams $2,200; the corresponding items for the previous year were $44,000 and $4,000 respectively. There is evidently something wrong, and hon. members who are interested in economy would be well advised to investigate and see whether or not the brakes should be applied.

Now, Sir, in closing let me say that I cannot subscribe to the abolition of the Civil Service Commission. I am not an extremist, I do not believe in radical measures. I stand for everything that will promote and maintain efficiency in the Civil Service at the least possible cost to this country. Therefore I think we ought to set aside any preconceived ideas and agree on the principle enunciated by the right hon. Prime Minister in asking that this House appoint a committee to look into the workings of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think that hon. members for the city of Ottawa are not in love with the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask the hon. genman if he was in his seat with his ears open when I said what my feelings were towards the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I know the hon. gentleman is something of a joker. He has told us that himself. I do not have to prove it; he admits it. The predecessors of my hon. friends took the same stand in regard to the Civil Service Commission. I can only suppose that by reason of living so close to the commission they must think they know better than we do whether or not its usefulness has been outlived.

Now I cannot agree with hon. gentlemen on the government side who think that we should displace the Civil Service Commission. It has been my privilege on a number of occasions to adopt this attitude. I was elected on a promise that I would stand for the abolition of patronage, and I have maintained that stand ever since. I shall do so to-night. The hon. member who has preceded me (Mr. Chevrier) called the classification a joke book. Well, I think he will admit that those who were responsible for preparing the classification had a very difficult task indeed to perform. For many years there was no classification of any kind and the civil service was not in a very satisfactory condition. It became imperative that there should be some kind of classification. I am not going to say that I am satisfied with that classification, or that I have not myself made com-

plaints about it. But that does not prove that there should not be a classification. If the classification is not right, it can be put right. That does not go to the foundation of the system at all; it is a mere detail.

Referring to the matter of expense, the hon. member pointed out that it cost $290,000 last year to run the Civil Service Commission, and he urged that that amount was too large. Perhaps it is; if so, it may be possible to reduce it. Then he says also that the procedure is too complicated; that there are too many details to be attended to. That may be true also. I do not say that the system is perfect, but these are only details, and I submit that it is the duty of the government or of the Civil Service Commission to endeavour to simplify the procedure as much as possible.

I must congratulate the mover of this resolution upon his frankness. He does not beat about the bush; he does not say that he is not in favour of abolishing the Civil Service Commission; he comes right out in the open and says he wants to get rid of it—and when he made that statement I noticed that he received a good deal of applause from hon. gentlemen on the other side. Now, I commend him for his frankness.

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman will pardon me; I did not say I wanted to get rid of the commission. I do want to get rid of it, but I did not say so.

Mr. McQUARRIE: To put it in another way, my hon. friend's resolution says so. And if he did not expressly say so before, he says so now, and I again congratulate him on his frankness. In taking that stand he is only following in the footsteps of some very distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the House. I have in mind certain ministers of the Crown; because I remember very distinctly the occasion when, during last session, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) stood up in his place and said, "For God's sake give us power if we are going to have responsibility."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I never said that. Hansard will disclose that that is not so.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I must accept the hon. minister's statement, but I think he said something like that. He may have put it in different words, but I gathered that it was his view that if he was to assume the responsibility he should also have something to do with the appointments.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Sure.

Mr. McQUARRIE: He says "Sure." Well, I do not see that there is much difference. We have heard other statements from hon. ministers of the Crown and from many supporters of the government. The thing is obvious enough to me, in view of a circumstance which I presume will not be contradicted, namely, that there are at the present time hundreds of appointments to the Civil Service that have been held up for months awaiting the time when the government shall have control over those appointments. If I am wrong about that, I will stand corrected, but that is my information.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend kindly inform us where he got that information?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is the information and it is not contradicted.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend is simply dealing with rumour.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It is alleged that hundreds of offices have been left vacant, many of them for months.

An hon. MEMBER: That is economy.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It is quite plain what the reason is: the government is not yet in a position to control the Civil Service Commission. I am told—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that the first thing every minister of the Crown did, one and all, after taking office, was to notify the Civil Service Commission that they were going to have control over their appointments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend mention the name of one minister of the Crown who made such a statment?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear—"one and all."

Mr. McQUARRIE: I included them all. If it is not correct, of course, I am very, very sorry.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my hon. friend a question? He is a lawyer, and he must know that if he alleges a thing he must produce the evidence. Will he produce evidence as to one single minister in the present administration, from the Prime Minister down, who has in any way interfered with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, I won't attempt to do that. I will admit freely and frankly that

my information is simply hearsay; that it did not come from any reliable or responsible source. But that is the information which I have received.

Mr. PUTNAM: Now you are frank yourself.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Well, I am telling you the truth. The hon. member who moved this resolution said that the Civil Service Commission was not responsible to anybody; that it was not clothed with the mantle of grace, and that it should not be allowed to exist. I must say I cannot agree with that. He says that the responsibility is cast upon him and other members of parliament when they come to Ottawa to advise His Excellency the Governor General how the affairs of the country should be conducted, and he asserts that he does not intend to shirk that responsibility. I do not know whether or not His Excellency would go out of business if the hon. gentleman did shirk that responsibility. However, he intimates that his business is to see about the appointments in his constituency, and he says that all appointments should be in the hands of the responsible parties —those who are elected by the people. Well, I suppose the hon. member would be frank enough to qualify that by admitting that the appointments should be made on the recommendation of supporters of the government, I do not suppose for one minute that he would give us on this side of the House any say in the matter of appointments. And what does that mean? It means that in respect of practically fifty per cent of the constituencies of this Dominion the appointments would have to be made by defeated Liberal candidates—persons in whom the electors did not have confidence. Would that be the proper thing? I submit not. If my hon. friend wished to do the right thing and would let us in on the appointments, there might be some force in his argument that the representatives of the people would then have some say in the appointments.

Mr. POWER: Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? If I accept his suggestion, will he vote for my resolution?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, I certainly will not. I do not want the patronage; I never did want it, and I hope I never shall.

A great many things have been said to-night about the Civil Service Commission, about the system of appointments, and so on, but not one word of criticism has been directed towards appointments which have been made. How many cases have been cited here to-night of improper appointments which have been made by the commission? I have not heard of any

We only can speak with respect to our own constituencies. It is said that comparisons are odious, but sometimes I think they are useful, and I think it might be of interest to the House to know something about appointments that have been made by the Civil Service Commission out in British Columbia, just to show how the thing is working out. Within the last few months to my knowledge certain appointments have been made by the Civil Service Commission in British Columbia. One was that of warden of the penitentiary at New Westminster. He was appointed from the staff of the penitentiary. He had been employed in that institution for something like thirty years and was a man of high standing and thoroughly competent. He had previously held the positions of chief keeper and deputy warden. There is no criticism of his appointment.

The next is that of Crown timber agent at New Westminster. That also went to the man who had been assistant Crown timber agent for a great many years. That appointment was also quite satisfactory.

A collector of customs in Vancouver was also appointed. That position went to a man who had been collector of inland revenue at Vancouver for some years. He had been in the department for something like thirty-five years and was thoroughly competent and well qualified in every way. All these appointments have been made by the Civil Service Commission within the last few months, and all are satisfactory. That is one side of the picture.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say, we can make better appointments if you let us go back to patronage. Well, they have made some appointments out there during the last few months. There were some vacancies on the Vancouver Harbour Board which this government has filled. The board is under the control, I think, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. If I remember correctly the man who had been in the position of chairman of the board for some time, and who had performed his duties to the satisfaction of every one concerned, a thoroughly competent man, was asked for his resignation, together with the other members of the board, and appointments were made by the government under the old system of patronage. Who do you suppose they got for chairman of the board, Mr. Speaker? A man who had been a druggist up in the interior.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend who the chairman of the board is.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Beattie.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Beattie is not chairman of the board.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I beg your pardon; I thought he was. He was appointed as one of the members of the board.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is not the chairman of the board Mr. Kirkpatrick, who was appointed by my right hon. friend opposite?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I believe that is right, and I apologize. I believe that he was retained for the time being, but it was reported at the time that he was to be removed, and that he was holding the chairmanship temporarily till he could tell the druggist something about his business. That was one of the appointments this government made under the old system—a druggist up in the interior appointed to the Vancouver Harbour Board. I suppose a druggist is presumed to know something about water, but I do not think this druggist had ever seen salt water before in his life. He had perhaps one qualification that I should not overlook, and that is that he had held the seat of East Kootenay in this House, the seat which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) now holds. He resigned his seat in this House to let the Minister of Public Works come in. I say nothing about that. Possibly it is a proper arrangement. I am not criticising it in any way, nor am I criticising Mr. Beattie's appointment. I am simply giving it as an illustration of the way appointments sometimes go under the patronage system.

The government appointed another man out there, and instead of going into the interior for a druggist, this time they went into a brewery and secured a book-keeper employed there in the person of Mr. Prenter. He was also appointed to the harbour board. I have not one word to say against him. He has lived in Vancouver a long time, and had seen the salt water for some years, so perhaps knew something about it.

Then the government appointed a director to the National Railways Board. They went up to Prince Rupert and got a grocer there for that appointment. I guess he is all right, but he did not know anything about railroading. Yet he was made representative for British Columbia on the National Railways Board, when we have in the province many of the most eminent railroad men in the world, some of whom might have been obtained for this position. I am not saying a word in criticism of these appointments, but I do say that is the way things go when you have patronage.

The Prime Minister is not perhaps as frank as the mover of the resolution, although he did congratulate the mover on what he had said and on bringing this resolution before the House. The Prime Minister said: No we do not want to get rid of the commission at all; that is not our idea; we never thought of such a thing, but Dr. Grant, the Principal of Upper Canada College has been saying that there is in process of formation a Civil Service Reform League, and consequently we will have a committee to investigate this whole business. I do not see the force of his argument at all.

The Prime Minister also said that the deputy ministers are not satisfied with the way the Civil Service Act is working out, and they would like to come before a committee and give some of their experiences. We heard the same kind of story in 1921, when we were told that the deputy ministers did not like the Civil Service Commission, and that they would say all kinds of things if they were brought before a committee. But if any hon. member will look up the proceedings of that committee and read the evidence taken at that time he will find that the deputy ministers came and said: The commission is all right, and with one or two exceptions the appointments are certainly up to the standard of previous years, and in some cases better. If, as the Prime Minister says, some of the deputy ministers are not satisfied now, what is responsible for their change of heart? Has all the trouble occurred since this government came into power, and if so, why is it?

I say that we have tried out this committee business before, and to my mind there is no necessity for going through the same painful process again. We know where it is leading to. It is too evident what the object of the government is, and I for one am opposed to this resolution, and opposed also to it in the amended form suggested by the Prime Minister.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): It was not my intention to intervene in this debate and I shall do so very briefly because of certain statements made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), following what I thought was a very reasonable suggestion advanced by the Prime Minister. I may say at the outset that I am opposed to the resolution as submitted by the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). I think it would be a misfortune if we returned to the system of patronage such as we had prior to the act of 1918. But I would not say that the act is not capable of some improvement. I do not suppose that we have ever had a piece of legislation that was perfect, and I

believe that to be the case with the Civil Service Act, especially in view of the fact that it deals with a matter of far-reaching importance. I take it, Sir, that all the members of this House—whether they belong to the Progressive party, to the Conservative party, or to the party that sits on this side—despite the fact that they may, perhaps, like to take a little political advantage or make a bit of political capital—that all the members of the various groups have at heart the true interest of the country in the matter of the Civil Service and that what we are looking for is real efficiency. If in the working out of efficiency we find that we cannot make a law so absolutely rigid as the pesent Civil Service Act, and if that involves some slight departure from the act as it is to-day —introducing, if you like, a slight degree of patronage—I, for one, would not be particularly alarmed at the word.

It seems to me, therefore, that the suggestion of the Prime Minister was quite in order, that the various members of the House might get together in committee with a view of investigating the difficulties and the disadvantages that have been exposed during the operation of the act in the last two years. It seems to me also that it does not at all follow, as was intimated by the leader of the Opposition, that it was the intention of the Prime Minister to return to the system of patronage, and I, for one, was glad to hear the Prime Minister say that he was not in favour of the resolution and that he has no intention of returning to the old state of affairs.

But even if that were true I would think that the same reproach could very fairly be made to the leader of the Opposition. He was the leader of the government in 1921 that brought in a government bill, which, in its provisions, went a great deal further than any suggestion of the Prime Minister could possibly be construed to go, and that is one of my reasons for rising on this occasion. When the Spinney bill was introduced in 1921—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member be good enough to tell the House how the bill of 1921 went further? The bill of 1921 was a bill simply submitting the question to a special committee.

Mr. EULER: I was just coming to that. The bill of 1921 was known as the Spinney bill, because it was introduced by a responsible member of the government, Hon. Mr. Spinney. I have not the bill before me but, as the leader of the Opposition says, it was referred to a committee of this House of which I was a member. According to Hansard —because not having the bill I cannot quote its exact terms—the measure made provision for the exemption from the operation of the Civil Service Act of certain classes and the result of these clauses if adopted would have been, as the chairman of the Civil Service Commission said, to drive a coach and four through the whole Civil Service Act. The Prime Minister to-day merely suggests an inquiry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that the government of that day when it presented the bill stated that the committee would be absolutely free. As to what was inserted as a schedule to the bill representing what was exempted, there was no restriction or specification. The government's action was merely a submission of the act to the special committee.

Mr. EULER: On that point I must take issue with the right hon. gentleman. The bill definitely and distinctly declared that professional, scientific and technical men were to be exempted from the operation of the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not my point. I know that was in the bill, but the government in presenting the measure to the House stated that it was quite prepared to allow the bill to go to a committee without any restraint, restriction, or specification whatsoever, and that the committee should be sole judge as to how the act should be amended.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is not that exactly what I have suggested? What objection can there be to my suggestion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As the act was amended there is ample liberty for exemptions from its provisions so there is no further object in submitting it now to a special committee.

Mr. EULER: In reply to the leader of the Opposition I would say there must have been in the minds of the government something very closely approaching what I am arguing; otherwise, why insert these words in what my hon. friend is pleased to term a blank bill. or why, indeed, introduce an amending bill at all? On the face of it, it was an indication on the part of the government that they felt that the law which they themselves had brought into existence was, in its working out, found to be impracticable and undesirable in certain directions. However, the bill was referred to the committee. It was very clear proof—proof at least to my mind—that the intention of the bill was, to some extent at least, to

reintroduce the practice of political patronage. I was not at all alone in that impression because throughout the length and breadth of Canada the press took alarm and viewed it in the same way; so much so that protests were made, and these grew so extensive and vigorous that we had not been in session very often in that committee before the words which I have quoted were eliminated from the bill. But the majority of the members of that committee devised something else and I speak deliberately when I say, that, in my opinion, the changes which were made in the bill, even after the elimination of the words which I have quoted, while not apparently alarming in themselves, were, according to the wording, intended to carry out exactly the ideas which were first in the minds of the government when they did insert the original words. Clause 38 of the Civil Service Act, 1918, read as follows:

> Provided, however, that in any case where the commission decides that it is not practicable. . .

And I would draw your attention to the word "practicable"—

> . . . to apply this act to any position or positions, the commission, with the approval of the Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed advisable prescribing how such position or positions are to be dealt with.

If it was not practicable, the clause stated the commission could, in effect, exempt those particular classes from the operation of the bill and, I presume, such classes as it might think it was not practicable any longer to control by the commission should be placed back into the hands of the government and thus, to that extent, restore patronage. And the change that was made was this:

> In any case where the commission decides that it is not practicable or in the public interest. . .

And then the rest of the clause reads very much as it did before. The only change made was to insert the words "in the public interest.' Now hon. members may judge for themselves whether the addition of these words "in the public interest" widens the power or whether it does not. The vice-chairman of that committee, the Hon. Mr. Calder, a member of the Cabinet, stated that he thought the power wider than if those original classes—the professional, technical and other classes which I have spoken about before—had been included. But that was passed in the House. Now the point I desire to make is this: The previous government drew up what they thought was a perfect act in 1918. They either found that it was not practicable, that it was not workable, that it was not for the advantage of the public service, or else the pressure upon the government for the return of patronage by their followers was so great that they found it could no longer be resisted. The evidence, as shown in that committee by the actual introduction of that bill, was at least as strong an indication of the desire on the part of the then government to return to patronage as is indicated by any remarks made this evening by the Prime Minister.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a further suggestion. The hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) has stated, I think, his opposition to the appointment of a committee. I should like to see him alter that attitude, for this reason: it is amply shown, I think, both by the action of the previous government, and by the instances which have been quoted by hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me, that there are conditions in the operation of the Civil Service Act which might very well be improved. What then is the natural and logical thing to do? Instead of debating the matter here, instead of examining instances, which we cannot do in any great number on the floor of the House, is it not the most natural thing that representatives of all the groups in the House should gather together, take evidence, satisfy themselves of weaknesses in the present act, and make such recommendations as they may see fit to make?

I think that is perfectly logical. I would add to that the statement that during the meeting of the committee, when it was finally decided to add these words "in the public interest," I know as a matter of fact the chairman of the Civil Service Commission was very much opposed to it. He would have preferred to wait a year—these are his own words—to see how the act would work out. My own impression was that it might very well go on for some time longer, and then the commission itself, and the various officials of the department, including the deputy heads, might very well make the recommendations to the government as to what remedy might be applied to make the act more workable. We have now waited two years more. It is time to review the whole situation.

A statement has been made that by order in council some ten thousand employees have been exempted from the operation of the act. I do not know whether that number is correct or not. I believe that there were certain classes of employees that could very well, and with public advantage, be exempted from the operation of the act; for example, such as country postmasters, who, I believe, are now exempt. I do not think hon. gentlemen will argue with any great force or conviction that

a body of men sitting in Ottawa will know more about the qualifications of a man out in a little place in British Columbia, or in the northern part of Ontario, or Nova Scotia, for the position of postmaster than the men who come directly from these places. If this means consulting the member of parliament, and to that extent a return to patronage, I am quite willing to say that I would be in favour of it. If ten thousand have been restored, and if as the leader of the Opposition says, that was done with exceeding promptness, I would merely like to say that, if that were done in June, I think the very same thing would have been done in 1921, after the change was made in the act. The change was made in the act enabling the commission to divest themselves of these powers in June of 1921. I think it was about the month of September when the leader of the Opposition, who was then Prime Minister, made the announcement that he was about to make an appeal to the country, and he had not very much time, and the commission had not very much time, to deal with matters of that kind; so that to my mind that is no reflection on the good faith of the government in the matter.

I would in conclusion make an appeal to the Progressives that it is perfectly reasonable and logical that a committee of this House composed of members of all the parties get together, review the whole situation and honestly and fairly make their recommendations to this House on the whole question.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): If it is perfectly logical and natural for the members of this group to whom the last speaker appealed to agree to the appointment of the committee that has been suggested by the right hon. the Prime Minister, is it not just as logical and just as natural, and far more in accord with parliamentary practice, that the government itself should submit certain proposals, if they feel those proposals to be in the public interest, to this House, and then have us consider these proposals, instead of the general question as to whether these proposals should be made or not? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that would be more in accord with parliamentary practice in this House than the procedure which they are taking. I must confess that it was with a good deal of surprise that I saw this resolution on the order paper, and with a good deal of surprise that I saw coupled with this resolution the name of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), because I was of the opinion that not long ago he was very much opposed to any change being made in the Civil Service Act. He admits that two years ago he was very much opposed to any change in the Civil Service Act, and he is quite frank in saying that he opposed the change at that time because he did not trust the Tories. I might just say to the hon. gentleman that there is a large body of public opinion in this country which, in respect of the appointment to the public positions, has a very profound distrust of both Grits and Tories, and why should the public trust either Grits or Tories, or Progressives for that matter, in regard to making public appointments.

The people of Canada desire to see an efficient Civil Service. They desire to see the administration of our public affairs carried out not only economically but proficiently and in the best possible manner, and, recalling what was said by the hon. gentleman from Brandon (Mr. Forke) about patronage being the system that was in use in this country in making public appointments for a good many years, the struggle that there was in this House to get away from the evils of patronage, and the impossibility under either political party of any substantial measure of civil service reform being enacted which would absolutely get away from party patronage, I cannot help thinking that if we go back in the very slightest degree towards that old system and recognize party patronage at all in the making of public appointments, it will be a very grave mistake for this House, it will be a grave mistake for the members of this parliament, and it will be only getting ourselves into difficulty and will not lend itself to efficiency in public administration.

Mr. PUTNAM: Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the government in power making the appointment of Superior Court judges, or would he like that to go to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Whether I would be in favour of the appointment by the Civil Service Commission of Supreme Court judges and that kind of thing, or whether I would not, is a question I am not prepared to answer offhand. I am quite frank in answering my hon. friend in that way. But I think it has been generally recognized in this country, even in days of patronage, that appointments to the Supreme Court should not be regarded as patronage, and should be above patronage. Whether that has been true in practice or not I am not prepared to say. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), whilst stating that there were some phases of the Civil Service Act that might require change and improvement,

admit that he would not be alarmed even if a little element of patronage entered into the changing or amending of that act. I quite clearly recall that two years ago in speaking on this same question, while protesting against the very slight change that was made at that time, my hon. friend said that he was afraid that that slight change would do away with the vital principle of the Civil Service Act, which was the abolition of political patronage. Evidently, he is of the same mind as the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power); he is not afraid of political patronage. But he instances the case of country post offices, small unimportant positions in outlying districts, and he contends that the member for that constituency, who knows his constituency and the conditions surrounding his locality, is in a much better position to choose the proper man for a position of that kind than is the Civil Service Commission sitting here at Ottawa. That may be true and it may not; but we have the evidence of men in the Post Office Department, for instance, evidence which was given under oath two years ago before the special committee, going to show that the system now in vogue of making those appointments by the Civil Service Commission is working out fairly well.

Mr. CARROLL: That is not in vogue now.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The post office inspectors say that they are getting good appointees and good service under the present system.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member say that appointments to small country post offices are to-day under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Of course, there are a few of the very small ones that are not, but very many of them are. It is a small post office, indeed, that does not give a remuneration of $200 or more.

Mr. CARROLL: There are many.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I am speaking only for my constituency and I know that to be the case there. I do not know that there is in my constituency one that is in the category of which the hon. member speaks.

The outstanding feature, to my mind, of the discussion this evening was brought out by the hon. member who just preceded me (Mr. Euler). He said that two years ago, when the bill which is commonly known as the Spinney bill, was introduced in this House, it was done because such pressure was brought to bear upon the administration of that day by many of their prominent supporters in this House, that the government submitted a bill. Is that not the situation that we have here to-day? I suspect that to be the situation, that such pressure is now being brought to bear upon the administration, and has been for the last year, that they are feeling their way as to whether it will be wise to bring in a bill to amend the Civil Service Act or not. That is why I am taking the ground that I am opposed to the suggestion that a committee of this House should be appointed. I was rather surprised to hear some prominent members across the floor state that the Civil Service Commission were an autocratic body; that they had power without responsibility, and that the government, who shoulder the responsibiltiy, should have the power. The present administration have not shown until the present time any particular anxiety to assume responsibility. If they are willing to assume responsibility, why not submit a measure for our consideration?

11 p.m.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A good deal has been said by my hon. friend and his friends as to the desirability of the government consulting parliament or a committee of parliament before taking matters into their hands. I have intimated, on behalf of the government, that we desire to do that, to as large an extent as possible. Would we not be proceeding more in accord with that spirit if we asked parliament or a committee of parliament, after examining the whole situation, to give us the benefit of their views, and then acted upon their views, rather than if we took the matter into our hands, making an arbitrary suggestion and leaving it to parliament to decide?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I can see there are many cases in which the Prime Minister is correct. I agree in general with the principle that he has laid down, and I think it is quite proper for the government to consult this House on many questions. But it is not two years since we had an investigation of a similar nature, an investigation as wide as one could possibly make it, by a special committee appointed for this very purpose. All the information that was collected by that committee is available for the present administration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A very different parliament.

Mr. EULER: Does the hon. member not think that an additional experience of two years in the working out of that act would tend to throw light on it?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I have no doubt an additional experience of two years would throw more light on the attitude of many members in this House towards that act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, I hope, remembers that even that investigation was opposed by the present Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that it was a very different parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): It is quite true that it was a very different parliament, but there were on that committee many members who are sitting in this parliament. The hon. member for North Waterloo was on that committee, and had the privilege of asking any questions he chose to ask. We had the privilege of summoning all witnesses we chose from amongst the civil servants, deputy ministers, heads of branches and other officers from the different departments. No effort was made to circumscribe the inquiry or to deny information, and the information laid before that committee, which that committee elicited from men who know that service from top to bottom, is sufficient ground on which to base any recommendations for a change in the act. It would be more in accord with parliamentary practice for this administration to make their proposals on the information thus gathered and then to bring down to the House a bill for our consideration.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member in favour of the action taken by the Civil Service Commission in the exemptions which they have already made? Does he approve those exemptions or does he not?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I think, in the main, the exemptions made by the Civil Service Commission are proper exemptions to make from the operation of the act. A few of them may not be. I am not just familiar with all the exemptions that have been made; but I quite remember that according to the information which we elicited from the chairman and secretary of the Civil Service Commission two years ago, they thought the act would be made more workable and more efficient in the public interest by making some of these exemptions which have already been made.

Mr. EULER: Does the hon. member know that they include those postmasters in favour of whose exemption I spoke this evening and also two years ago? I am glad to hear that my hon. friend is also in favour of exempting them.

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the time of the House. My hon. friend and colleague from Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) has gone into this question very fully, and I wish to associate myself with him in the statements he has made in support of the proposal that the Civil Service Act shall go before a committee. I spoke on this subject last year, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to repeat what I said then, that I stand for civil service reform. Civil service legislation was first introduced in 1908 by the Laurier government. I had my experience from 1908 to 1911 under the act as it then was administered for what is known as the inside service at Ottawa. That act was founded on the British Civil Service Act. The idea of civil service reform is that you must have an honest competitive examination for entrance to the Civil Service. If you do not, then you must have influence. That is the point. If you are going to have influence of some kind without responsibility in the making of appointments to the service I would prefer the responsibility to rest with the administration.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask the hon. gentlemen if he is suggesting that the Civil Service Commission does not prescribe honest, competitive examinations?

Mr. McGIVERIN: No, certainly not. But I say that one of the reasons given here for the appointment of a committee is that in very many cases the Civil Service Commission cannot possibly prescribe a competitive examination. Take the classes of appointments lately withdrawn from the operation of the act at the request of the commission itself, no competitive examination is possible. For instance, what competitive examination can you set for charwomen? Are they to be required to measure their mops, and so forth? The same condition applies to lots of other appointments. What is the result? It is left to certain men to advise the Civil Service Commission as to who should be appointed to such positions. I submit that the responsibility of making these appointments should rest with the minister or the deputy minister, for it is doing harm to civil service reform to have the commission in charge of appointments which it cannot justify.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the personnel of the Civil Service

Commission. As a matter of fact two of the commissioners were formerly members of this House and my personal friends; but I do object to the act, and I think a committee should be appointed to investigate not only the making of appointments but the principles governing promotions, transfers, etc.

In the debate last year my hon. friend, the former leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar)—and I sincerely hope he will soon be in his seat again—made it very plain that he was against political patronage. After stating that the Civil Service Commission should be entrusted with the duty and responsibility of seeing that any person coming into the service possessed the necessary qualifications, he went on to say:

> But after that is done it seems to me that on the whole we would perhaps get better results if ministers and deputy ministers in charge of the various departments had greater latitude in control of the services than they have at the present time. If a minister or a deputy minister in a department wishes to promote some one in his department, if he wishes to transfer him from one branch of his department to another, that should certainly rest in his hands.

In other words, the responsibility of administration should rest with the minister or his deputy and not with the commission. My hon. friend continued on the same lines as regards the right of appeal from the decision of a deputy minister. While I believe that the administration should absolutely be in the hands of the minister or the deputy minister or of the heads of branches, I would still leave to the individual civil servant the right of appeal, but not to the Civil Service Commission. Rather I would propose the adoption of the practice followed in Australia and New Zealand. I would have a civil service judge, equivalent to a judge of the Exchequer Court, a man of the highest character, to deal with appeals. I would further protect the civil servant by introducing in the various departments what the civil service organizations have asked for, namely, Whitley Councils in each department and inter-departmental councils. Then any civil servant who feels aggrieved in regard to promotion or otherwise submits his grievances to his fellow civil servants composing the council, and if they think he has a just case against the head of his branch or against his deputy minister they take it before the judge.

Frankly, I want to see the most efficient and the most satisfied Civil Service that we can have, and I believe that it is the honest intent of every hon. member, but if the bogey of political patronage is to be trotted out every time any attempt is made to correct what we believe to be faulty in the act, then we might as well not attempt any improvement. I think my hon. friend and colleague, (Mr. Chevrier) made out a splendid case, and I strongly support the question being taken up by a committee. Let us try to make progress. There are other very serious questions in connection with the Civil Service that later on can be taken up, but in the meantime the law governing the Civil Service Commission needs amending. Mr. Speaker, I shall have much pleasure in voting to have this matter referred to a committee.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (Sainte-Marie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to strongly support the motion proposed by my hon. colleague of Quebec South (Mr. Power). Those were precisely my sentiments last year, and I have no fear to state this evening that my views have not since changed. I wish to congratulate the member for Quebec South on the initiative, courage and talent which he displayed in asserting his contention. This act, as draughted and applied, of which he urges the repeal, is certainly an arbitrary and unconstitutional measure. Such legislation belongs to ancient history, and to find its parallel, one must go back almost a hundred years, when the governors of Canada, at the helm of public affairs, ruled through an executive power irresponsible to the people and also had the privilege of voting themselves salaries and dividing among themselves the public funds. This kind of administration brought on those times of crises of which history still vividly reminds us. During that period we witnessed individuals living in London, rendering no services to Canada, not having even set foot in this country, drawing fabulous salaries. As the same thing is happening here, at present, although on a smaller scale, I shall have the opportunity in the course of my remarks, to ask the Civil Service Commission, who has the care of watching over the interests of the country, why they are paying out salaries to persons who are not even in the country's service. Those powers conferred on the Civil Service Commission, remind us of the times when the country was governed by a group of friends or a Family Compact. At the time, a few persons were allowed to distribute all public offices amongst friends and relatives, claiming salaries to their hearts' content without any compunction, exactly as the thing is practised to-day. This I stated and proved last year, on the floor of this House.

Of all these independent commissions, the Civil Service Commission is certainly the most arbitrary and unconstitutional, owing to its extensive powers. However, the principle which places the administration of the country un-

der independent commissions is a false one in many ways, because under a responsible government, all these commissions are only responsible to themselves, which is perfectly ridiculous.

In regard to these independent commissions although the people's representatives have received a mandate to look after the interests of the county, they find themselves frustrated, on arriving at Ottawa, by persons absolutely independent of parliament. Such legislation legalizes the principle of administrative independence to such an extent that it is interdicted to parliament, to the representatives of the people, to interfere with their decisions or their way of carrying on the administration of the country whatever injury it may entail on the public weal. The people's representatives have no say in the matter. If administrative machinery is invented by which public money is squandered and a representative of the people dares to ask for an explanation, from the pinnacle of their independence the answer comes that it is not in the interest of the country to divulge these details.

By virtue of section 53 of the British North America Act (page 10, 1867-1907 edition) it is stated:

> Bills for appropriating any Part of the Public Revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons.

This section, according to me, is very plain. Taking into account the administrative machinery at the disposal of these independent commissions: such as laws, regulations, promotions, arrears of salaries, creating positions, in a word all the necessary disbursements to start this machinery going, sometimes they are fabulous amounts, I conclude that the Civil Service Commission, in regard to administration, is in violation of section 53 of the British North America Act, because these rules and regulations, arrears in pay, new positions, are no more nor less than an appropriation of some portion of the public money and all this emanates outside of the House of Commons, which is prohibited by this section, and the latter has no other right, under this system of control, than to compulsorily ratify and sanction sound as well as unsound legislation. In my humble opinion, this is arbitrary and unconstitutional, and as long as the British North America Act is not amended, I think that the creation of the Civil Service Commission is an ultra vires legislation.

At page 17, 1867-1907 edition, chapter VI, section 91 of the British North America Act, under the heading Distribution of Legislative Powers, and sub-heading Powers of Parliament, it is stated:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the Peace, order, and good Government of Canada, in relations to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects—next herein after enumerated; that is to say,—
>
> 1. The public debt and property.
> 2. The regulation of trade and commerce.
> 3. The raising of money by any mode or system of taxation.
> 4. The borrowing of money on the public credit.
> 7. Militia, military and naval service, and defence.
> 5. Postal service.
> 6. The census and statistics.
> 7. Militia, military and naval service, and defence.
> 8. The fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada.

There are many other subjects dealt with which I trust you will dispense me from enumerating.

The powers granted to all these independent administrative bodies, such as the Civil Service, Taxation, Harbour and Railway Commissioners etc., etc., are in violation of section 91 of the British North America Act, by depriving the deputation of its exclusive privileges.

All the members of this House are well aware that the fixing of the civil servants' salaries comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact, paragraph 8 of section 91 of the British North America Act states that the fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officials of the government of Canada is the exclusive right of the Parliament of Canada. I therefore conclude that this act creating the Civil Service Commission which my hon. friend for Quebec South wishes to have repealed, is certainly unconstitutional and arbitrary and that he is fully justified in demanding its repeal.

At the time of the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I heard many of our Progressive friends preach economy in administration. However, I notice, this evening, that they are in favour of continuing this unconstitutional and arbitrary legislation. It seems to me that if they had recommendations to make in regard to the economic administration of the country they might have left us out and bestowed such recommendations on that commission which is so dear to them.

Mention was made, this evening, of the order in council, dated September 22, 1922, from which we may judge of the exorbitant

powers which the Civil Service Act conferred upon this commission. As stated by the Premier, we beheld the members of that commission humbly come and beg the Privy Council to release them of such responsibility which was unbearable to them and consisted in having blacksmiths and copper-plate polishers employed in the Department of Public Works, in Montreal, pass examinations on mathematics, geography, and on many other scientific subjects.

I fully understand that it was humiliating to them to be forced to apply so ridiculous a law as that of the present Civil Service Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that all these commissions based on administrative autonomy, have exactly all the same weak side. I see here amongst my notes that some time ago a member questioned the late Minister of Railways, Mr. Kennedy, about a scandal relating to the Canadian Northern Railway which was managed last year, as all know, by an independent commission. To obtain the required information, the minister met with all kinds of obstructions. However, to comply with the request of the member—whose name I beg to be allowed not to divulge—the hon. Minister of Railways instituted an inquiry, placing the matter in the hands of a group of federal detectives under the supervision of Mr. Page. These detectives, after some clever work, discovered an embezzlement of funds amounting to more than $100,000. This only goes to prove that after all it is always the representative of a riding who is the best judge of what takes place in his own county. It also proves that the principle of governing the country through independent commissions is a false principle. Again I say a member is the best judge of what is going on in his county and these independent commissions are wrong when they inform members who seek for information through the minister, that it is not in the interest of the country to give out the facts. In the case just mentioned, if I am well informed, proposals of reimbursement by the embezzler were made to the government. That goes to show that a member can do something besides drawing his sessional indemnity and giving during twelve months of the year, letters of recommendation, three quarters of which are useless; he would be in a position to save the country hundreds of thousand dollars, if he were not tied down in carrying out his duties by these independent commissions.

Although, Sir, I am willing to give the officials of these commissions credit for their ability, it is not the less true that it is impossible for them to control and supervise their subordinates. They do not know their employees and their various duties, they cannot economically look after the affairs of the country, and, the minister leaves himself open to criticism, each session, by asking unwarranted and entirely ridiculous appropriations as it happened last year. For instance, the Civil Service Commission have under their control the Department of Public Works, at Montreal, so far as salaries above $200 are concerned, if we except the trades people. We now find in the Report of the Auditor General, for the year ending March 31, 1921, volume 3, page 178-V, that a person named A. W. Sullivan, junior engineer in the Department of Public Works, at Montreal, has been so classified that he drew, for the year 1920-21, a salary of $2,040, plus a bonus of $240 and an extra sum of $240 for arrears, making a total of $2,520. Nevertheless, it is admitted that the department does not need his services, because, being a resident of Valleyfield, he practically only appears at the department to draw his salary. Although the Civil Service Act prohibits any employee receiving a salary of more than $1,000 to engage in any other work irrelevant to his civil occupation, this gentleman carries on, in Montreal and Valleyfield, with the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, a private business totally foreign to his duties. Here is the proof: I hold in my hand a copy of the newspaper Le Progrès, published in Valleyfield, in which we find the name of Mr. Arthur W. Sullivan (successor to J. H. Sullivan) land surveyor and civil engineer, Valleyfield, P.Q., offices at 59 St. Peter Street, Montreal. This goes to show how this commission, from its high pedestal, in the Hunter building, can administer and watch over the interests of the country. It would be much preferable if the members received a more cordial hearing when they have recommendations to make to the commission, but better still, in the interests of the country, that the exclusive privileges of members be admitted.

The Civil Service Commission might possibly be able to tell us what amount they recommended to be paid to a person named Mousseau, so-called inspector of heating installations in the Department of Public Works, at Montreal, an employee who only called at the department to draw his monthly cheque of $115, when no inspections were being carried out. This employee, at the same time that he was drawing a salary of more than $1,000 per year, had, to the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, a butcher's shop at Ahuntsic, a trade which took up all

his time, with the exception of his monthly visits to the department to draw his cheque.

I am convinced, Sir, that none amongst us who have private business to look after would wish to have such a system perpetuated. So far as I am concerned, nothing in the world could induce me to connive at such a state of affairs.

To my mind, it behooves the government to bring on a change in the administration of the country. With this system of independent commissioners, the representatives of the people are but honourable messengers in touch with a receiving and transmitting instrument, which is the Cabinet, and which in turn is powerless and has but to transmit requests and recommend the disposal of public funds at random to unchecked officials which are uncontrollable under the law. I urged before the electors of my county, a return to responsible government, and, I urge it again to-night. In my county I was listened to and understood; I hope to be equally understood here and that my request will be given due consideration. I will admit that a commission may at times be necessary, but only when it is entirely under the jurisdiction of parliament and not when it creates a system of administration obliging the representatives of the people to vote public money blindly. For my part, I refuse to be dragged into the current, dead fish only are swept away by the current and I am not one of them. I protest against my colleagues being considered as parliamentary pedlers promenading through the country, and held responsible for other people's doings.

I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to abuse the patience of the House, but I think I have sufficiently stated in a few words what I think of these independent commissioners and so long as you have not acceded to the request made last year, to have a parliamentary commission verify the charges which I brought forward and that cannot be contradicted, I shall maintain the same stand. It gives me pleasure, this evening, to support the resolution of my hon. friend, the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), even though the resolution is somewhat of a sweeping nature, however, I believe in applying the hot iron to all evils.

Mr. SHAW moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Unless there is really a desire to have the debate go over I hope my hon. friend will find it possible to continue to-night.

[Mr. Deslauriers.]

Mr. SHAW: I would very gladly indeed accede to the wishes of the Prime Minister, but it is a matter of some importance and I see no objection to the debate going over unless there is some special reason for continuing the discussion to-night.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have no objection to having the debate adjourned, but I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that there is a great demand for economy and the duration of the session is one of the factors in that regard. If we can expedite business we are ready to go on. However, we will not insist if hon. gentlemen opposite wish the debate adjourned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are now half an hour past the regulation hour so long promised by the government before it came into power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very well.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Monday, February 19, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance), moved:

That the name of Mr. Archambault be substituted for that of Mr. Laflamme on the select standing committee on Privileges and Elections.

That the name of Mr. Bouchard be substituted for that of Mr. Provost on the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

That the name of Mr. Michaud be substituted for that of Mr. Robichaud on the select standing committee on Forests, Waterways and Water-powers.

That the name of Mr. Robichaud be subtituted for that of Mr. Michaud on the select standing committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

RESTAURANT OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance), moved:

That Messieurs Anderson, Bancroft, Gordon, Putnam, Macdonald (Pictou), Rinfret, Papineau, Wallace and Wilson be appointed to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

KITSILANO INDIAN RESERVE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to ask one or two questions of the government, based upon a very important despatch which I see in the press. I must apologize for not having notified the minister, but I think he will be able to answer the question without the usual courtesy of a notice. The despatch is from Victoria and, in part, reads:

> The Vancouver Harbour Board in future will control the Kitsilano Indian reserve, announced Hon. J. D. MacLean, Acting Premier. A telegram was received from Premier Oliver at Ottawa advising acceptance of the sum of $500,000 for the property and the Executive Council ratified the agreement.

And then it says further—I do not wish to read more—that an unstated amount over the half million will go to the Indian fund, the province retaining the customary reversionary rights. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior: Has the transfer been agreed to as indicated in this despatch; is the sum of $500,000 correctly quoted; what is the amount to go to the Indians, referred to in the despatch; does the arrangement allow to the province its contention for reversionary rights?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil), (Minister of the Interior): That is a very difficult question for one to answer from memory. All the despatch indicates that is new in the matter is that when Mr. Oliver was here I succeeded in getting him to agree to accept $500,000 as the amount claimed by the province in the settlement of this dispute. True, the harbour board are desirous of obtaining the reserve. I have just forgotten the sequence in which this thing runs, but at all events there was an arbitration the terms of which the federal government refused to accept. No price has yet been fixed as the amount that the harbour board would pay for the island. But the $500,000 mentioned in the despatch is the amount that the provincial government, as announced by the premier, would be willing to accept as settlement of their interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that mean that they get $500,000 for their alleged reversionary interest?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not mean they get anything. That is their own proposal; there has been no acceptance of it.

Mr. STEVENS: Then the despatch is not correct in saying that there has been acceptance of the sum of $500,000 for the property, and ratification of the agreement by the Executive Council.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will try to give the information, but this whole question involves a considerable amount of detail.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps my hon. friend will give it to-morrow—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. STEVENS: —because it is a very important question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might say for my hon. friend's information that no further progress has been made with the settlement than that one statement from the provincial government that they would be willing to accept $500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just to clear up one point that the minister attempted to answer to-day, and which I did not understand: he said that the government had prevailed on Mr. Oliver to accept the $500,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought that was my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If I left that impression on my right hon friend's mind, I did not intend to do so. That was their own suggestion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government have not accepted that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, we have not accepted anything. We are trying to settle it.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 18, respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 19, respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.—Mr. Jacobs.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHS

Mr. SALES:

1. What is the number of miles of telegraph lines between Fort Qu'Appelle and Humboldt, and between Humboldt and Battleford?
2. What is the number of telegraph stations maintained on these lines?
3. What is the cost of maintenance, exclusive of salaries, of these stations?

4. (a) What is the number of telegraph agents employed on these lines, and (b) the total salaries paid?
5. What is the number of repair men employed on these lines, and what is the amount of the salaries and expenses paid to them?
6. What is the cost of material for repair of said lines?
7. What number of messages were handled by these lines during the last year?
8. Are the said lines serving any territory which cannot be served by telegraph lines along the railways?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Qu'Appelle to Fort Qu'Appelle, pole line 17 miles; wire, 17 miles; Fort Qu'Appelle to South Humboldt, pole line 162 miles, wire 163 miles; South Humboldt to Battleford, pole line 127 miles, wire 171½ miles.

2. East of Battleford 7 offices viz:—Qu'Appelle, Fort Qu'Appelle, Lipton, South Humboldt, Saskatoon, Henrietta and Baljennie.

3. Proportion of general average of outlay (aside from salaries) for all lines and offices in Saskatchewan, $18 per mile (wire): For the section embracing the above 7 offices, $6,327.

4. (a) 7 agent-operators and 1 lineman; (b) $10.980.

5. 2 linemen, 1 at Fort Qu'Appelle, salary $1,476 per annum; and 1 at Saskatoon, salary $1,620 per annum. Outlay for keep of horses, etc., is included in above-mentioned general average.

6. Cost of material used in maintaining the line is included in the above-mentioned general average.

7. 5,762 messages sent.

8. With the exception of Baljennie, the lines of the Canadian Pacific Telegraph and the Canadian National Telegraphs are now serving all points in the territory covered by the above described lines, in consequence of which the above lines and offices east of Baljennie, along with some other sections farther westward in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, are, in pursuance of an Order in Council, P. C. 141, of 30th January, to be discontinued and withdrawn by 31 March next.

YORKTON INCOME TAX OFFICE

Mr. SALES:

1. What is the total cost of the office of Assistant Inspector of Taxation at Yorkton, Saskatchewan?
2. What staff is employed in the said office?
3. What are the salaries paid?
4. What rental is paid for the office?
5. What amount of income tax has been collected by this office, (a) from farmers, and (b) from other persons?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Cost including rent, 1 April, 1922 to 31 January, 1923, $11,756.80.

2. At 31 January, 1923, 8.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

3. Salaries per month: G. H. Bradbrooke, $225; A. V. Laban, $133.33; A. J. Blackwell, $100; H. Hing, $100; G. W. Butt, $100; C. McNair $75; M. I. Lorimer, $75; J. Smith, $50.

4. $720 per year, which includes heating and lighting.

5. (a) None. (b) None.

Yorkton is a sub-district office and not a collection office.

The functions of a sub-district office are to assist taxpayers in the preparation of returns, build up and maintain a tax directory for the territory covered by the sub-office, conduct investigations and perform such other duties as are assigned to it by the Inspector of Taxation for the district.

Mr. DUNCAN MARSHALL

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Is Duncan Marshall now an official of the Department of Agriculture?
2. If so, since when has he been drawing salary as such and at what rate?
3. Is he the same Duncan Marshall who was several times defeated as Liberal candidate in Dominion Elections?
4. Was he appointed through the Civil Service Commission?
5. If not, how was the appointment made?
6. Has the said Duncan Marshall addressed a number of Liberal political gatherings while drawing salary as an employee of the Dominion government?
7. If so, how many, and where were such gatherings held?
8. Did Duncan Marshall and W. A. Dryden go to Argentine, Chile, or Patagonia or any other South American countries at the expense of the government of Canada as announced in the House of Commons by the Minister of Agriculture on April 3, last?
9. Have the said gentlemen visited Great Britain at the expense of the Government of Canada?
10. Did Mr. Duncan Marshall or Mr. Dryden, while on any such trips purchase stock on their own behalf or on behalf of either of them, and import such stock into Canada?
11. If so, what number of animals were purchased by each of them, what were the breeds of such animals and when were they imported?
12. What is the total amount paid to each of these men by the government of Canada for salary and all expenses up to the present date?
13. Are these men or either of them now in the employ of the government?
14 If not, when did their duties cease?
15. How many pure-bred cattle or horses, sheep or swine have been exported from Canada to South America in the present fiscal year?
16. Have reports been made by either of the said men as to the duties they discharged while drawing salary or expenses from the government?
17. If so, are such reports available to members of the House?
18. What duties has Mr. Duncan Marshall performed that could not have been well discharged by expert officers already in the department?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Duncan Marshall is now an employee of the Department of Agriculture.

2. Since January 15, 1922, at the rate of $6,000 per annum.

3. The records indicate that Duncan Marshall, like many other able gentlemen, was defeated in the general elections of 1921.

4. No.

5. By order in council, P.C. 223 of February 7, 1922. (Under authority of Sec. 38C of the Civil Service Act as amended by C22 of Statutes of 1921).

6. No knowledge of such.

7. Answered by No. 6.

8. W. A. Dryden went to Brazil, Uruguay and the Argentine Republic on a mission for the Department of Agriculture but was not accompanied by any other agent or employee of the department.

9. Mr. Marshall spent some months in Great Britain on government business and, naturally, his expenses were paid by the government.

10. Not to the department's knowledge.

11. Answered by No. 10.

12. Duncan Marshall: Salary, $6,274.19; Expenses, $2,677.89; total $8,952.08. W. A. Dryden: Advance for expenses, $2,000.

13. Mr. Marshall is still in the employment of the government.

14. Mr. Dryden was never an employee of the government. On the mission indicated in the answer to question No. 8 his expenses were paid but he received no salary or other remuneration.

15. None.

16. Mr. Dryden has submitted a report on his observations and findings in connection with his trip to South America and Mr. Marshall has submitted a report on the Agricultural Instruction Act.

17. Both of these reports will be laid on the table of the House but it is not proposed to print either of them.

18. The investigational work conducted by Duncan Marshall in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act, Dominion Exhibitions, and attendance at various international live stock and dairy conventions could have been performed by expert officers already in the department only by considerable neglect of their present duties. Mr. Marshall's special knowledge of pure-bred live stock and the importation thereof, together with his previous study of and experience with the embargo question marked him out as the one man, with Dr. Grisdale, to act as expert adviser to the Canadian Cabinet representatives at the recent British-Canadian Conference on this important question.

WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO MONTREAL

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is it a fact that in August 1921, eighteen hundred to two thousand cars of wheat remained unloaded for weeks in the Port of Montreal?

2. What is the cost per bushel of transportation of wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal?

3. What does the Montreal Harbour Commission charge per bushel for the transferring of wheat to its elevators?

4. What is its charge per bushel to load the grain on board ship?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. In August 1921 there were at different times in the Montreal terminals and Port of Montreal from one thousand to two thousand cars waiting to be unloaded, but the peak of from eighteen hundred to two thousand cars did not exist for longer than six or seven days.

2. The cost of transportation of wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal at the present time by rail is 34½ cents per 100 pounds or 20·70 cents per bushel.

3. The charge for elevation of wheat from vessels to commissioners' grain elevators is four-tenths of 1 cent per bushel, including storage in the elevator up to 10 days free, and free fire and explosion insurance. In addition there is a charge of $2.75 per thousand bushels for shovelling the grain to the elevator buckets in the vessel's hold. The charge for elevation of wheat ex railway cars is six-tenths of 1 cent per bushel including storage in elevator up to 10 days free, and free fire and explosion insurance. The shovelling in this case is absorbed in the elevation charge.

4. The charge for delivery of grain to ocean steamer over the grain conveyor system or otherwise is four-tenths of 1 cent per bushel.

MISS BARBARA LEE

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. When, and in what capacity was Miss Barbara Lee employed at the Immigration Building, St. John (West), New Brunswick?

2. By whom were her services engaged?

3. Was she dismissed? If so, by whom?

4. Was she at any time required to perform services for which she had not been engaged? If so, by whom?

5. Who is in immediate charge of the dining rooms at this immigration building, and is such person in charge as an employee of the government or under contract?

6. Had such person any right to engage or dismiss help?

7. Is the government aware that Miss Lee has for some years given capable service in connection with immigration service dining rooms, and has been driven out of her position by the actions of the person in charge?

8. Does the government propose to restore Miss Lee to her position?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Nov. 20, 1922. To do general work in the catering department in the Immigration Building, West St. John, N.B.
2. Department of Immigration and Colonization.
3. Yes, by the Department of Immigration and Colonization.
4. No.
5. Mr. J. Byrne, as an employee of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.
6. Yes, upon the approval of the department.
7. No.
8. No.

CONVERSION LOAN

Mr. GOOD:

With respect to the recent Conversion Loan:
1. What was the total amount converted?
2. What was the total cost of the conversion?
3. What was the cost of the advertising in connection therewith?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $114,449,250.

2 and 3. Expenses paid to date, $322,635.46, of which $117,828.29 was for advertising. Charges are practically complete.

TUG MURRAY STEWART

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries invited tenders for repairs to the tug Murray Stewart, owned by the Dominion government?
2. If so, what date has been set for closing such tenders?
3. If the date for receiving tenders has expired, what are the names of the parties tendering and the amount of their respective tenders?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. February 8, 1923.
3. P. Payette Co., Penetanguishene, Ont., $4,489; Midland Shipbuilding Co. Ltd., Midland, Ont., $5,862; The Great Lakes Foundry & Machine Co., Midland, Ont., $6,077; Midland Engine Works, Midland, Ont., $8,607.45.

SYDENHAM HOSPITAL SITE

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. Has the government decided to convert Sydenham Hospital site, Kingston, into military headquarters or barracks?
2. If so, what will be the probable cost of such change?

Hon. Mr. COPP: (For the Minister of National Defence): This matter is under consideration, but no decision has so far been arrived at.

[Mr. Baxter.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

MILITIA AND DEFENCE PAYMENTS

Mr. BOYS:

1. What expenses, payments or disbursements of any kind have been made since 1st April, 1922, out of other moneys than those included in the amounts voted by Parliament for the Department of Militia and Defence in respect of items or charges paid in the fiscal year 1920-21 out of moneys voted for the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. Under what authority were such moneys so paid from other votes, and why was the change made?
3. Were objections offered by the Department of the Auditor General to payments being so made or to other attempts to make similar payments? If so, in what cases?

CIVIL SERVICE—RETURNED SOLDIERS

Mr. McKILLOP:

1. How many appointments to the Civil Service were made during the year 1922?
2. How many appointments of the Civil Service Commission for the said year were given to returned soldiers?
3. How many appointments to the Civil Service during the year 1922 were made through other sources than the Civil Service Commission?

OLEOMARGARINE AND BUTTER

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Does the supervision over the manufacture of oleomargarine, the inspection and analysis thereof appertain to that branch of the Department of Health relating to pure food for the people, or to that branch of the Department of Agriculture relating to the health of animals?
2. What firms, corporations or individuals have been granted licenses under the Oleomargarine Act of 1922 to re-work and adulterate butter by incorporating therewith baser and cheaper materials?
3. Are the manufacturers of butter allowed to adulterate the same by adding thereto baser or cheaper ingredients?
4. What quantity of oleomargarine was manufactured in Canada during the past fiscal year?
5. What quantity of butter has been re-worked and incorporated into the oleomargarine manufactured in Canada during the period referred to?
6. Is it compulsory to show on the wrapper or label attached, the ingredients contained in oleomargarine, manufactured in or imported into Canada?
7. Is it compulsory to show on the wrapper or label attached, all oleomargarine manufactured wholly from vegetable oils, or which contain no butter?
8. What quantity and to what countries have butter been exported from Canada during the past fiscal year?
9. What quantity and from what countries have butter been imported into Canada during the past year?
10. What rate of duty has been collected on the butter imported into Canada from whence it came?
11. What amount of duty has been collected on the butter imported into Canada during the past year?
12. What rate of duty is collected on salt imported for use in the manufacture of oleomargarine?
13. What rate of duty is collected on salt imported for use in the manufacture of butter or cheese?
14. What is the duty on milking machines and what amount of duty was collected on such imports during the past year?

JOINT PEAT COMMITTEE

Mr. IRVINE:

1. On what date and by what authority was the Joint Peat Committee appointed?
2. What are the names, addresses and previous occupations of the several members of the committee?
3. What was the total amount of money expended by the Joint Peat Committee to date, including grand total, also total spent each year?
4. Does the committee owe any moneys for goods supplied, property purchased, or services rendered? If so, how much, and for what?
5. What was the total amount of moneys expended by the Mines Branch, Department of Mines, upon experimental work at the Alfred peat bog, prior to the appointment of said Joint Peat Committee?
6. What estimated number of days were expended by each and sundry members of the Mines Branch upon work to aid the operators of the said Joint Peat Committee, the value of which time has not been charged up to or paid for by the said committee?
7. Is it the intention of the government to continue the operations of the Joint Peat Committee?
8. What precautions have been taken by the government to ensure the compilation of a full and complete technical report of the work attempted, the failures made, and the work accomplished?
9. What was the quantity of merchantable peat fuel manufactured and sold during 1922?
10. At what price was this peat fuel sold f.o.b. cars Alfred, and at what price did the Joint Peat Committee permit this peat fuel to be retailed in the city of Ottawa?
11. Where were the offices of the Joint Peat Committee located?
12. What are the names of salaried officers, their residential addresses, and what amounts were paid to each of them each year, for salaries and expenses?
13. Have any of the salaried officials applied for patents for improvements in the manufacture of peat fuel or in the machinery required in said manufacture?
14. If so, when and in whose name were such applications for patent made?

LIGNITE UTILIZATION BOARD

Mr. IRVINE:

1. On what date and by what authority was the Lignite Utilization Board of Canada appointed?
2. What are the names, addresses and previous occupations of the several members of the said board?
3. What was the total amount of money expended by the said board to date, also the amounts expended during each of the several years since appointment?
4. Does the said board owe any money for goods, machinery or other materials supplied, goods, machinery or other materials ordered but not yet supplied, property purchased or agreed to be purchased, or services rendered or under contract?
5. If so, how much and what are the details?
6. What was the quantity, in short tons, of briquettes made, and what was the quantity, in short tons, marketed, sold and paid for each year, and at what price f.o.b. Bienfait were the briquettes manufactured, sold in 1922?
7. Have the briquettes produced during the year 1921-1922 been found by consumers to be satisfactory as fuel?
8. Were the members of the board paid for their services or for expenses?
9. If so, what amounts were paid each year, and to whom, under both these headings?
10. What are names of salaried officers employed by said board, length of time employed, salaries paid, previous employment before being engaged by the Board, and salaries received by them in such previous employment?
11. What, if any, monetary obligations were undertaken by the board in excess of or in anticipation of government appropriations?
12. By whose authority were fourteen expensively constructed houses, besides a probably necessary boarding house, erected?
13. What were the reasons for such constructions, in face of the continued failure of the works to make briquettes commercially?
14. Were officials of the government employed, without remuneration from the board, to do work for the said board?
15. If so, what were the names of such officials and what estimated time were they so employed?
16. Is it the intention of the government to continue the operations of the board?

CIVIL SERVANTS—QUEBEC CITY AND DISTRICT

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the names of the civil servants employed in the various government departments who are stationed in the city and district of Quebec?
2. On what dates were they employed?
3. On whose recommendation was each appointment made?
4. What is the nature of their employment and the salary of each?
5. What are the names of those who passed the civil service examinations?

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—QUEBEC CITY AND DISTRICT

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the names of the government employees, temporary or permanent, employed in the city and district of Quebec who have been dismissed between October 15, 1911, and December 25, 1921?
2. What are the names of those dismissed following an inquiry?
3. What are the names of those dismissed without an inquiry?
4. How many of these employees have been reinstated, and on what dates?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MDLLE. ADRIENNE BOULAY

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, reports and memoranda relative to the dismissal of Mdlle. Adrienne Boulay, postmistress at Sayabec, and relative to the appointment of her successor.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR BOARD

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

For a return showing all correspondence, letters, documents, petitions, etc., passed between the government or any member of the government, or officials of the department and persons in Vancouver, B.C., relating to retirement of certain members of the Vancouver Harbour Board and the appointment of successors; also copies of the orders in council appointing members of the Vancouver Harbour Board since its inception; also orders in council that have passed since January 1, 1922, authorizing the expenditure of of moneys by the Harbour Commissioners in harbour improvements.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. R. M. ROMBOUGH

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

For a copy of all correspondence, writings, documents, or other communications passing between the present

Prime Minister or any one on his behalf, and R. M. Rombough since May 1, 1921, on the subject of an investigation or proposed investigation into the Grain Trade.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

MOTION BY MR. GOOD FOR ALTERNATIVE VOTE IN SINGLE-MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

Whereas the special committee on proportional representation appointed at the last session of the last parliament reported in favour of the adoption of the alternative vote method of election in all single member constituencies when more than two candidates were running for election, and also found much merit in the system of true proportional representation;

And whereas the last general election has fully demonstrated the many serious anomalies of the existing electoral system;

And whereas this matter was debated at the last session of the present parliament but did not reach a vote;

And whereas the government has promised to submit a Redistribution bill during the present session;

And whereas it is important that any desirable electoral reforms be adopted in conjunction with Redistribution;

Therefore be it Resolved,—

That in the opinion of this House the alternative vote method should be adopted for use in future elections for this House in all single member constituencies where more than two candidates are running for election.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year when I brought this matter to the attention of the House I included both of the proposals for electoral reform in a single resolution. I think that a mistake was made in so doing, a mistake into which I fell, I presume, because the two questions had both been referred to a committee in the preceding parliament (1921) and were both investigated and reported on by that committee. This year, however, I am submitting the matter in two distinct resolutions. The first proposal was unanimously recommended by the parliamentary committee of 1921, and no objection was raised to it in the course of the debate last year. I take it, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we might dispose of this resolution without further debate, and proceed to the consideration of proportional representation upon which I presume there is a greater difference of opinion.

However, before putting the question I deem it advisable—in view of the fact that there may be some here who were not in the House last year when the matter was discussed and have not read the debate in Hansard—to explain very briefly the meaning of the expression "the alternative vote method". But before doing that let me point out, as I did last year, something of the need for this reform. In the Ontario elections of 1919, out of 111 contests there were 74 three-, four-, or five-cornered contests. In the Dominion elections of 1921 out of 235 contests there were 140 three-, four-, or five-cornered contests. I have not the figures as to the number of three-, four-, or five-cornered contests in the last British elections in 1922, but 178 were elected by a minority vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having thus pointed out very briefly the needs of the situation may I explain three points in connection with the system itself.

First, as to the ballot. The ballot under the new method would be identical with the ballot that we are accustomed to use at the present time. Second, with respect to the duties of the elector. Instead of placing a cross opposite the name of the candidate whom the elector wishes to vote for, the elector places the figure 1 opposite his first choice, the figure 2 opposite his second choice—if he so desires—the figure 3 opposite his third choice, and so on to any extent to which he may desire to go. In case of three candidates running it would be sufficient, of course, for any elector to mark on the ballot paper his first and second choices, to mark them by the figures 1 and 2. In the case of four candidates, he would be invited to place the figures 1, 2 and 3 opposite his first, second and third choices.

In the third place, in respect to the count. The candidate who has the lowest number of votes is declared out of the running, and his votes are distributed among the remaining candidates according to the preferences expressed thereon by the elector. The process is simplicity itself, and the result is that we are quite sure that every candidate who is elected is chosen by a clear majority over all.

Mr. HOCKEN: May I ask whether, in the event of an elector only marking his first choice, that would be a good ballot?

Mr. GOOD: Yes, I intended to mention that point. In answer to the hon. gentleman from West Toronto I may say that if an elector marks nothing on the ballot, of course the ballot is useless; but if the elector marks his first choice, either with the figure 1 or with an X, that ballot is perfectly good and it operates as our ballot does at the present time. But the elector's wishes in that event are impossible to discover in case his first choice comes lowest in the first count, or should be eliminated later in the count. The elector is, therefore, requested to put the figure 1 opposite his first choice, and he is invited, if he has any preferences, to express them on the ballot paper. If he does not choose to exercise the right which he has, then, of course, we cannot help it, he simply does what he does now; but the new method

of voting permits the elector to express his preferences beyond merely voting for one candidate.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that as there was no objection raised to this particular reform last year, and as I have not heard any objection, it is needless to spend further time upon the resolution at present, and we might have the question put.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask whether the government has any policy upon this question?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The motion having been brought forward by a private member and not by the ministry, any member of the government is free to vote as he pleases on the subject. For myself I intend to vote for the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Good). I may say that when this matter was debated last session the Prime Minister expressed his views upon it, giving his assurance of support of the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Motion agreed to.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN MULTI-MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant), moved:

Whereas the special committee on proportional representation appointed at the last session of the last parliament reported in favour of the adoption of the alternative vote method of election in all single member constituencies when more than two candidates were running for election, and also found much merit in the system of true proportional representation

And whereas the last general election has fully demonstrated the many serious anomalies of the existing electoral system;

And whereas this matter was debated at the last session of the present parliament but did not reach a vote;

And whereas the government has promised to submit a redistribution bill during the present session;

And whereas it is important that any desirable electoral reforms be adopted in conjunction with redistribution;

Therefore be it resolved,—

That in the opinion of this House, for the purpose of demonstrating the working and effects of the system of true proportional representation, one or more multi-member constituencies should be constituted by the redistribution legislation in which that system should be applied at the next general election.

He said: May I be permitted for a very few minutes to give a resumé of the case I presented last year, in view of the fact that there may be some members present now who have not read the debates in Hansard and who were not here last year?

I traced last year, first the history of the attention which had been given to this subject by this parliament from the time when the late Hon. Mr. Monk introduced it on the 15th March, 1909, up to the the time at which I spoke, covering a number of cases when this matter was submitted to and debated by this House and action taken thereon. Without mentioning all of the cases which I mentioned last year, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in 1921 a committee was appointed to consider this matter, which committee reported quite late in the session of 1921, too late for anything to be done during that session.

Now, as the House has already adopted the first recommendation of that committee, I wish to deal with the other question presented to it. I pointed out last year that, having adopted the alternative vote method, we would not necessarily get very far towards a true representation, and I instanced a number of cases under the old system which showed how difficult it was either with the voting method we have followed in the past, or with the alternative vote method, to secure a true representation. May I briefly enumerate the cases which I presented to the House last year in that connection? They were: Nova Scotia federal election of 1904; British Columbia federal election of 1911; Dominion federal election of 1896; Manitoba provincial election of 1914; Dominion federal election of 1908; Dominion federal election of 1911; British elections of 1918; Transvaal elections of 1914; Ontario provincial elections of 1919; Alberta election of 1921; New York aldermanic elections of 1921.

I then proceeded to make a somewhat exhaustive analysis of the last Canadian general election and gave a very large number of facts in that connection. Next I pointed out—illustrating this point by referring to the Canadian federal elections of 1908 and 1911—the way in which the pendulum swung from one extreme to another, with a very small change in popular vote; and in that connection I pointed out that in 1911 a majority of 47 representatives could have been wiped out by a change in the popular vote of less than 3,000. So there is a great deal to support the statement that under the old system the result of our elections was pretty much of a political gamble. I pointed out, next, the very remarkable accuracy in representation which occurs under the system of proportional voting, referring in that connection to the Tasmanian elections of 1909, 1912, 1916 and 1919; the Belgian elections of 1908; the Finland elections of 1909; the New South Wales' elec-

tions of 1920; and the Winnipeg elections of 1920.

I dealt next with the growth of the sentiment in favour of proportional representation throughout the world, referring to a number of places and countries which had adopted this newer system of representation. Among these I may again mention the following: New South Wales—and in that connection I may say that Queensland and Victoria have adopted the alternative vote,—Tasmania; New Zealand; South Africa (for the Senate); England (for the university constituencies); Scotland (for the school board); Ireland; India (the alternative vote); some cities in the United States; Switzerland; Belgium; Bulgaria; Sweden; Finland; Norway (optional for municipal elections); Germany; Austria. Moreover Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy and France have adopted half-measures of proportional representation. In addition I pointed out that a number of Canadian cities had adopted this system, among them the following: Winnipeg, Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and so on.

I referred next to the report of the committee appointed by the Ontario legislature about three years ago, which reported two years ago. And lastly I considered a number of advantages and disadvantages, or advantages of and objections, to proportional representation First, I discussed the idea of majority representation as against proportional representation. In the second place I showed the security of tenure of office of outstanding men which is obtained by this better system of representation. Third, I showed that the claim that proportional representation will necessarily lead to small majorities in legislative bodies cannot be substantiated, and I examined a number of cases to prove that point, namely, British Columbia, New South Wales, Australia and New Zealand. I examined, in the fourth place, the charge that proportional representation encourages the formation of groups, and I think I showed pretty conclusively that that charge could not be substantiated. In the fifth place, I pointed out that proportional representation makes impossible or difficult the spoils system. In the sixth place, I examined the allegation that proportional representation is un-British. In the seventh place, I discussed the supposed difficulties of holding by-elections under proportional representation. In the eighth place, I dealt with the alleged difficulty in canvassing large constituencies. In the ninth place, I discussed the effect of proportional representation on the power of a small minority of floating or purchasable voters. And, in the last place, I discussed the question of the difficulty of operating this system in large, sparsely settled areas.

That, Mr. Speaker, in brief, is the case which I presented last year. I want to discuss now just for a very short time one or two objections that were raised last year, and which, owing to the adjournment of the debate, I had not the opportunity of dealing with on that occasion.

I wish to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) last year, which are found in Hansard at pages 1651 and 1652. In answer to a question of mine the hon. member for South Vancouver to-day, spoke as follows:

> Unfortunately I did not hear the hon. member—

Referring to myself.

> But I have had the advantage of reading Lord Bryce's "Modern Democracies" in which that aspect of the question is very ably dealt with.

A little further on, in answer to another question of mine, the hon. member said:

> If the hon. gentleman puts it that way, I may tell him that I heard very little of what he said, and if I had heard it I do not think my view would be changed by the hon. gentleman's argument, having read the words of Lord Bryce and a number of other constitutional authorities for the past fifteen years.

The inference from these remarks is that the late Lord Bryce was opposed to proportional representation. I want simply to point out that Lord Bryce was a vice-president of the British Proportional Representation Society, and I wish to read at this point—

Mr. LADNER: Has the hon. gentleman read through my speech of last year? I do not say that Lord Bryce is an exponent against proportional representation; but I say that he gives such an analysis of the federal systems of government that it is impossible for a person studying those systems to apply in practical politics and statesmanship the principles underlying proportional representation. I do not suppose my hon. friend intends to distort my speech; but that is what he is doing. He is leaving the inference that something which I stated to the House last year is not correct. If my hon. friend will read through my remarks, he will see that in the application of the principle of proportional representation to our federal system, there is a difficulty which he has yet to overcome, and so far, in his speeches of this year and last year, he has not overcome it.

Mr. GOOD: I am very sorry if I misunderstood the hon. member last year. I certainly heard all his address last year, and I think I read it all again this year in Hansard. But it is possible that I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, and I am very glad to

hear him state now that Lord Bryce did not oppose proportional representation. Since the matter was raised last year and since I was afraid that a wrong impression had been given as to Lord Bryce's position, I wished to read some remarks which Lord Bryce made in a debate on the Representation of the People Bill in the House of Lords in England, on 22 January, 1918:

> My noble friend, Lord Harcourt, poured some scorn upon the whole plan of proportional representation as if it was a fad confined to certain persons in this country. It is the fact that over nearly all the free countries at this moment men's minds are very much exercised upon this question of proportional representation. There is hardly any considerable country popularly governed which has not been confronted with the very same difficulty which proportional representation is meant to meet as we are trying to grapple with here. The experiment is being tried in an additional number of countries almost every year. New Zealand has just adopted it. I was in Tasmania a few years ago and I can tell my noble friend Lord Harcourt that the opinion of Tasmania was in favour of the plan which has been adopted, and that I did not hear of any desire to depart from it. The same thing is true about other countries which I will not enumerate. And the reason is this, that conditions have changed. My noble friend quoted the opinion of Lord Beaconsfield, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Bright. It is thirty-eight years since Lord Beaconsfield died. Our politics and our party system have changed completely. We have now got three or four parties and we cannot tell whether the process of dividing up parties, which has gone so far in some countries, may not fall upon us also. Under conditions so different it has surely become desirable to find new expedients for meeting the evils which have arisen. I think these considerations justify my noble friend in the proposal he has made, a proposal which of course is capable of modification, which need not be extended to that amplitude which he indicated, but which can well be adopted in more modest form, and which, I think, in one form or another, well deserves to be tried.

Just in that connection I may say that after investigating this whole question in 1909 and 1910, the British parliament appointed a Speaker's Conference in 1916, which reported in 1917. Lord Bryce was a member of that committee, and I might here refer briefly to the recommendations made by that Speaker's Conference in Great Britain in 1917. They are as follows:

> A parliamentary borough which may be entitled on a basis of population to return three or more members shall be a single constituency; provided that a constituency entitled to return more than five members shall be divided into two or more constituencies, each returning not less than three, nor more than five members. The election in any such constituency shall be held on the principle of proportional representation and each elector shall have one transferable vote.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the recommendation with respect to proportional representation. At the same time, with reference to those constituencies which would not be thus grouped, the conference made this recommendation:

> At any election in a single member constituency where there are more than two candidates, the election shall be held on the system of voting known as the alternative vote.

So I think we may conclude that Lord Bryce was distinctly in favour, not only of the alternative vote, but of proprotional representation, and I do not know of any man who was better qualified to express an opinion on a question of that sort than the late Lord Bryce.

I should like also, to refer to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said in the debate of last year on this subject. His remarks will be found on page 1655 of Hansard. He said:

> In a word, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in entire sympathy with the resolution, and, so far as an individual member has voice in the House, would like to express myself as supporting it as it stands. In this matter, the government would wish to be governed by the opinion of the House, and if the House approves the resolution the government will do all in its power to give effect to it as opportunity affords.

Answering a question asked at that time by the hon. member for Vancouver South, the Prime Minister said:

> I confess that as I study the question more and more, it is my view that instead of adding to the number of groups in the House, the adoption of what is proposed here might tend to limit the groups.

And so on. I should like also to refer, just in passing, to a remark which the Prime Minister made the other day when he was introducing the Redistribution bill. He spoke about the bitterness that was aroused one or two decades ago in connection with the process of gerrymandering. I would suggest that there is no possibility of gerrymandering being effective under proportional representation, and that is a consideration which, I think, we ought to bear in mind.

I have not much more to add at this time. No doubt a good many objections will be raised, and I shall have an opportunity of replying a little later on. But there is some additional information which we have now, which we did not have when this matter was debated last May. I would just briefly call the attention of the House to some of the information which we have received since that time. In the first place, I would point to the adoption of proportional representation in Edmonton on 11th December last by a vote of 5,664 to 3,075. The Edmonton Journal of the next day, December 12, comments on the election as follows:

> Proportional representation was not defeated yesterday in a single polling sub-division and received the approval of the citizens by practically a two to one vote.
>
> It seldom happens that a political reform is so emphatically endorsed when first submitted. Those who have watched its operation elsewhere can have no doubt that it will realize all that is hoped for from it in the improvement of the character of our city government.

I might also quote from the Calgary Herald, which extended greetings to the city of Edmonton in these terms:

By a decided majority Edmonton has voted for the proportional representation system of conducting municipal election. Edmonton is the last of the cities of first class importance in the West to decide to employ that system. Calgary's experience with it has been so satisfactory that we are in no doubt of the success of it in Edmonton and we can indeed congratulate our northern neighbour on joining the cities that have adopted the system which best reproduces the political preferences of the voters.

Next, I would refer to the last British elections. I do not wish to burden the House with all the figures that I have here, but I may give some examples that go to show the extraordinary unfairness of the results in Great Britain last year. The Conservative party won 296 seats. In proportion to its voting strength it should have won only 208. The labour and co-operative forces won 138; they were entitled to 164. The Liberals won 54, although they were entitled to 101; while the National Liberals, who won 51, were entitled to 61. Independents and others won 8 seats, but they were entitled to 13. In this connection, let me quote from the late Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd George:

The result of the elections has fully justified those who maintained that no party standing alone could hope to secure the measure of public support which will guarantee stable government. It is true that the Conservatives have succeeded in obtaining the return of a majority of the members to the new parliament, but the most notable feature of the elections is the return of a decisive majority of members by a very definite minority of electors.

I observe that the Prime Minister, in returning thanks to the nation, claims that he has received a vote of confidence from the people of this country. Out of a total of 15,000,000 his candidates secured fewer than 3,000,000 votes. Making full allowances for uncontested seats, this figure cannot be stretched out to a height much above 6,000,000. That means that only two-fifths of the electorate voted confidence in the administration, while three-fifths voted confidence in other leaders of groups. A minority of 3,000,000 in the national referendum could hardly be claimed as a vote of confidence.

I do not wish to quote all that Mr. Lloyd George says, but towards the end of this extract, I read:

Of one thing I am, however, certain. That is that a minority administration in 1922 and onward will help to discredit the government with certain classes of the community. A minority administration will weaken the respect of other classes for representative government, and between them, an atmosphere will be created inimical to the moral authority of all government in this country.

I therefore earnestly trust that in the interest of stability and good government, which must be based on the good will and co-operation of the community as a whole, this Parliament will apply its mind seriously to finding some means of preventing a repetition, either in one direction or the other, of this freak of representative government.

[Mr. Good.]

Next, I shall refer very briefly to the second trial of proportional representation in the city of Winnipeg last summer. I have here an article that appeared in the August 2 issue of Canadian Finance, a magazine which is not especially given to propagating the Farmers' platform, or the Progressive policy. In the course of this article the writer states:

There are a number of general criticisms against P. R. which should be either admitted or denied by supporters of P. R. They include the following:

(1) P. R. is too complicated. People will refrain from voting under it.

(2) There will be a heavy percentage of spoilt ballots under it.

(3) The counting takes too long.

(4) The voter cannot understand what happens to his vote.

(5) P. R. breaks up the party system and leads to group government.

(6) It is not a perfect system.

(7) It does away with government by the majority or tends to create governments with small majorities.

This article goes on to examine each of these criticisms against proportional representation. Let me read one or two of its answers to these criticisms:

The reply to the statement that people will refrain from voting under P. R. because it is so complicated is effectively given by the recent Winnipeg elections, when 45,000 persons voted out of a total of 61,736 persons entitled to vote, a higher percentage than was usual under the old system, and this despite the fact that the ballot paper contained 43 names and was 22 inches long. The next objection regarding large numbers of spoilt ballots is also shattered by actual facts. In the recent election at Winnipeg spoilt ballots were less than 2 per cent of the total votes, a percentage which compares favourably with the results obtained under the old system. The assertion that P. R. leads to group government is without foundation. Ontario has group government, but they do not have P. R. there. The Dominion government is without a majority in the House—

This, of course, was written last summer—

—but they have no P. R. elections under the Dominion Elections Act. The Farmer party in Manitoba is a minority party at the present time, mainly as a result of the vote in the rural districts, where P. R. is not in force.

I do not wish to weary the House with any further quoting of these answers, but I submit that the various criticisms that have been levelled against proportional representation can all be, and in my judgment, have been, very effectively answered. Of course, one must admit very frankly that it might break down in operation if those who are responsible for counting the ballots do not know how to count them, or if the voters do not take the trouble to read the instructions and to vote according to those instructions. But our experience has shown that these difficulties are no more under this system than the same difficulties under the present system.

4 p.m.

The allegation has been made that proportional representation is un-British. I happened to hear this statement at a meeting of the Social Service Council of Canada a short time ago in the Chateau Laurier, and Mr. Gisborne, who was Parliamentary Counsel for many years, combatted the idea very definitely and emphatically on that occasion. I fancy the evidence which I have already given as to the action being taken in Great Britain, and the fact that the Australasian countries are generally committed to this reform, constitute a pretty effective rejoinder to that criticism. I have here a certified copy of an interview that took place in Saskatoon not long ago. The date of the letter enclosing the certified copy is December 4. I read as follows:

"The proportional representation single transferable vote has undoubtedly proved a great success in Saskatoon," says Mr. M. C. Tomlinson, city clerk. "First it has stimulated greater interest in the election. Last year there was practically 5,000 votes polled, while the highest number at any previous election was 3,000.

Secondly, it was found that there were fewer spoiled ballots under this system than under the old.

Prior to the election last year we heard on all sides that numerous ballots would be spoiled by the voters, chiefly due to the western cities having a large foreign population.

This was not the case. The percentage of rejected ballot papers under the P.R. system was actually lower than was the case with the X-marked ballot, when voters were called upon to mark their ballot papers for more than one candidate. This would lead one to believe that the P.R. system is easier for the elector than the old.

Although this was the city's first election under the P.R. system, the carrying out of the voters' wishes as expressed on the ballots proved to be a very simple process.

The new system has won favour with the city council, the press, and the public. There are a few objectors, of course, but they are very few."

I have here a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the British Proportional Representation Society, Mr. Humphreys, to the secretary of the Canadian society, in which he says in part:

P.R. has never been so much discussed in England as it has since our recent general election.

I do not know that at the present juncture I should say anything further. I should be very glad indeed to hear any further objections that can be made to the proportional representation system, and I shall do my best to meet those objections when my turn comes.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member who proposes this motion has taken a great deal of interest in the subject and is thoroughly informed with regard to it. I wish to put to him a few questions concerning phases of the subject with which he did not deal, at least so far as I could hear him.

The first question is: Does the hon. member not distinguish between municipal government and its operations, on the one hand, and the federal system of government, or government by majority rule and cabinet responsibility, on the other hand? The second question is: Does he consider that the application of proportional representation to our system of government will have the effect of dissipating cabinet unity and cabinet responsibility to the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who proposes the resolution stated in his last sentence that he would like to hear from other hon. members who have objections to offer or suggestions to make regarding the subject matter of his motion. If he speaks now, that will close the debate. I think some other hon. members are desirous of speaking on the resolution; and if that is the case they must do so before the proposer of the motion replies and thus closes the debate.

Mr. GOOD: I shall be pleased to answer the question later or now, whatever is the desire of hon. members.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, while I am heartily in sympathy with the last resolution that we passed regarding the alternative vote, I would like to point out one effect of the present resolution. The mover calls upon the government to constitute one or more multi-membered constituencies. I would suggest that the word "urban" should be put in there; otherwise this is what would happen: The hon. mover of the resolution suggested that a multi-membered constituency might appropriately consist of five ordinary constituencies. In British Columbia that might include the constituencies of Skeena, Cariboo, Comox-Alberni, Yale and, we will say, East Kootenay, constituting, I should say roughly, seventy-five per cent of British Columbia. I do not think that any of the members for the districts I have mentioned would contradict me when I say that to make an ordinary canvass—not from house to house, but by the holding of meetings at which two or three score of people could be got together—six months might reasonably be required in respect of any one of these constituencies. I am quite sure that the members for Cariboo and Skeena will bear me out in that; I myself can speak for Comox-Alberni. Can one conceive of the work that would be imposed on a candidate—especially a new candidate, because he would be unknown—in attempting a personal canvass of five constituencies the size of those represented by the ordinary

country constituency in British Columbia? It cannot be gainsaid that it is desirable and in the public interest that the candidate should endeavour to meet at least a number of the constituents and explain his point of view on the issues before the country at the time, and also that the electors should have an opportunity of seeing the different men who are seeking their support. But how will that be possible with a multi-membered constituency of five seats such as we would have in the country districts of British Columbia? It would take at least two years to canvass such a constituency in that way.

I can see further vast possibilities of trouble after the wretched man had been elected. For myself I would hate to be bracketed with four other members in such a constituency. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that three of those members were not in the habit of paying attention to their correspondence—a failing that we often see in members, at least, until the next election comes round. What would be the fate of the unhappy man who had got the reputation of attending to his business and who had all the correspondence to answer emanating from such a multi-membered constituency? It would not be fair to him, to his colleagues, or to the public. I think the hon. member who moves the resolution has lost sight of that, and in my opinion he should introduce an amendment, if he wishes the motion to pass, providing that such multi-membered constituencies shall be urban in their character.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other hon. member rises now, the mover will close the debate

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the address of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) on the subject of proportional representation. I have heard this subject discussed in the House on two previous occasions, in 1921 and in 1922, and so far as I am concerned I still hold the view that proportional representation is not in the best interests of parliamentary institutions in this country. The hon. member for Brant did not give us any exposition of how true proportional representation might be worked out; nor has any other hon. member done so.

I have before me a pamphlet prepared by the exponents of proportional representation which deals with one or two elections carried out under that system, and which refers particularly to the single transferable vote in multi-membered constituencies. In the election held in the city of Winnipeg in 1920 under the system of proportional representation, labour polled 20,167 votes, or 42.5 per cent of the total vote polled, getting only four seats. The Liberals polled 14,423 votes, or 30.4 per cent of the total vote, giving them four representatives. The Conservatives polled 6,475 votes, or 13.4 of the total, getting two members. The Independents, with 6,362 votes, having 13.4 per cent of the popular vote, received no representation whatever. It is supposed that under this system all parties appealing for the suffrages of the people will get proportional representation, yet in the Winnipeg election, the Independent party received no representation at all, while the Conservatives, with the same amount of popular vote, received two members; the Labour party, having 42 per cent of the total vote, received four representatives, and the Liberal party, with 30 per cent of the total vote, also received four.

Consequently, it will be seen that proportional representation does not quite work out as its advocates say, that is, it does not always give proportional representation to the various parties that are appealing for the suffrages of the people. Proportional representation, if it means anything, means that it will give representation in the House of Commons, or in municipal government, to all the parties that have candidates before the public. It therefore means the breaking up of the party system, and the substitution for it of the group system of government. That is the intention of the principle; it cannot be anything else; and that is how it works out in practice. It is intended to give representation in our government and in municipal affairs to the minorities among the people. It is for that purpose, and for no other purpose. Consequently, its purpose is to disrupt the present condition of affairs, to do away with our democratic system, for democracy means the rule of the majority. It would do away with the rule of the majority, and give a system of rule to minorities and to group government; and we know what group government is. We have one in the province of Ontario at the present time, although it was not put in power under the proportional representation system.

In a pamphlet that has been submitted by the exponents of proportional representation, a copy of which has been handed me by the committee here in Ottawa, I find the result of a municipal vote in the town of Sligo in Ireland, and this is given for the purpose of proving that proportional representation gives proportional representation to the parties that are putting up candidates for election. In that vote, taken in 1919 in the town of Sligo—and I point this out in

view of the claims made that proportional representation gives a better result than any other system—we find that in one of the wards—a small ward was taken so that the vote could be more easily counted to illustrate how the system worked—there were sixteen candidates. Altogether 940 votes were polled, and we find that the eight candidates having the highest number of votes on the first count were, with one exception, the eight candidates who were elected on the twelfth count. There was no change whatever so far as the parties were concerned, but there was a change in that one member of a party was substituted for another. The Sinn Feiners on the first vote had a candidate who came third in their party but who, on the twelfth count, was placed first in their list, and the first Sinn Fein candidate on the first vote was defeated. That was the only change made in the whole twelve counts. Apart from that there was no change whatever between the twelfth count and the first. The advocates of proportional representation say that the system is very easy, that it does not give any more trouble to count the votes than the old system. Yet why the necessity of having twelve different counts when the first count gives the same result?

The other test vote I received from the city of Ottawa, and possibly it was made up by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) himself. It has a number of names of late representatives of parliament, and the name of my hon. friend is also to be found. Whether by accident or intention, we find the same thing works out in this case, and the hon. gentleman has unconsciously given an argument against proportional representation, for on the first count in his test we get exactly the same results that were obtained on the sixth count. Why the need for six counts when the first gives the same result?

The hon. member also said that in this country in 1921, of 140 representatives from constituencies where there were several candidates, seventy-four or seventy-eight were returned as minority candidates. Now I think that same argument will apply to proportional representation. Take the results in the city of Sligo, for instance. There were 940 votes cast in that election under the system of proportional representation, and 105 votes was the quota—that number of votes were required to elect a candidate. I wonder if a man who is elected by 105 votes out of a total of 940 can be called a majority candidate. I think he is a minority candidate, and in that election two candidates were elected who did not receive the quota. They were considerably below the 105 votes necessary to elect them, but they were elected. Surely they were minority candidates. I have no doubt that in that Sligo election the will of the people would have been more effectively expressed, and with the same results probably that obtained on the twelfth count, under the present system of election. Therefore I cannot see how proportional representation, particularly with regard to the single transferable vote is of any use in multi-member constituencies. It might have a different application in a constituency where only one member was to be elected.

With regard to the system itself, as I said before, democracy is based on the principle of majority rule: I think all will agree with that. Proportional representation would do away with that, because it gives you minority rule; it gives representation by minority groups in the House.

Mr. GOOD: Does not the hon. member distinguish between majority rule and majority representation?

Mr. ANDERSON: Majority representation in the House of Commons should be based on the popular vote. The people are supposed to rule in a democracy, and the majority of the voting people should be represented in the House. But proportional representation gives us minority representation. It is intended for one purpose and one purpose only, to give minorities in the country representation in the House. In many instances these minorities are so small as not to be entitled to representation at all.

The hon. member for Brant in his speech last year made this statement:

> The remarks I have ventured to address to the House to-day can make little or no appeal to those who do not believe in democracy.

I think that that statement is scarcely correct. I believe it applies more to proportional representation. I believe that proportional representation will appeal more to the enemies of democracy than to its friends. You will find the people of other countries who have come to Canada and brought with them perhaps some of the ideas of their own country lined up behind proportional representation. I do not mean to say that those who would advocate proportional representation are not in favour of democracy, a great many of them are in favour of democracy even though they support proportional representation; but I say that behind proportional representation you will find all those who are opposed to democracy and would be very pleased to see it destroyed. The hon. member went on to say that there are many in Canada who are not in favour of democracy. I do not know that

there are so many of that type in this country. However, that may be, I do not think there are any hon. members of this House who are opposed to democracy; I would take it that all of us here are in favour of democracy and are working in its best interests notwithstanding the fact that our views on certain questions may not be the same. Therefore taking our democratic institutions all in all I cannot see that proportional representation will, in any way, give a better representation in this House of the will of the people. The will of the people must rule in Canada, and it is upon that will we depend for the maintenance of the present constitution and the proper enforcement of our laws.

Proportional representation, to my mind, will mean an increasing number of groups in parliament, not only in the provinces but in the Dominion, and this will have the result of creating group parliaments. Group parliaments and group representatives cannot be for the best interests of the country, because that state of things inevitably leads to bargaining for position. When you get several groups in the popular chamber they lose sight of the best interests of the country, of the general interests of the state; they look only to the interests of their groups and they will go ahead bargaining with one another in order that they maintain some selfish interest that will apply only to the group with which they are identified, and they will lose sight of the welfare of the country as a whole. I cannot find myself in harmony with the representations made by the hon. member for Brant, and must say that I am strongly opposed to the system of proportional representation.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): The hon. member for Brant has covered the ground so completely in explaining the principle underlying proportional representation, and also in marshalling the facts and authorities bearing upon it, that it would seem as if very little remained for anyone else to do. I would, however, just like to refer to the conditions which prevail in some sections of the country.

Mention has been made of the city of Winnipeg. For some time we have had proportional representation in Winnipeg, both in our provincial and in our municipal affairs, and my judgment would be, in so far as I have talked with considerable numbers of men in all the different parties, that proportional representation has worked well in that city, and to my knowledge there is no movement whatever, in either branch of public life, to return to the old method. There is some little difficulty, perhaps, for those unaccustomed to this method to understand the principle on which it is worked. A great many in reading of the question have been inclined to think that the system of counting is very cumbersome. I quite agree that it requires some patience in order to master the actual counting of the ballots, but so far as the ordinary elector is concerned there is no difficulty whatever; as a matter of fact in our last federal election we had to go to a very considerable amount of trouble in getting the ordinary electors to understand that they had to revert to the older method of marking a cross. Under proportional representation the ordinary elector goes in and simply marks his ballot, one, two, three and so on, in order of preference. So far as voting is concerned, the system is simplicity itself, and it is always a very easy matter to arrange for an expert staff to count the ballots.

I take it that the mover of this resolution has not in mind the extension of this principle to the rural districts, in fact he is not suggesting that it can be immediately put in force in all the urban districts, but he is asking that the principle of proportional representation shall be tried out. How it works is evidenced in a matter aside altogether from party consideration, in the late provincial elections in the city of Winnipeg. There was a very considerable minority of the people who believed in what is known as moderation with regard to temperance matters. Generally speaking this group represented the liquor interests, and personally I had no particular sympathy with the representations of that group, but I have to acknowledge that there were a considerable number of people in all parties who believed that the act in Manitoba ought to be changed. The people holding that belief were able to elect their own representative to voice their particular views on the floor of the legislature. They would have been unable to do so had not this principle of proportional representation been in operation. The principle being in existence, men of all parties who believed strongly in the Moderation party's programme voted for this programme, and then they had their chance to be heard within the legislature. So far as labour is concerned I may say that for a good many years the labour organizations throughout this country, as well as in older countries, have advocated this principle and have very frequently used it in their own elections.

The last speaker has suggested that democracy is based on majority rule. Now, I cannot for the life of me see how democracy is

going to be interfered with or how the majority rule, as far as that goes, is going to be interfered with. I take it that the very principle of democracy is that the people, and all the people, shall have a voice in the government. It seems to me that it is not the underlying principle of democracy that one particular section of people shall rule over other sections. The danger is, or might be, in minority rule; but the fact that there are minorities in this House does not mean that the minorities rule. The fact is that under proportional representation the minorities would have a chance of expressing themselves in the House to some extent in the same proportion as they express themselves outside of it. Surely that is fair. The fact that there are minorities in the House does not mean that the majority does not still rule; it means what we are all in favour of, I take it, that every section of the community has a right to be heard here.

The last speaker also made the statement that group representation cannot be in the interests of the country, that if we had group representation it would simply mean that men would be free to further their own selfish interests and disregard the best interests of the country. It seems to me the hon. member goes too far in making that statement, because it is unproven. If there are in fact various groups outside the House, as I think we must admit, why should not those groups have a chance to be heard inside a House that ought to be representative of all the people? I take it that to-day there are various interests represented in Canada. There are certain western interests, for example,—we have heard it again and again on the floor of this House that there are certain distinctive western interests. There are certain other interests in Canada represented by the people from the Maritime provinces. We have interests representated by the people in this central part of the country. There are interests represented by the people who come from Toronto, and there are very different interests represented by the people who come from Quebec. Surely we approve the principle in this country that it is well worth our while to hear, not merely the representatives from the prairie provinces but also the representatives from the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, not merely the representatives from Toronto, but also the representatives from the province of Quebec. We go on that principle.

Mr. ANDERSON: Does the hon. gentleman not think that the various sections of the country have their views on all questions represented in parliament under our present system?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so. If the hon. gentleman will follow me I think he will see the bearing of my argument. I say we recognize that in the geographical distribution, which we have had for some time, but within each of these constituencies there are also divergent interests, or within each of these areas there are divergent interests that are just as important, and I think considerably greater than those that are caused by mere geographical divisions. We have within any one city certain divisions, for instance, manufacturers, bankers or railway people; we have the smaller business man; we have those generally known as labour people. The interests of these different groups are often by no means identical, or the people themselves do not think they are. As long as we have these divergencies among the people, as long as we have these divergent groups, surely they have a right to be heard. I do not think hon. gentlemen here ought to be afraid of having the minority express viewpoints. It seems to me we obtain the very highest and best results by each man or group speaking out as to what are their essential principles. Otherwise there is more or less autocracy and more or less force exercised by the majority over the minority. I do not know that we ought to be afraid of having the minority express their views, for it would seem to me that if we are going to suppress any particular body of public opinion by in some way refusing it a voice on the floor of the House, we are thereby giving to those who hold that opinion a direct incentive to express their opinion in some other way. As an example, the other day we had a discussion with regard to the trouble amongst the steel workers down in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. A year ago we had trouble among the coal miners in Cape Breton. These people for some reason or other have not been enabled to have their own direct representatives here to express themselves on the floor of this House. It is quite true, there are men who represent the constituency in which they live, they do not represent particularly the interests of the steel or mine workers. If these men cannot express themselves on the floor of this House, then it seems as though they would have to resort to some other method of having their will expressed. It would seem to be in the interest of the country as a whole that they should be able to express themselves, as we have so often said, through constitutional

means. If we deny them the right to express themselves through regular parliamentary agencies, it is inevitable that sooner or later they shall try to express themselves in some other way. So that from that standpoint alone I would suggest that we ought to afford these men every opportunity of expressing themselves through their own representatives here on the floor of this House. As we approach this matter of redistribution, I would like to think that we could settle some of these fundamental principles before we go into committee and thresh out the details. Here we have an opportunity of laying down the principles, and it does seem that we are on the side of thorough-going democracy if we say that it is in the general public interest that suitable machinery be provided. Proportional representation means, simply that machinery should be provided, so that as far as is possible we shall have represented on the floor of this House every considerable body of public opinion in any section of Canada.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I think the best argument in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for Brant has been the complete silence of the members of the government and their failure to express themselves in any way upon this important question because it is an important question. I take for the basis of my remarks the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) given a few days ago, with respect to the resolution regarding the want of confidence vote. The right hon. gentleman at that time—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman cannot quote from a debate which took place during the present session.

Mr. LADNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the position of the government might be implied from the statements that we have heard from time to time, and among them I recollect a contention that at this stage in our procedure or in our constitutional development we should be careful about having any innovations. We were reminded that the British system of government has been built up over a long period of time, step by step, during which period innovations or changes have been carefully thought out and the effect of them upon the system has been weighed before any change has been made. The real point of this debate, in my opinion, centres around the application of proportional representation to our federal system, the British system of government, in which there is cabinet responsibility to the House. That point I have not heard fully dealt with by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) but I would suggest to him that the keystone of our structure of government is the Cabinet, and as an instrument of government its great power is its unity and the joint responsibility of every member for all its decisions to the House of Commons. Once you destroy the effectiveness of co-operation of the different members of the Cabinet, you make it impossible for them to agree upon a common course or policy and lose for them the confidence and the support of the majority of the House; and just as soon as you place the government in that position, just so soon do you make it impossible for any government to continue and make permanent progress in political matters or in policy. Let us take, for example, the tariff question. The Conservative party, as is well known, for years has had a policy of reasonable protection. Of late years we have a new political organization, which commenced with one idea, and most of the members still have that one idea. Some of them have departed to other quarters, but most of them still have the one idea. The Progressive party have as their ultimate goal, free trade; they want free exchange in commodities with all the nations of the world. But take our friends of the Liberal party—what can we say of them? We must say that on this question they have no policy or at least their words and acts do not agree to such an extent that we can come to an intelligent conclusion. Supposing we take the question of horse-racing, in which some hon. gentlemen are interested, and on which I do not think unanimity could be found either in the Cabinet or in any party in this House. Let us say that we had an election under the system of proportional representation, and in that election we had some hon. gentleman, perhaps the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), running as a special candidate in favour of horse-racing, and, on the other hand, we had the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) running especially as an anti-horse-racing candidate. Then we might have another gentleman running as a special candidate for prohibition and another running in the liquor interest. We might have some running as straight Conservatives, some as straight Liberals, and others as Labour candidates. This might go on until, in a constituency, you might have half a dozen or a dozen different candidates, each one basing his appeal to the public on some question of public importance, or some question of class prejudice, or some question involving a special fad in regard to which he is an expert. After the election, perhaps, the House would find itself with eight or ten

different parties, each experts on a fad. A government has to be formed and the question arises—how are you going to combine the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for Victoria under some policy and let them work out a system of government? Unless a cabinet has the support of a majority of the House, it cannot continue in office. Only recently the government have taken the stand that on an adverse vote, they are not in favour of having a special want of confidence vote. They hold that it is consistent with our constitutional form of government that if an adverse vote is recorded against the government on an important question, or on almost any question, they must take that as an indication that the administration has lost the confidence of the House. How can you reconcile that principle of constitutional government with the principle involved in proportional representation, under which all ideas of government responsibility are dissipated?

Let me continue the illustration which I have been giving. You have eight or ten groups in the House and you want to form a cabinet of seventeen men. It is not possible to secure the support of a majority of the House unless you can combine the leaders of several of those groups in a cabinet under some policy. When you do that, problems will arise in this way to confront the Cabinet. For instance, the question will be started under a resolution by some private member who, perhaps, has a political end to serve by moving his resolution. He will raise some question in regard to horse-racing, and immediately the hon. member for Brant, being the champion of horse-racing, is going to say to himself: "Now, shall I do my duty to my country and stand by a general policy of advantage to the country and by the rest of the members of the Cabinet, and thereby commit political suicide; or shall I save myself politically before my constituents so that I may be re-elected by saying: 'I will have nothing to do with this; I will stand on my pledge to the people to have horse-racing, whether this government exists or not.'" In short, when you come to apply proportional representation to municipal government, much may be said in favour of the principle, and for my part I am rather disposed to accept the principle for municipal systems of government; but when you come to apply proportional representation to the British system of government, you necessarily develop a system of group government, and when you endeavour to have cabinet unanimity and responsibility under the British system of government and, on the other hand, you are trying, by the form of your elections, to have in this House diversified groups which it is almost impossible to draw together, you are going to have a complex situation which will not make for strong government, consistency and permanency in policy, and which will not redound to the best interests of Canada. In order to have, in a new and vigorous country like Canada, effective policies that can be carried out over a period of years, you must have strong government and strong men who stand together on principles. You can have that only under the system which has been developed over a period of seven hundred years. Unless you are prepared to change your system of government; unless you are prepared to accept the French system, which is largely a bureaucratic system, a highly centralized system in which all the authority is centred at Paris and in which the ministers themselves in fact share their responsibilities with highly paid officials who can appear in the Chamber of Deputies and speak on public questions on behalf of their ministers, you cannot apply proportional representation. The hon. member for Brant was perfectly right when he cited a number of countries in Europe which have proportional representation; but their system of government is different from ours, and the success of the British system of government has been based upon our cabinet system which is distinctive from any other cabinet in the world. In the United States you have a cabinet in which the responsibility of the ministers is to the President and not to the House of Representatives. They advise the President; they are elected for a given term of years, and you may have an anomalous situation, such as that which arose at the time of making the Treaty of Versailles, where the President of the American Republic went over to Europe to a great international conference, the like of which had never before been heard of, with tremendous responsibility upon his shoulders, where he took along with him men who were eminent in statesmanship in that country and endeavoured to lay before the people of Europe principles which, they intimated, the people of the United States were in favour of, and where they endeavoured to bind the United States to a treaty and to a system of after-war problems which were found, when the matter was referred to the people of the United States, not to be in accord with the popular will. Could that happen under our system of government? Not at all. When our representatives proceeded to Europe in connection with the Treaty of Versailles, the Cabinet would know that they would have to

keep in touch with the members of their party which was in the majority in this House. The members on their part would be in constant communication with various organizations and men of influence in order to sense the trend of public opinion in their constituencies, and just as soon as a big question of international consideration came up, public opinion in each member's constituency would be brought to bear upon him at once. In turn, he would communicate with his minister, and in turn, if you have enough of those communications from members to show the prevailing will of the people, you have an expression of the popular will coming to the government of the country in a fashion which enables that government to act in accordance with the prevailing will of the people. Under our system members of the government, engaged in any international matter or any question of domestic policy, are, through the flexible system of government which we have, constantly in touch with public opinion in a manner which does not exist in France, the United States or Belgium, or in a number of other countries to which the hon. member referred. Therefore, I conclude with this reference, that the real point of the question in this: Will the system of proportional representation not make for group government and for dissipation of cabinet unity, with consequent weakness of policy and lack of progress in this country? Words which I have heard the Prime Minister use are applicable in this case. This is an innovation which is not suitable to our constitution, and those who think well and seriously on this question—and I believe a large majority of the government will take the same view—will not allow this innovation in our form of constitution at the present time.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): I desire to deal only with one phase of the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). But before doing so I might make an observation. I noticed that when the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ladner) referred, by way of comparison, to the possible situation that might exist where the hon. member for Brant might be appealing as a direct representative of the racing interests, the remark seemed to occasion a little merriment. However, I read in a recent issue of the Canadian Sportsman that a famous Canadian racehorse, known as Canada's Iron Horse, has won 29 races in the past season and has a couple of brothers and sisters that give promise of equal development; and these horses are owned and developed by the well-known J. J. Morrison, secretary of the United Farmers of Ontario. In the light of this, I can understand that it is within the bounds of possibility that some time in the future that gentleman's faithful follower, the member for Brant, might be appealing on such a platform. In reference to the present question, however, I am in sympathy with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). It seems to me that we should consider just how it would affect the particular district with which each of us is most familiar. This resolution calls for the constitution of one or more multi-member constituencies for the purpose of experimentation at the next general election, and I can consider it only in view of the possibility that one of these multi-member constituencies might be in my own district, where I am sure that ninety per cent of the people—I can safely speak for that percentage—would be absolutely opposed to this system being tried in that district and their being represented by perhaps five members. As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni pointed out, it would be impossible for candidates under such circumstances to conduct their election campaign, and almost impossible, after election, to represent the people. While, therefore, this system may have some merit in theory, I am very much afraid that it would be impracticable in operation, and were I to support the resolution as it stands I should simply be voting to impose upon the people of some other district a condition which I should not be willing to have applied to my own. I think, therefore, that it is the duty of this House to oppose the resolution in its present form.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): There seems to be some diffidence on the part of hon. members about discussing this very important question. I do not know the explanation; possibly there is one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same old one.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I wonder whether there is some tacit understanding between the members to my left and the members on the other side of the House, that this resolution shall go through. I have heard that the members on the other side are all very busy trying to figure out how they can secure safe seats for themselves and for others who may be expected to support them in the next house. There seems to be an air of mystery pervading these premises which I suppose is reflected in the condition we find here to-day. Now, on an important question like this, it seems to me, we might very well expect to hear a declaration of policy not only from the government, but from its supporters.

Mr. BROWN: And also the opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the fifth member of the opposition to speak.

Mr. McQUARRIE: And also from the Progressives. I have been comparing the present resolution with the one which has just passed and I find there is a marked difference between them. In the one which was passed there was set out a positive declaration of the House as to what should occur in single-member constituencies, if I may put it that way. The present resolution seems to be an experimental one. Now, the hon. member who moved the resolution advanced a very strong argument for proportional representation. Well, if proportional representation is a good thing and if the government, as they imply by their silence, are in favour of it, then why do we not pass a resolution advocating proportional representation as a policy? Why should we consider a resolution such as this, the effect of which is very problematical to say the least? Why is it necessary to have a hesitation policy, so to speak? Why is it necessary to move a resolution which might mean something or might mean nothing, and which would leave the door open for manipulation at will? We have had in this parliament several very marked examples of change of policy on the part of the government, notably in reference to the budget of last year. I suppose the reason why this resolution is framed in such un-

5 p.m. certain terms is because the mover thought that in that way it would appeal more strongly to the government and he might get them to consent to it, whereas if it were in more definite terms he would not. What would be the result if this resolution passed? It would simply mean that the government could pick out some district where they thought the experiment would work advantageously to them and adversely to their opponents, and put it into force. It is very unsatisfactory to leave the matter in that way, for the government could apply proportional representation in a particular district and leave all the other districts to be dealt with under the old system. If we are to have proportional representation at all, why not have it all over the country? If it is a good thing why not let us have it generally? Why is not the government strong enough to initiate a policy that means something, and stand by it? The hon. member who moved the resolution said something about the western cities, and he read an extract from an Edmonton newspaper which indicated that Edmonton had at last adopted proportional representation and that, in doing so, it had come into line with the other western cities. I am quite aware that hon. members from the prairies seem to think that the prairie provinces constitute the whole of the West.

Mr. McMASTER: No, no.

Mr. McQUARRIE: They overlook British Columbia, which is the real West. In this particular instance, as in a great many others, British Columbia has been a little bit in advance of the other parts of this country, and more particularly of the prairies. We have tried out proportional representation in a great many places. We had it in my own city of New Westminster; we had it in Nelson, in Victoria, in North Vancouver and elsewhere, but in all these places, after a short trial, it was decided that proportional representation was nothing but a fad; that it was unworkable and unsatisfactory, and therefore it was discarded. So far as I am aware the only city in British Columbia that now has proportional representation is Vancouver. They tried it again there this year, and I believe they found it very unsatisfactory; at least, so I would judge from the newspaper comments and from public statements in regard to the matter. I think I am safe in saying that proportional representation will be discarded in Vancouver before the next election. That is the way the system has worked out in the municipal politics of British Columbia. We do not like it; no matter what side of politics we are on, we are opposed to it, and we have got rid of it. If this parliament decides to bring in proportional representation I am sure that in a few years they will decide that it is a fad, that it is unworkable and unsatisfactory, and will wish to discard it.

One point involved in this resolution that I would like to touch upon is the constitution of one or more multi-member constituencies. We in British Columbia have tried that, too. In connection with provincial elections there have been some multi-membered constituencies, but there is a strong agitation at present to have that arrangement done away with because it is found in practice to be very unsatisfactory. Why should one man have the right to vote for five members while another has the right to vote for only one? And why should there be five members sitting for one constituency while other constituencies have only one representative? Personally I am opposed to this resolution. In the first place I am opposed to proportional representation, and in the next place I am opposed

to the motion, because I fear there is some subterfuge in it. In any case, it is a very uncertain quantity, and I don't know how the government would proceed to work out the problem if the resolution were adopted.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): We have heard some arguments advanced against this resolution—at least what purported to be arguments; if hon. members have any real ones to offer I wish they would let us have them. Many attempts have been made to set up men of straw and then to knock them down. It has been suggested that the government in this case might, for instance, establish one or two multi-membered constituencies where the advantage would be particularly to themselves. I might remind the hon. member who has advanced that argument that the matter would not be left in the hands of the government; in fact, the government has already declared that the details of redistribution are to be dealt with by a committee of the House. I know that governments in the past have done some very strange things in the way of gerrymandering constituencies. It was done as far back as the election of 1882, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. McMASTER: The time of Macdonald.

Mr. BROWN: But as time went on it was recognized that though the people of Canada would stand for much, there was a limit to what they would put up with, so later a different system was adopted in connection with redistribution. While I say I can understand governments doing much in that direction, I can scarcely understand the present government singling out, for instance, Toronto, and naming that as one of the multi-membered constituencies, and neglecting to put Montreal in the same class. Public opinion simply would not stand for any such demonstration of partisanship as that. Surely, therefore, the hon. member is setting up a man of straw when he even suggests such a possibility.

Another hon. member tried to raise a point against the resolution by attempting to discern some difference between the resolution in favour of the preferential ballot and the one which declares for proportional representation. I submit that both are explicit and definite. The first one declares definitely in favour of the preferential ballot in single-member constituencies, plainly indicating that in no person's mind is there the thought that at present there shall not be or will not be a large number of single-member constituencies. The second declares that it is advisable that parliament should name a number of multi-membered constituencies in which the principle of proportional representation might be tried. That is objected to by one hon. member as experimental. To a certain extent it may be experimental, and it is proposed that the experiment be tried in those places where the system will be given the greater opportunity of demonstrating its success. It has been demonstrated in the provincial elections in Winnipeg that proportional representation is a success. The member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has declared what is well known to every person in Manitoba, that there is practically no opposition in Winnipeg to the application of that principle in provincial elections. An hon. member of the opposition, who seemed to constitute the only opposition to the resolution, made reference to the case of Winnipeg, and if I understood his argument it was that proportional reprsentation did not bring about the results it was intended to accomplish; that a certain number of votes went to independents who were not able to elect a candidate. It must be admitted, Sir, that a real independent is somewhat handicapped in proportional representation unless he represents a great cause or has outstanding personality But it is making a false argument to lump all the independents together and say that they constitute one party. We have independent men, but the name "independent party" is paradoxical; therefore the hon. member's argument in that respect has no force whatever.

I wish now to deal with the argument that proportional representation does not fit in with the British constitution, as advanced by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner). He made the same argument last year, in substantiation of which he referred to Lord Bryce. Most hon. members at the time got the impression that he was referring to Lord Bryce as one who was opposed to proportional representation. He has now corrected that impression, but I do not see that it affects his argument. He admits that Lord Bryce is a great authority on constitutional government. He admits, on the other hand, that Lord Bryce is in favour of proportional representation, as has been abundantly proven by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), who has cited a number of quotations. Therefore, in the mind of a great constitutional authority like Lord Bryce, there is no inconsistency between constitutional government and proportional representation, and if the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), sees any inconsistency between these two positions, it is up to him to demonstate it a little more clearly than has been done up to the present time.

What do we want, first of all, in an electoral system? We want a principle that will secure in the highest degree possible a fair expression of the mind of the people. We must all admit that the system we have followed all these years has served fairly well to achieve that purpose, but we are all compelled to admit that it has had many defects. It can be shown that this House or any other elective house has not altogether always been representative of the will of the people in proportion to the way in which they expressed their will at the polls. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that on one occasion in the United States the President was elected by an actual minority of the votes that were cast. When new systems are proposed I have found that there has been a tendency on the part of men opposed to those systems to hunt up all the objections they can find, and think that they have proved their case when they show that the new system is not perfect. So far as the preferential ballot is concerned, I admit that it is not perfect; but I do contend that it gets us a little nearer the result we want to obtain than did the old system, and so also in regard to proportional representation. We may find difficulties and what seem to be anomalies, but what we will find—and I think this has been demonstrated in more places than one but particularly in the city of Winnipeg, with which I am most familiar,—is that wherever there is any considerable minority of opinion, that considerable minority—not all minorities, but any considerable minority—will be able to secure representation.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): We have in this House a certain touchstone whereby we may prove, or tend to make up our minds, whether a thing is really progressive, really in line of advance, and that is the effect which it will have on the Conservative representation from British Columbia. If a proposal in this House meets with the unqualified opposition of the gentlemen of that once great and ancient party in this House who come from the sea of mountains, from the western Pacific province, we know that we must be right. I would beg to point out the change that has taken place in the mentality of the Conservatice party within the last few years. There was from the province of Quebec years ago a great Conservative leader, now dead, by the name of F. D. Monk. He was one of the most fervent advocates and hot-gospellers for this principle and this mode of election known as proportional representation, and do we see in the sliding back from his teaching of the Conservative party that they have become more reactionary in the present than they were in the past? It is to be hoped not.

Mr. STANSELL: Would the hon. member say what progress is denoted when he finds himself opposed entirely by the members on his own side of the House?

Mr. McMASTER: That is a question which I will answer by saying I do not think I am called upon to reply.

A discussion of this sort as a rule, Mr. Speaker, tends to show how inadequately the opponents of this system have grasped its real meaning and effect. Proportional representation proposes that instead of the present principle of single-seated constituencies, we should have constituencies electing at least three, and preferably five members; sometimes more, but I think five is the best number for the proper working out of the system. It does not, as the member for one of the Vancouvers seems to think, give a man the right to vote for four or five candidates, but it does give the voter, be he man or woman, the chance to express as many preferences as there are candidates. He expresses his first preference by putting the figure 1 in front of the candidate whom he wishes to see elected above all others. He puts the figure 2 before the candidate to whom he wishes his vote to be transferred in either of two cases; first, in the case of his first choice having so many votes as to make his vote unnecessary, or secondly, in the event of his first choice having so few votes as to make his vote useless. That is the principle, and I think it is an excellent one. Let me ask this question, and I would direct it in all courtesy and politeness to the party seated angularly opposite to myself: Do they think that a system the result of which has been that the Conservatives of Nova Scotia are unrepresented in this House, is a proper system? No answer. Silence does not in this instance indicate consent. I am sure that with me they consider that the Nova Scotia Conservatives, being only less intelligent or almost as intelligent as the Nova Scotia Liberals, should be represented in this House in proportion to their number. Do they believe that a system which has brought it about that the whole of the Conservatives who dwell in the province of Quebec should not have a voice here to represent them is a proper system? I do not believe they can think that it is a proper system.

What is a proper system for a democratic assembly? Is it not, as Mr. Asquith has said, that there should not be a substantial strain of public opinion unrepresented in this House

of Commons? I think we shall all agree upon that. Is not this proportional representation system a good way in which to get such a proportional representation of public opinion? I have not had the privilege of listening to all the arguments or assertions which have been made against proportional representation. It has been suggested that the government may have some nefarious scheme up their sleeve which they may use to put proportional representation in practice in some part of the country where it will turn to their advantage, and not to put it in practice where it would be to their disadvantage. I think that argument or assertion has been dealt with very well by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), and it is unnecessary for me to speak more upon it.

I think that in this age of the world's history we have to be prepared to make experiments. When Simon de Montfort called the knights from the shires and the burgesses from the boroughs to the Commons of England, I suppose that was an innovation. They had not had it before. They had only had the great nobles called to give their advice to the King. We have got to make innovations unless we are prepared to stand in a position of immovability; and I do not think that even my hon. friends from British Columbia—following a political faith with which I am not in sympathy,—desire that.

I have little to add to the discussion. The present situation appears to me to be one which does not appeal to logical or righteous minds, it does not give us proper representation of the thought and the political sympathies of the people; therefore, we should strive to find out something that will.

I have heard this argument advanced as against proportional representation: They say that if you have proportional representation you will get too close a correspondence between the numbers of men in the House of different political faiths and the number of people in the country, that the differences in number between different groups which go to make up the electorate are so close that you will get in the House parties too evenly balanced. I have heard that argument used, and the logical deduction to be made from that view is, that you require some disturbing factor so that majorities or minorities will be increased or decreased extravagantly. Now you might have, and it has happened from time to time under the present system, a majority when, as a matter of fact, you should get a minority.

I quoted this case in the debate on this question last year. I think it was in 1886 that Mr. Gladstone went to the people on the Home Rule bill and he was beaten and, as far as the membership of the House of Commons was concerned, badly beaten. It is a question whether, if he had only won on that occasion, the last fifty years of strife in Ireland might not have been avoided. But that is a side issue. The point I want to make is that in the election of 1886 Mr. Gladstone was supported by the majority of the people and on a proper counting of the votes, or had there been in operation such a system of proportional representation as we should aim for—I do not see that it is a possibility at the present time in Canada in view of geographical conditions—had there been a truer representation of the different proportions into which public opinion divided the English people, Gladstone would have been elected and not defeated.

Now to think that democracy is properly represented when you have elections under a system which gives you a majority of the members from a minority of the electorate is, of course, too absurd for further argument. I would commend this resolution to the House. I think it is a reasonable suggestion that the matter should be tried out. It should be tried out in several of the large cities. I would suggest that it might be possible to divide the great island of Montreal into three constituencies electing five members each; that the great city of Toronto might be divided into two constituencies electing five members each; and that the experiment be tried in some other great city. I do not recall what representation Winnipeg is entitled to in the federal arena but suppose she is entitled to five. That city for federal purposes might form one great electoral division. Then it could not be said that the proposal was brought forward for political purposes or for getting party advantage. The three great parts of the country would have the opportunity of learning about this system and of trying it out. I commend, in all seriousness, this resolution to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): I rise to oppose the resolution of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). I come from the city of Winnipeg where this proportional representation scheme has been tested, and it may be of interest to the House to consider some of the aspects of that election there. At the last election in Winnipeg there were 43 candidates, and the ballot looked like the Greek alphabet or a circus poster. Those men represented all kinds of ideas. To the average voter the real issue was clouded, and disappeared. One of the candidates, who secured

the highest vote there, ran as candidate of the Moderation League. He got an eccentric vote. The same thing held with a great many of the other candidates.

Now then what do we get under the system? You have an election and you have your candidates. These candidates are elected, one man probably because of his personal popularity. He belongs to a large number of clubs and so on; he is a good fellow; his friends mark him number 1. They forget the issue he is standing on, and you have coming to the House a man without any clear cut ideas upon the paramount issues, but elected because of his personal popularity. The man has entirely taken the place of either his party or the main issues. Now that is not a mere idea, it is an actual fact. A voter says "I will vote for Brown, I am not sure of his policy but I like Brown himself". He forgets altogether the real issue, and so in an election of that kind the paramount issues are ignored.

Now another matter comes up in connection with this question. Take the man who gets the highest vote. The man next to him may be some 80 or 90 ballots below on the first vote. The man at the bottom goes out. His second-choice votes are given for the third man. The third man with a majority of number 1 votes and number 2 votes is elected over the man who has the largest number of first choices. It works out very much like things do in the case of an elocution contest. After the competition the judges go out and decide —one judge for A, another for B, and the third for C. They all agree that B is the second man, none of them can agree upon the first man, and B who is not the first choice of any of the judges gets the prize. You will have men coming to this House under this system which I submit is not consonant with the party system of government, who were elected not upon the main issue but upon eccentric and freak ideas.

Mr. IRVINE: Is it not the case in the practice of proportional representation that the low man drops out first where a decision has not been reached and of course has not been given?

Mr. McMURRAY: That is what I say precisely. The low man drops out first. His majority of votes, his number 2 votes, will be given probably for the third candidate, and he is elected upon a majority of number 2 votes and number 1 votes beating the man who had number 1 votes ahead of him.

Mr. IRVINE: How then do you manage to elect B by your illustration?

Mr. McMURRAY: C is elected by my illustration.

Mr. IRVINE: You elected B a minute ago.

Mr. McMURRAY: C is the man elected, but he has not as many—

Mr. STEVENS: May I interject a question? I think this point ought to be made clear as it is one of the most important in the whole matter: Before you distribute the low man's seconds do you not distribute first the excess over the quota of the high man?

Mr. McMURRAY: I do not follow you.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not wish to interrupt the speech of my hon. friend, I am wholly in sympathy with his view. I am not putting this forward with any idea of embarrassing my hon. friend, although the hon. members to my left hate to hear intelligent argument interjected into this question. One of the objections to this proposition in my estimation is the very point I am raising, and I should like my hon. friend in making his argument, which he has been doing very justly and fairly, to include this point: in the distribution of the votes, supposing A secured a larger number of votes than was necessary—

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I understand by the rules of this House one member has not the right to question another, and I do not think one member has the right to endeavour to coach another.

Mr. STEVENS: I am asking my hon. friend a question, and if the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who said a moment ago that he took his lead from the Conservative party, will follow that advice now, he will be well advised. In case A, or the man receiving the highest number of votes, had 50 votes above the quota necessary to elect him; then the 50 votes are distributed amongst the others before the low man drops out.

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: And that is done arbitrarily.

Mr. McMURRAY: The point I am making is that the second vote should not have the same value as the first vote. The second vote is a rambling vote. A man casts his vote. If he is a sane voter he will vote for the main issue, but his second vote is one thrown anywhere, and should not have the same value. It has not the real value which the first vote has.

Mr. IRVINE: Is it not the case that there are no bad votes in proportional representation? Does the hon. gentleman not mean choices instead of votes?

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes, choices.

Mr. IRVINE: One choice is as good as another then.

Mr. McMURRAY: I fail to comprehend the distinction my hon. friend is trying to draw.

Mr. IRVINE: I notice that.

Mr. McMURRAY: That being the case we are bringing to the House of Commons a group of men who have been elected on issues that are not real paramount issues submitted to the electors. There is that great danger in proportional representation. The second point is that it is not consonant with our form of party government. You will find you will have a group of men, out of control of all kind, eccentric men, and in fact looking over the list of candidates it will be seen that that is so.

Mr. HOEY: Will the hon. gentleman contend that candidates in the city of Winnipeg are inferior intellectually or in any other way to the candidates returned by the rural districts?

Mr. McMURRAY: They are not, in the federal House; I will admit that, but comparisons are always odious. What I mean is that they are men with eccentric ideas, men with ideas that are hobbies with them, and very often men with these ideas are men of marked intelligence and good character, but the point I am making is that the man with a hobby will be elected to a seat in parliament.

Mr. BROWN: Might I ask another question?

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, the hon. gentleman who has the floor can always allow a colleague in the House to interrupt and ask a question, but for the decorum of the debate there should not be a volley of interruptions, because the value of the argument suffers thereby when it is in print. A speaker should be allowed, as far as possible, to present his case to the House without interruption. I do not say a question is not allowed. It is generally allowed, but that this debate may be intelligible, I think it is better that every member should be allowed to present his own statement in as connected a way as possible.

Mr. McMURRAY: I have no objection to answering the question if I can. That strikes me as the main objection to proportional representation, as it worked out in the city of Winnipeg, and as I saw it personally. Furthermore, it is absolutely opposed to the party system. There is no control over the candidates. My hon. friends of the Progressive party may say it is a good thing, but under the party form of government it would not be workable. We would have ambitious men who have not the sanction of the party crowding themselves into the position of candidates. For these reasons, I am opposed to the resolution.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): We have had a debate lasting almost an entire afternoon on a question that affects the whole Dominion, that affects vitally the principle of representation in this federal parliament, a question that has been the subject of discussion within and without parliament for years. The decision of the House on this resolution constitutes thereon the mandate of the House of Commons of this country. We have had various speeches in support of it from the party in parliament which openly and frankly favours the principle of proportional representation. We have had four or five speakers against it from the Liberal-Conservative party, and we have no expression of opinion from the government as to whether they favour or whether they oppose it, as to whether they have in mind an amendment; not one of them has told us what their policy is, or whether they have a policy at all. I venture to say that never before in the history of our parliament—at least never before this government came into office,—has a parallel to such a thing been found. The government is silent, impotent, bloodless, without information, without judgment on the question. It is apparently allowing the matter to run at large, not only giving no heed to it in parliament, but giving no intimation as to where it stands.

I am prepared to admit that there may be questions propounded by a private member in respect of which it is not the duty of government to lead parliament, not the duty of government first to state its position. Government in respect of all questions has ample opportunity in advance to review these questions and to prepare to assume the function that belongs to an administration. There may be some questions in respect to which it does not need to take any special view, a question for example that is local in its application, a question that does not go to the

root of any dominion method of electing parliament, a question that is not Dominion-wide. In respect to such a matter as that it may be quite competent for the administration—and I suggest that the fewer of those the government admits the better—to leave as one at large, and to say, as the hon. leader of the House to-day said in respect to the last resolution: "Some members of the government may vote one way and some another, and some supporters of the government may vote one way and some another." But I do think that when a subject of the magnitude of proportional representation comes up, going to the very root of the whole electoral system of this country, it is the duty of the government to take a stand and say what attitude it takes with regard to a resolution which decides that question. If this were merely a resolution to appoint a committee to review the subject, that would be entirely different. Then the time for the government to take its stand would be when the issue may come before parliament after the report of that committee. But when this resolution is decided, there is the mandate of this parliament; there is decision, the stand this parliament takes, and we are asked now to go to a vote upon this question without any word from the government at all. Such a course does not indicate very much strength or self-reliance on the part of the administration.

It is true that in the Liberal platform which was passed in August, 1919, a platform they do not like to be reminded of any oftener than cannot be avoided, the Liberal party committed itself to the principle of proportional representation. If we are to assume that such action constitutes the government's position, please let us be told so, and then the government can thereafter take refuge in silence. But because a pledge on this subject appears in the record of that convention, I always take such fact as a presumption that now the government is on the other side. The presumption is that way. Of course such presumption is capable of rebuttal; the government has it within its power to say: "On this, for an exception, we are in the position we were in at the 1919 convention." But until it does that, the presumption is that the government is to-day precisely the other way. At all events, the resolution passed in 1919 said only that the Liberal party favoured the "principle" of proportional representation. Another presumption therefore which we would be quite justified in drawing from the experience of the last two years would be that while they, the government, favoured the principle, it was utterly opposed to the practice. That is precisely where they stand on the question of free trade. They favour the principle of it; they love it as an ideal; but as a matter of practice they are in direct antagonism to it. Consequently, there is no reason for drawing a conclusion that because there is a statement of principle here, the government either favours that principle to-day, or if it favours it, favours its being put into actual effect.

On motions of this kind, motions of a nation-wide character and effect such as this, it is the duty of the government to state its position, and really it is not incumbent upon the opposition in parliament to take a stand as an opposition until the government has first taken its stand as a government. Such has invariably been the attitude—nor did I ever criticise it—of hon. gentlemen opposite when they sat in the opposition in this House, and as a member and as a leader of a government, I took no exception at any time to that attitude. Nor did we ever shrink from stating our position when the time came, when there was before parliament something, the decision on which was to constitute the mandate of this House. Such a course, however, is in keeping with the quality of spirit and courage shown by the administration since it came into power.

But without waiting for the government's view, I do not refuse to state my own. I am opposed to the resolution. I find myself in substantial accord with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). Whether he takes this as a compliment or not, I find myself pretty much in accord with the arguments he advances in defence of his position.

Hon. gentlemen to my left seem to feel that it is a matter of revelry, if anything in the way way of a contention is advanced against proportional representation. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) stood in his majesty in this House and declared that he always knew the pathway of progress as soon as he knew which way the opposition in this House was tending; he knew that the opposite would be the road of progress, and I am sorry to have to say, because I do not think this was worthy of hon. gentlemen to my left, they received that absurd statement with considerable applause. Let me trace back for a few years the legislative record of this parliament, and I venture to think that hon. gentlemen who applauded the statement of the member for Brome will attribute their momentary applause to the influence of hereditary Liberal associations rather than to the sway of reason. What have been the main questions before

this parliament in recent years? What have been the big new problems with which this parliament has been confronted? What have been the attitudes, the positions of the parties in relation thereto? One of the big problems was the question of the nationalization of our railways. That was forced upon this House by anterior policies that, I venture to suggest, even the hon. member for Brome will not stand and say were distinguished by sane much less by progressive attributes.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the right hon. gentleman making a virtue out of necessity?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The necessity was there and we made out of it a virtue. I am afraid if hon. gentlemen opposite meant what they said and had been in power, they would have made out of it a disaster. The nationalization of our railways was a policy which we initiated prior to 1917, that we carried to advanced stages after 1917, with the co-operation of the group to my left, with the co-operation of their late leader, not only with his co-operation, but with his enthusiastic support. That support he consistently continued on every platform in this Dominion. I want to know where were hon. gentlemen opposite on that question. They were fighting us day and night in parliament, standing and blocking the road, and they stood and blocked the road in every constituency in this country where they thought the road was blockable in the contest from which we emerged a year ago. Keep in mind the subject of our railway policy, the biggest one we have really decided in the last ten years, and I want to know the opinion of hon. members to my left as to which party was on the side of the progress there. I listen for their verdict. At all events, the laughter has subsided.

Another matter that constituted a considerable change, many thought a radical change, was made in recent years. The franchise of this country was expanded 100 per cent by the admission of women. That was done by what is known as Union government, supported by a parliament elected to support Union government. That course was not opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite as a party. But in this parliament all the opposition it encountered was from the Liberal party. And that opposition was not inconsiderable; it was vigorous; what there was, was able; it was an opposition in which the eloquence of the present Speaker of this House was heard to perhaps as great advantage as ever in our history. It came, all of it, from the Liberal party. No opposition whatever came from the party that is now held up by the hon. member for Brome as thwarting the march of progress.

Nor are those the only illustrations. What about the re-establishment policy effected after the war? What about the settlement policy that leads the way in land settlement for every country in the world. There stands to-day something to which other countries are looking in admiration and which, I venture to suggest, hon. gentlemen of all three sections of this House, are now disposed to applaud rather than to deride. I do not say that our land settlement policy met with opposition on the part of the Liberal party. It did not. I do not say that it met with opposition on the part of the Progressive party. It certainly did not. It met with consistent and fair support; but nevertheless the soldier land settlement policy was put into practice by the party which the hon. member for Brome holds up as the very acme of reaction and retrogression.

Yes, let hon. members of this House opposite me in particular,—but in this instance I join, with them, those to my left—look back over the history of confederation at the great milestones of policy, that to-day are embedded in the statute books, policies initiated at confederation, policies initiated in the seventies after confederation, policies initiated in the last ten years, and then ask me whether that policy was fathered by this party or by that to which the hon. gentleman belongs. I do not say that all that is of value was originated by this party; but the big steps were due to its resource and courage. I know there is something to the credit of the Liberal party. I know they initiated and put into effect the policy of submitting our railway difficulties, railway rates and all matters that arise in controversy in connection with the roads, to a commission, a judicial body—there was a policy for which the Laurier government deserves every credit. I am willing to accord it the credit due in that regard, nor have I ever denied it. But I hope I shall be forgiven for reminding hon. gentlemen opposite that after they took that step, the very body which they erected and put in a place where it could not defend itself, they were the first, for political purposes, for party election purposes, to deride and to defame in the public eye of this country. And they were the first as well, after a vote bargaining adventure, to circumscribe the ambit of authority of that body and thereby create anomalies in this country from which we shall be struggling to escape for years to come. I do not know that I could name anything else to their credit of much consequence. I will not harrow the memories of hon. gentle-

men opposite by referring to those tragic bills to construct the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. These were the main achievements of their administration. And if there are any hon. gentlemen that feel like calling those ill-fated measures milestones of progress it is a shame, really, not to leave them in the enjoyment of their delusion.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, when six o'clock arrived I was in the middle of a review of some of the policies of this country that have so stood the test of time, indeed, that have so enamoured their original enemies as to be finally accepted by them. Even then I had not mentioned some of the most outstanding. There are hon. members of this House of all parties who can remember the historic struggle over the building of the Canadian Pacific railway—a policy that put the life blood of trade into confederation and made a political union an organic union; a policy that had to be pressed against the bitterest opposition, certainly the ablest opposition that this or any parliament in Canada has ever known. But it exemplified surely progressive government. There was an instance of courage and of aggressiveness and it does not stand to the credit of the Liberal party. The hon. member for Brome would not likely give the respective attitudes of the two parties on that subject as an illustration of his theory that the Conservative party of Canada has been reactionary and his own progressive. There is nothing so delusive as names; nomenclature deceives unguarded minds, and I put the hon. member for Brome on warning in that regard.

But we do not need to stop there. The very shortest memory carries to the controversy over civil service reform in this country. I know that a measure of reform was achieved under the Laurier government, but I know that in its working out it proved a most contracted and ineffective piece of legislation. To suggest that it abolished patronage or removed it from the control of political parties is merely to suggest something that sounds monstrous to memory and reason. The big step, the abolition of patronage, was taken in opposition to hon. gentlemen opposite—at least, when they were in opposition; for to be absolutely fair it could not be said that they resisted it as a party in opposition. They were most critical. But it is easy to be brave in that regard in opposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been quite ready to agree that, subject to their terms, political patronage shall be removed from the other political party when in power but they have shown distinct evidence of late that they are not at all prepared to have it removed from themselves.

And indeed, one does not need to stop there. The exigencies of the last ten years demanded more in the way of progressive policies than did all the previous history of confederation. There came an exigency in the marketing conditions of the world that demanded action in 1919. The government of the day took action. The government of the day took its life in its hands so far as western Canada was concerned and established a wheat board—a wheat board that operated, a wheat board that in the course of its existence, by its mere success, converted or destroyed its enemies. And who were its enemies? Its enemies were all in the party that sits opposite now. Oh, I well remember—and this will be illuminating, I know it will be interesting, to some hon. gentlemen of this House—I well remember how, when that course was taken, hon. gentlemen opposite, some of them not in the House today,—translated to the Senate—stood on this side and denounced us as having established that board to help our rich friends the millers. I was portrayed, because of the wheat board legislation, as an ally of the big interests; and the eloquence of the former member for Kent will ring through this hall for many a day in which he depicted me as the tool and minion of the rich, establishing a wheat board to crush the farmer in order to benefit the milling interests. Such was the character of opposition we met with to progressive legislation, and the same opposition continued throughout the life of the wheat board. It ceased only when the wheat board ceased. And we had the progressive style of hon. gentlemen opposite well illustrated in the wheat board legislation of last session, wheat board legislation that has stood a dead letter ever since, that never "progressed" so far as to get into operation. The progressiveness of the respective wheat board bills well illustrates the progressiveness of the two sides of this House.

So much for that; it is a digression forced upon me by the hon. member for Brome, but I apprehend I have given him illustrations enough—and I witness now at last the smile of approval on his face.

Coming to this resolution, I stated that my opposition was founded in part on reasons expressed by the hon. member for North

Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray). I cannot say that I have given the closest attention to the discussions in other countries as well as in our own on this principle, but I have given them some attention and I have given pretty close attention to the working out of the principle of proportional representation in Canada, in our municipal and provincial fields.

One of the reasons advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg, and strongly urged on this side of the House before he spoke, strongly urged in a very logical address from the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), was this: that proportional representation is a method of election that tends to the fostering, at all events to the continuance and multiplication of groups in parliament. These hon. gentlemen argued that such consequence is not consonant and does not harmonize with the British system of party government. I know there is such a thing as parliamentary government without party government, but I for one—and if it is reactionary, all right, call it reactionary—I for one believe you get the best results of parliamentary government when you have party government. I believe that you get better results than you do when you have group government.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), in his very moderate speech, has said that we will have groups whether we have proportional representation or not. Certainly I admit there have been groups in other countries, and groups that arose without any proportional representation as a cause. That is quite true, it has been inevitable. Not only is it inevitable, but within the limits fixed by a system of direct majority vote I am not sure that it does not work for good. But the multiplication of groups in my judgment is not consonant with the British parliamentary system and does not conduce to the good of the country. It tends to interruption of continuity of policy; it tends to uncertainty throughout the country as to what policy is going to be; and stronger still, it tends to rob the electorate of power of real and final decision in matters of policy, and to transfer that power in more uncontrollable form to their representatives in parliament. The elector is not in a position to decide policy as fully as he is in a position to do under the present system of election. He is in a position to decide on his preference for men perhaps better, but as betwen the merits of a policy which a government has followed, the naked question of the merits of that policy, he has not so effective a decision in his hands under proportional representation as he has under the present practice. There is more likelihood, more necessity indeed, of personality being the dominating influence in the election. The elector is bound to give thought to that after his first vote anyway for he is bound to be voting 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, and consequently the force of his electoral action does not go as effectively to a definite "yea" or "nay" on big fundamental questions of policy. It is dissipated over other considerations and does not have its full and final effect on policy. It is anti-democratic in that regard rather than democratic.

Now it seems to me the British system of government has stood the test of many centuries. That does not say it is perfect and cannot be improved; but I do not think you improve it when you establish a method of election that tends undoubtedly to the multiplication of groups, and consequently tends to a carnival of favour-bargaining in parliament which destroys responsibility, which destroys continuity of policy, which destroys strength and efficiency of administration.

I may be answered that even under the alternative vote system,—and I admit that that system is open to some of the objections I have advanced,—there is easily a possibility of log-rolling, too; but there it would be beween the electors. The electors might easily engage in a log-rolling practice. The followers of one party or candidate might come to a bargain with the followers of another that each would be the second choice of the other in the contest; and such a practice is not good. It would not tend to the purest form of election. But far better have log-rolling there than have it in parliament. The worst thing that can happen parliament is to have it so constituted that policy is determined by a system of exchange of favours, of sectional favours, of favours of any other kind—policy determined thereby rather than determined initially by government on its responsibility to parliament and ultimately to the electors. For that reason I do not think proportional representation is consonant with the British form of government. Let me put it this way also before I leave this phase of the subject. The elector may vote for 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. He may conceivably decide on a choice of six different lines of policy as he votes, and the representatives of six different policies may therefore be elected but when the elected comes to parliament he has only two ways of voting on any subject; he may vote yea or he may vote nay, and you have either to abandon your system of responsible government or you are going to put some of those elected men in a position where they are

voting against their principles time and time again. That is bound to result under proportional representation. The fact that there are only two ways of voting in parliament, following the fact that there are six or seven different things to vote for in the election, results in anomalies and departure from principle in parliament, and is out of harmony with the British system of parliamentary government.

Now I come to a reason that weighs with me heavier than the one I have expounded. The first reason has been faithfully advanced by hon. members who have spoken. The second has been referred to as well, but I regard this reason as a dominating one. I regard it as imperative to my mind. Proportional representation may be right or may be wrong. I cannot deny for a minute that there is much to be said in its favour, and I do not believe I could say that it does not tend, that it would not likely tend, at least, to a more accurate reflection of all the phases of public opinion in the country in this mirror of parliament. If that itself is a distinct, final advantage, I do not think it can be at least conclusively disputed. What I argue is that though you may get some good result, you get it at a price that is too great for all the advantage received.

But whether proportional representation is right or wrong, the isolated application of proportional representation is wrong, and wrong in my mind without any room for debate at all. I am against the isolated application of the principle, and would be against it even though the principle itself appealed to me as sound. Now why do I say that? You cannot have the isolated local application of proportional representation while all the rest of the country is under the old system, and either do justice as between party and party or do justice to the constituency to which proportional representation is applied. It is unfair as between party and party, and it is unfair as respects the constituency itself. Now as between party and party you may apply proportional representation to constituencies, or to classes of constituencies, where one party is the stronger, and thereby deplete its strength in those constituencies but leave unmolested whole areas of the country where another party is the stronger, and thereby give it the whole advantage of its majority over that area. That such a result would be grossly unfair—indeed, that it would be an outrage on the public of this country, there can be no dispute at all, and I do not believe you can choose any area and say that you have chosen this fairly as between the parties represented in parliament. For example, if cities of this country are taken, so far as the last election reflected—I do say it would be the same again; it might be quite different; it should not have been the case at the last election; it would not have been the case but that large sections of this country were led astray—if cities of this country were selected, particularly certain cities, and they made to illustrate the system of proportional representation, that would merely be a matter of having the minority in those cities represented. Consequently the party that is strongest in those cities would be bereft of much of its electoral result, while the party that was strongest in the rest of the country is left in the full enjoyment of all the advantages of that strength.

Not only is this true, but it is grossly unjust to the constituency itself. I could not illustrate this better than to take the working out of this system in the province of Manitoba as we have witnessed it up to date.

Now I want here to interpolate this. The basic objection to proportional representation is that it does not fit in harmoniously with the British system of parliamentary government, does not make for continuity of policy and for strength, and consequently for efficiency of administration. That does not apply with equal force to municipal government, for definiteness and continuity of policy are by no means so important there as even in a provincial arena, and by no means so important as they are in the federal arena. The objections that apply, apply with greater and greater force as the arena to which the application comes is extended in its horizon and elevated in degree.

We have had it illustrated in provincial legislatures. The province of Manitoba is about half urban and half rural. Almost half of the population of the province of Manitoba reside in the city of Winnipeg. That city has a representation, I think, of ten. The balance of the province has much more than that, because they have followed, rightly or wrongly, the principle of giving to rural parts a larger proportion of representation than to the city of Winnipeg. The province has been under the regular system of distribution; Winnipeg has been under proportional representation. Winnipeg as a consequence, as one would naturally expect, has elected three or four different groups. It has elected Conservatives, it has elected Liberals, it has elected Labour representatives; and I think it has elected some who call themselves independent even of labour, and of liberalism, and

of conservatism. It has elected a Progressive, It has elected three or four different groups. None has any marked advantage over the other. The Conservatives have no advantage, I think, over the Liberal nor the Liberals over the Conservative; and it would be difficult to conceive, in the years to come, any election in the city of Winnipeg, in which under the new system, any party will have very much advantage over the other. It might have an advantage of one member, it might have an advantage possibly of two or three, but the latter would be rather difficult to conceive. What, on the contrary, is the condition through the country? There they have, say, forty seats. The party whose policy plays to that vote wins not an advantage of one seat or two seats but an advantage say of forty seats. In a word, the party that directs its policy to winning that vote plays for a stake of forty seats; the party that directs its policy to winning the city vote plays for a stake of one vote or two. As a consequence there is every motive, there is every political motive—and let us not be so hypocritical as to deny that political motives exercise an influence in parliament—there is every political motive to neglect the constituencies to which proportional representation is applied in the public policy of the country, and to place the whole trend of that public policy in favour of those constituencies to which that system is not applied at all. There would be very little to be gained by any government in office in Manitoba to-day in so turning public policy as to be even fair to the city of Winnipeg. And as I make these remarks I do not want to be understood as saying that there has been unfairness to the city; that has nothing to do with the question at all. The question is, what are the forces at work? what will be the tendency? Under the existing system there is very little reward for any party, in following a course fair to the city of Winnipeg. The best that could be expected there would be an advantage of one seat or two. But the party that ignores the city of Winnipeg to the advantage of the rest of the province—that party has much to gain and its appeal is liable to be much more effective, than the appeal of the party that pursued a policy equally fair to both. This reasoning will apply in the federal arena where, necessarily, there are antagonisms of local interests far greater than there could be in a compact province like Manitoba. Sectional interests here unquestionably have great influence. There is more diversity of sectional interest, and consequently more diversity of sectional activity; this is inevitable and we are never going to get away from it. For that reason the party in this parliament that applies proportional representation to certain sections of the country and does not apply it to others, that party puts those sections under a distinct disadvantage in reference to its influence in the parliament of Canada. Therefore I am opposed to the sectional, the isolated, the local adoption of proportional representation. I am not prepared to support it applied to certain selected places when I know those places will be chosen by a government which has a majority in parliament, or by a committee on which, necessarily, that government will have a majority over all other parties combined. For this reason, which to my mind is final I will not support the resolution that is now before the House.

I think also, if we reflect on the experiences of those parts of our country which, in other fields of politics, have adopted this system I do not think we will gain anything in the way of accession of argument to the affirmative of this resolution. The Liberal-Conservative party has taken very aggressive steps in this country. It claims, and on the record, I think, I can establish its claim, to be the party of progress in this country, but in all the steps of progress it has taken the Conservative party has known every time where it was going; it did not adopt everything just because it was new, and lightly call such action by the name of progress. The best criterion by which to judge whether a policy proves progressive or not is to watch and see what becomes of it when the other side gets into power. If the other side, in defiance of all its proclamations, in defiance of all its sworn principles, facing the responsibility of governing and facing the consequences of a change, comes to the decision to support the policy of its opponents, then we have just about as final a test as can be thought of as to the essential soundness and progressiveness of that policy. And a party which in respect of one thing or the other, facing all along the stoutest resistance finds its policies the law of Canada to-day, that party is not boasting when it says that those policies have been really progressive for they have stood the sternest test of time.

But there are certain things the Conservative party has opposed; some of them it has opposed unsuccessfully. In the provincial arena it opposed the introduction of the once famous initiative referendum and recall. But the initiative referendum and recall which, when it was under discussion one would really have thought from the enthusiasm the very

honest enthusiasm of its supporters was going to regenerate this stricken world, was going to correct all the evils of political life—that initiative referendum and recall hon. gentlemen must admit has simply stood as a dead letter on the statute books of our provinces. Nor do I think that proportional representation where it has had its chance has contributed to the betterment of our legislatures. I do not think for example members of the Liberal party in Manitoba, and particularly members of the late provincial government, would say that proportional representation tended to give legislative virility to the liberal party of that province and I do not think their hearts would be behind that principle to-day. I know they would not be enthusiastic for that once so much heralded reform, the initiative, referendum and recall. Adhering, though, to the subject of proportional representation, I do not think it has contributed to the strength, the efficiency and usefulness of either the Liberal or the Conservative party provincially, and I do not think it will contribute to the value as a party in office of the Progressive group that now enjoys power in that province. I believe the time will come when they will see that they would do more efficient and effective work for the whole province under the old British system of election. Looking to the Pacific coast, my reading of the results there is wholly adverse to the success of the principle. I understand that in its actual working out there were so many errors and so much misunderstanding, the numbers of those who found it impossible to master the intricacies of the vote were such that when the result was known there was not only a large volume of dissatisfaction, but very general and grave doubts as to whether the result really reflected public opinion. For those reasons and in the light of these experiences I oppose the resolution now before the House.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The greatest part of the speech of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has dealt with matters outside the resolution before the House, and into that part of his address I do not wish to enter. I would like to, however, make a few remarks coming more directly to the resolution itself. We are of course profoundly moved—moved to profound sorrow—by the declaration which my right hon. friend made with so much emphasis that his conception of the functions of government differs from our own. We must comfort ourselves with the thought that when our conception of government and his conception of government are submitted to the highest authority in this democratic country, his conception of government is not found to be acceptable. My right hon. friend has a very queer notion of that conception of government when he says that it is the duty of government to take a stand on every question that comes before the House.

If my hon. friend had strange notions as to the functions of government, I must confess he also gave us some strange notions as to the functions of opposition, because he made the statement that according to his conception, and according to that of the hon. gentlemen who had worked with him, they are not called upon to make up their minds on any question until they first learn where the government stand in the matter. That is a new notion and I must admit that he does as well in defining the principles of the opposition as he does in defining the principles of the government. The government are bound to be united on any measure which they bring before the House. I say they are not bound to be united on a measure brought before the House by a private member.

If any private member feels that he wishes to bring any motion before the House and to invite a free discussion of it, that is his privilege, and we all commend him for exercising that right. But to say that when a private member exercises that right instantly the government have to take a position on the matter and declare they are for or against it, I think is a strange notion indeed. At all events it is a notion which we are not prepared to endorse here. For myself—and I am speaking for myself alone—I would have preferred if my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good) had rested, as he might well have done, on the passage of his first resolution, in which the sense of the House was taken, on the question of the alternative vote. It having received the unanimous consent of the House —at all events there was no objection—I think my hon. friend might have said that that was progress enough for one day, and perhaps for one session, and might well have waited until we had a trial of it before trying it on a larger scale.

As now proposed, however, if the matter has to be voted on, I shall vote for the hon. gentleman's motion—though I shall do so with some little hesitation and not without some doubt—for two reasons: first, the idea of proportional representation in a general way has long commended itself to my fancy. I have not studied it as closely as some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but in a general way

the idea has found favour in my mind. But there is another and more specific reason. I do not need to go outside the situation in my own province to-day to see there is something wrong in the present system. We are keen politicians down in Nova Scotia. Sometimes you would think we are all one-sided. But that is hardly correct. I have not made a careful analysis of the figures, but I am not far wrong when I make a rough guess that about 40 or 45 per cent of the electors of Nova Scotia will call themselves Conservative, and about 55 or possibly 60 per cent—I am making a broad statement and not a close analysis—will call themselves Liberals. But the majority, not more than 10 or 15 per cent more than the others absolutely control the situation, and a large number, not far from half the people of the province, are utterly without representation in this House. It is very pleasant to me as a good Grit to find that is the case. When the polls were closed and we found the whole province to our credit we were all very proud, but in calm moments of reflection I can see there is much injustice in that, and inasmuch as the hon. member for Brant is aiming to remedy that injustice, I am inclined to favour his motion, at all events to the extent of giving the scheme a trial.

I do not forget that there are difficulties in the way. I am inclined to think, whether the government or the committee undertake to work out a bill to carry out the resolution, they will probably find it very difficult indeed. I suspect that if the matter goes before the committee on the readjustment of the representation, they will not find the quietest time of their lives. There is a curious thing about this, when we talk of the principles of Liberalism or Conservatism in relation to this measure. Only two or three years ago the question excited the British parliament. The curious thing was that the Tory House of Lords voted for proportional representation, and the democratic House of Commons refused to do it. The House of Lords took the broad, general sentiment, but when it came down to brass tacks, as the saying goes, to deal with the matter, the democratic House of Commons said they would not have anything to do with it. That suggests that there are difficulties in the way.

Again I want to say I have some doubt and hesitation in the matter. I am speaking for myself, but because I like the principle of it, and because I see an illustration of the injustice in the case of my own province, I am going to support the motion of my hon. friend from Brant.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary): Perhaps one reason why the Tory House of Lords found it necessary to vote for proportional representation was that they were beginning to see that very soon if they did not get their proportion they would not have any representation at all, and I have no doubt the time will come when the Conservatives of this House will take the same attitude. Proportional representation is becoming popular in the public mind as a corrective to the present system of voting. I shall mention very briefly two points where the present method of voting is very unfair and undemocratic. In the first place, a minority candidate in any constituency may be elected. Let us take an example. Suppose we have a constituency with a hundred votes. Suppose there is a Liberal, a Conservative and a Labour candidate in the field. We will give the Liberal 30 votes, the Conservative 30 votes and the Labour candidate 40 votes. The Labour candidate will be elected with 40 votes. There will be 60 votes against him, therefore the majority of the votes of that constituency have no representation at all, whereas the minority have the representation. That is one fault of the present system of voting. Extend that over the whole country and you frequently have a party in power which has not the support of the majority of the voters.

The next point is that a very large minority may have no representation at all. That has just been very ably pointed out by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Take the illustration again of a constituency with a hundred votes with two candidates running, one Tory and one Grit. We give the Grit 51 votes and the Tory gets 49, very nearly half. The Tory has no representation; the Liberal has it all. Spread that over all the nation, and you may possibly have almost one-half of the voting population of Canada without any representation whatever. That is possible under the present system, and I believe the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), cited a number of instances in Canadian politics where a similar situation to what I have described arose.

This resolution, as again was pointed out by the Minister of Finance, does not mean to isolate the practice to one or two constituencies as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who built up a very elaborate argument on that assumption, seemed to conclude. This resolution asks simply that proportional representation be experimented with in one or more multi-member constituencies created for the purpose at the present redis-

tribution. Therefore, the whole argument of the leader of the Opposition falls to the ground, as it presupposes a condition that is foreign to the intention of the resolution.

Proportional representation will ensure that a minority will never rule. It also will ensure that no considerable minority will ever be excluded from having a voice. Is that not democracy? What have the self-appointed protagonists of democracy and majority rule in this House to say about that? Are they opposed to a minority having a voice? Are they opposed to majority rule? If so, they may vote against proportional representation; otherwise, they are voting against the very things which they pretend to be willing to see established. Some of them have advanced the argument that this will encourage groups. The leader of the Opposition very properly admits that this will not and cannot create groups. The best that it could possibly do would be to give the groups already in existence an opportunity of expressing themselves. Is that not British? Personally, I have opposed the idea of direct action. Direct action has been advocated in certain sections of Canada and also in Great Britain. There is no better incentive that I know of to direct action on the part of a section of the people than an electoral system which prevents them from giving expression to their opinions. That is the system which we have in vogue at the present time, and I believe that if the various groups now existing had an opportunity of expressing their opinions and desires, there would be no danger of the development of an unconstitutional method of taking action.

I want briefly to follow two or three of the hon. members who have attempted to criticize this resolution. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) seems to get a little mixed between the federal government and the British system. He distinguishes between the British system as applied in municipal government and the British system as applied in the federal government. I do not know why he makes that distinction; but may I ask—since when has a mere method of marking a ballot determined the system of government in any country? Will the mere system of marking a ballot alter the form of government in this or in any other country? That is a question which I would leave to the hon. member for Vancouver South. His next point was that this would dissipate cabinet unity. He says that the keystone of the present system of government is the Cabinet. We say that the keystone of the present system of government is democracy, the people, and so, if that is true, then I fail to understand his claim that he stands for democracy.

Another hon. member advanced the argument that proportional representation would prohibit canvassing; that it would be almost impossible for him, indeed, it would take him years to canvass his constituency, providing it is a group constituency as is called for by proportional representation. It might be a very excellent thing if members were prohibited from canvassing, if this method of voting were adopted. If it threw upon the people themselves the responsibility for political organization, if it gave to them instead of to politicians, the responsibility of running elections, that would be a very decided advance. In view of this, I do not consider the canvassing objection as constituting an argument against proportional representation. The hon. gentleman's second point was that this might interfere with members of parliament carrying on their correspondence during the year. That again, I submit, is rather a lame argument to advance against a principle so needed to correct the weaknesses of the present system of voting.

Another hon. gentleman opposed proportional representation because it was not proportional. If that is really his argument, I wish, as a student of proportional representation, to assure him that we will make it proportional. He need not fear for that at all. Indeed, when we are dealing with proportional representation, we are dealing with mathematics, and there is no doubt about getting the proportion. I am of the opinion the hon. gentleman must have made some grave mistake in his figures to arrive at such a conclusion.

A number of hon. members opposing this have said, calmly and seemingly in their right minds, that we have group government in Ontario, and that the adoption of proportional representation would give us group government in Canada. Let me point out to those hon. gentlemen that we have not group government in Ontario. There is not group government in any province in the Dominion of Canada; there is not group government here; there is not group government anywhere that I know of in the English speaking world. There is, in Ontario not group government, but a coalition system of government, which might indeed be said to be the most pernicious form of the present party system of government which we have. I do not say that the Ontario government is a pernicious government, by any means; I hasten to say, on the contrary, that it has been a very excellent

government. But the coalition makeshift of government has grown out of the British system under certain conditions, and we had it in full force in the government which preceded the present government. If that is group government, then the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) introduced it into this House. That is not group government as I understand it; that is coalition government.

Another hon. gentleman seemed to think that proportional representation had something to do with horse-racing, and that if he had a lame horse in a race, by proportional representation he might get it in first. That is how I understood his argument. But he seems to me to want to deny the right of considerable numbers of people in a constituency to run after a fad if they want to. He prefers that they should run after his fad; that he should be allowed to state to the electorate what the real issue is, and when he has done that, to get them all to follow him. That is perfectly democratic; that is perfectly in line, as he sees it, with the British system of constitutional government! But to allow Dick, Tom and Harry to say what they think the issue is, that would never do at all, because if you did that, you might not elect the Tories! That is very clear reasoning, and I am in sympathy with the hon. gentleman's position, but not with his point of view.

That is a summing up of the opposition to this motion. I conclude by reiterating that this is merely a change in the form of marking a ballot and a corresponding rearranging of constituencies to make that possible. Its aim is to give expression to every considerable group in a nation and it prevents minorities from having power as they sometimes have to-day. It would ensure the continuance of majority rule, and, therefore, those who claim to be such ardent supporters of democracy and majority rule should find themselves bound to vote in favour of this resolution.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I had not purposed taking part in this debate this evening, but the seriousness of this proposal and the meagreness of the actual information that has been placed before the House regarding the practical working out of the new system impel me to invite the House to give some further consideration to the matter. I confess very frankly that I am not in a position to-night to enter into a technical discussion of the system. So far as I have been able to gather from the speeches that have been delivered, there has not been a single member promoting this measure who has given a clear, technical exposition of it. I have studied the system for a great many years and at first I was attracted by such arguments as we have just heard from the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Irvine) concerning the rectifying of certain apparent inequities in our present methods.

Now, so that there need be no misunderstanding as to the way in which I approach this question, I am going to admit candidly and at once that there are inequities and that frequently a constituency will be represented in this House by a member whose number of votes does not represent a majority of the votes cast. That is quite true. But I would invite the House to consider, in connection with our historic system, this fact, that in the majority of instances, whether on the part of hon. gentlemen belonging to the Liberal party or of those belonging to the somewhat newer party, the Progressives, or on the part of members of the Conservative party, any man who enters this House does so with a genuine desire to represent the people of his riding as a whole.

If the rules of parliament would permit, and if the members of this House would extend me the courtesy, I could put the question individually to member after member sitting here, "Are you endeavouring to represent all shades of religious, social and economic opinion in your riding?"—and I think the answer would be invariably in the affirmative. I also know that we are all human and are apt to err, and it may be that some will be a little more prejudiced than others, less balanced in their conception of their duties; so that occasionally, perhaps, you may find a glaring wrong. But in the majority of cases, not only in the present House but in previous parliaments of which it has been my privilege to be a member, the members have all endeavoured to discharge their entire duty by their constituencies.

That, I think, should be borne in mind. To quote the figures of the illustration given by the hon. member who has taken his seat (Mr. Irvine), because a man was elected by forty per cent, while the candidates of two other groups received thirty per cent each, he does not come into the House with the object of disregarding the interests of those two groups. He comes to represent the whole constituency. Under our great parliamentary system, the product of the experience of ages, the member is asked, first, to take a stand upon the great general policies of the party to which he belongs. It might be an economic policy of free trade versus protection, or a policy as between nationally owned railways or privately owned railways; it might be some great policy of that character. He is asked

to be true to that general policy, and in all other matters, whether in regard to estimates or private bills, or in regard to the routine of government, he is at liberty to express himself in a manner which he thinks is in the interests of the country at large; while in all local matters he is supposed to represent his riding. This is a pretty satisfactory situation; it is about as good as one can get. So far as the proposed system is concerned, I think it ought to be shown to the House that it has such distinct advantages as far outweigh all the advantages of the older system.

There is another point I wish to make. It strikes me that by the introduction of proportional representation you would reduce this parliament to the status of a county council or a municipal body, the members of which are elected annually or biennially. A group of citizens offer themselves for office as aldermen or councillors and meet to transact the business of the city or municipality. There are no great policies, or at least there seldom are. Once in a while in a large city some great problem will come up, such as the question of hydro-electric power, or something of that character. But in ninety per cent of the municipalities it is simply a process of carrying on the ordinary business, and there is no distinct cleavage on questions of policy. Further, parliament cannot go to the country annually; it must sit for a reasonable period of time, or you would have absolute chaos.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), advanced, as an argument for the position he was taking in support of the resolution, the situation in Nova Scotia. If I understood him rightly he said that practically fifty-five per cent of the people of Nova Scotia were Liberal while forty-five were Conservative, and that this ten per cent in the difference controlled the representation of that province, of sixteen members. First, I would remind my hon. friend that he wholly ignored the stalwarts representing the Progressive party and of the supposedly large number of citizens in that province who are in favour of the policy of the Progressives. However, that is a quarrel he must settle with them; I will not interject any opinion here on that point. But let us look at the situation. We are not complaining. We acknowledge that the people of Nova Scotia declared that they wanted a Liberal government in Ottawa. Now, unless we grouped all the constituencies of Nova Scotia into one or two groups and applied this fantastic scheme here proposed, it would be impossible to do otherwise than follow the existing practice, namely, of majority rule. We do not object to the situation in Nova Scotia at all.

9 p.m.

What we say is that in the working out of our parliamentary system we have the opportunity of saying to the people that their choice was not a wise one, or of showing them that the members they elected have been derelict in their duties. It is our privilege —indeed, our duty,—to do so; then we have an opportunity of winning their support. In other words, if these sixteen members come to Ottawa and discharge their duties in a manner satisfactory to the majority of the people of Nova Scotia they will be reelected and reaffirmed in their position; and we could have no complaint. But on the other hand, if after a period of service they again appeal to the electorate—a period which varies, under our system, but approximates four years—and are then rejected, that is a test of public opinion and, we believe, a sufficiently frequent and a sufficiently honest test.

I know that the members from Alberta will support this proposal, because practically all of them are avowedly in favour of what is known as group government. Now, I appeal to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I read only a few days ago a rather able speech made by him in which he referred to the danger of replacing the present system of government with what is known as the group system of government, and as I recall his words they pointed out very clearly that under group government we were endangering the stability of parliamentary institutions in this Dominion. Let us follow this group government idea, because you cannot have proportional representation without having group government. My right hon. friend wishes to interject something?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend appeals to me in reference to this point. I may say that I do not agree that proportional representation will necessarily lead to group government; I am inclined to think as matters stand it would strengthen the traditional parties. Everyone elected under the system of proportional representation has to get a majority of the votes cast for the candidates entitled to election. I think the effect in our country would be quite the opposite of what my hon. friend expects.

Mr. STEVENS: I have great respect for my right hon. friend's opinion, but I call to my support several of the speakers of this afternoon who distinctly urged as an argument in

favour of this proposal that certain classes of people did not at present have the opportunity of becoming represented in this parliament. Well now, take the case of Winnipeg, advanced by an hon. member from one of the Manitoba constituencies as a distinct argument in favour of this scheme. And what is there in Winnipeg? Representation by groups, purely and simply—no one will deny it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: How is Winnipeg represented in this House? By groups.

Mr STEVENS: Winnipeg is represented in this House by members supporting my right hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: By some two or three groups.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, that may be so. It is quite true in one respect, but separate ridings are involved. For instance, the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), who sits on this side of the House, runs in one riding, and that riding is composed very largely of individuals who think, perhaps, as he does, or as he persuaded them to think they thought—I doubt if they do, to tell you the truth. Then, my hon. friends from North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray), and South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) represent, again, distinct and separate ridings in which the individuals who voted for them consider them to be fair representatives of their views. But under the provincial system the whole of the city was grouped under one riding. Now, then, let me turn to another point.

Mr. HOEY: Would my hon. friend permit a question? I do not think it is fair to use the Manitoba legislature as an illustration, because the same things prevail in Ontario where proportional representation has not been attempted at all. Proportional representation, therefore does not necessarily lead to group government, which is here already.

Mr STEVENS: My hon. friend is in error there. We do not deny that you can have groups under the present system, but what we do assert is that proportional representation not only tends to it but almost makes it compulsory; it multiplies groups. I do not think there is any denial of that; I do not think it is disputed even by those who support the principle. In fact they advance that as a reason in favour of the adoption of proportional representation.

My hon. friend a moment ago said that this system was, to use his own words, mathematically perfect. I would like to have some one demonstrate its mathematical accuracy. I am not in a position to-night to go into any detail in regard to that; I shall simply give one or two illustrations. Take a group or multiple riding where, we will say, five members are to be elected—a city like Toronto or Montreal, or any other large urban centre. The experience is—and I am talking now of experience—that you will have perhaps twenty or thirty candidates—at least twenty or thirty where there are five to be elected. I have seen cases in Vancouver where there were thirty nominations and only five or six were to be elected, the ballot being of tremendous length, a very complex document, Now, they take the number of individuals to be elected and divide that into the total number of votes to be polled. We will assume that there are a thousand votes to be polled; they divide that by five, the number to be elected, and add one, making 201 necessary for election. When the ballots are counted, one man who is very popular receives on the first count, 300 number one votes, and they credit him with 201. Then they arbitrarily take 99 votes and divide that into the number of seconds that are then available for distribution, and they allocate the result to each individual on this long list. My point is this: what is the mathematical reasoning of so applying these 99 votes, simply because this man happened by chance to have a larger number of first choices than the others?

Now, the next step is this: the man at the bottom of the list, number thirty-one or whatever he may be, drops out, and his seconds are taken in a somewhat similar manner. But why should his seconds be taken any more than the seconds of number fifteen, number sixteen or number eighteen? Where does the fairness come in? I do not say it is unfair, but there cannot be any claim for accuracy or fairness in the thing; it is simply an arbitrary action. And here is the way it frequently works out; I have seen cases of this kind. Two individuals had been running along together and after fifteen or sixteen allocations of this arbitrary character it became necessary to allocate the votes of one of these individuals, each of whom represented a very small but particularly virile group in the community. It happened that they both ran first and second right through the whole count, and because it chanced to come to the turn to take one of these, the one of the two who was first was immediately placed two or three ahead of others who had held a lead over them up to that point. My point is that there is just as much of an element of chance in the allocation of these votes as there is under the present system.

Mr. HUGHES: Suppose that under this system A got the largest number of votes, B the next largest, C the next, and so on? Is there any possibility in the counting that A in a single-member constituency would not be the representative, or in a double-member constituency that A and B would not be the representatives, and in a triple-member constituency that A, B and C would not be the representatives, and so on?

Mr. STEVENS: Unquestionably. That is what I am trying to point out. I admit frankly I am not prepared to-night to enter into such a closely analytical discussion of this as will make it perhaps clear, and if I fail to make it clear, it is because of my own inability to do so. But there is just that point my hon. friend raises. The element of chance enters into this system just as much as into any other.

Mr. HUGHES: After the votes are cast?

Mr. STEVENS: After the votes are cast. A and B, we will say, in a dual member constituency have the largest number of votes. Of course, if they have enough on the first count to give them their quota they are elected, but assuming they have not, and that is very often the case, and it is the only reason for this innovation, it may be that on allocating the other votes, C and D will be elected over the heads of A and B. As a matter of fact, if I had time and had the figures before me, which I have not, I could show where what I consider to be grave injustices have been done in the distribution of the votes. The only mathematical accuracy in the matter is this; by taking this arbitrary number and determining arbitrarily that one candidate shall drop out, you may distribute those votes mathematically, I do not dispute that; what I question is your right to declare that you get, from a mathematical standpoint, an accurate reflection of the views of the electors. You do not do so. You have the element of chance. You arbitrarily remove from the list the candidate with the lowest number of votes, and after that arbitrary removal you allocate a group of votes which may favour this man or that. If it happens that number 4 or number 5 has a certain number of second choices after number 15 has dropped out, he benefits. So it is a game of chance just as much as is any other form of polling.

I would like to join with the views expressed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in saying to my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Good) that I think he ought to be mighty well satisfied as an enthusiastic advocate of these measures to have had his first proposal, the alternative vote, advanced. I was somewhat surprised at the Minister of Finance saying that he needed proportional representation to remedy the difficulties of Nova Scotia that he outlined. The resolution already passed in the early afternoon would correct what my hon. friend suggests is perhaps an injustice.

There is another point. We find by experience in our province that the electorate do not take the same interest in the polling that they do under the present system, and there are two distinct reasons for that. One reason is the complex nature of the poll, and the other is that the average elector says, "Oh, well, what's the use? If you go and vote for the man you think should be elected he has mighty little chance because of the peculiarities of this system." It discourages and has discouraged the turning out of the electors to poll. In the case of the city of Vancouver the number of persons turning out to poll under proportional representation is about one-third normal, and I notice it is the same in other cities.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is that true of Winnipeg, may I ask?

Mr. STEVENS: I am not prepared to say that that is a reason to advance in support of my argument. I am simply stating what experience teaches us, and that is that people do not take the same interest in an election under this system.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the hon. member if it is a fact that in the city of Winnipeg there is less interest taken in an election under proportional representation than under the old system?

Mr. STEVENS: I am quite aware that after the activities of my hon. friend and some of his friends in Winnipeg, public affairs have been creating quite a considerable degree of heated opinion.

Regarding the alternative vote, I do not see perhaps quite the same objections to it that I do to proportional representation, although personally I may say very frankly to my hon. friend I voted "no" to that proposal. Someone said that it carried unanimously. When the motion was put I called "lost." I did that out of candour and frankness, because I did not wish to be considered as supporting it. I think my hon. friend ought to have been satisfied with the passage of his

first resolution. I think the government owes it to the country, and I say this with great earnestness to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, that this very important departure from our present system ought to receive more consideration and a great deal more detailed discussion than has been given to it during the debate before it is approved. As I read this resolution in the order paper proposed by the hon. member for Brant it says:

> For the purpose of demonstrating the working and effects of the system of true proportional representation, one or more multi-member constituencies should be constituted by the redistribution legislation in which that system should be applied at the next general election.

I invite the Prime Minister and the government to consider this resolution. Virtually what it is doing is this: It is not merely a pious expression of opinion by this House on the merits or demerits of this system, but it is a definite instruction to the government and to the committee that will be formed under the aegis of the government to incorporate this system in the redistribution bill which the government has now before the House. In other words, if this resolution carries, it becomes a definite government measure. Now I ask the Prime Minister in all earnestness: does he think this matter has received all the consideration it should have before we get to the point of incorporating it in the redistribution bill? Then I ask him further, does he not think that it is wholly unfair, I will not say unconstitutional, to inaugurate this system as an experiment in one, two or three sections when we are not at all sure that it is wise to incorporate it as a part of the general electoral system of this country? I feel very keenly about this. I do not wish to deride the proposal, but I do think we can well afford to let this particular motion stand, or, if the hon. member is not agreeable to that, to vote it down, not necessarily rejecting the idea altogether, but rejecting it in this form, and letting the first proposal that was passed be given a trial. I am opposed to the first motion also, but it has carried and I bow to the wish of the House. But I do ask the House to refrain from hasty action— perhaps that is too strong a word—in connection with this matter which is of such grave importance.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this question other than this, that I am an absolute believer in parliamentary government as it has developed in Great Britain and in the nations of the British Commonwealth that are now growing up in all quarters of the world. Parliamentary government does not stop, it is progressive; and the whole history of progress in connection with our parliamentary institutions is the removal of abuses in connection with government and the substitution of a better system. Therefore I say the day of reform is not completed, the public in many quarters are asking for improvements, and I am prepared to see these two questions embodied in the resolutions considered this afternoon submitted to a committee for the consideration of the House.

But I want to bring something else, which is a real grievance in the country, before the House. It is a real grievance in my constituency. I represent here over 100,000 people and if an election was declared there would have to be a registration of votes in South York and there would be 60,000 people on that voters' list. Well, there is a case where 100,000 people in South York are outvoted in this country by four constituencies that do not have 80,000 population. In other words, as I size up the census and the representation of Ontario, Toronto and the adjacent constituencies in the county of York associated with it, are entitled to perhaps one-fifth of the representation of Ontario which would be 16. In other words the real question in our portion of Ontario is "rep. by pop." Are we to have it? There is the old cry that was long ago raised in this country That was the old Liberal cry. I have always believed in it, I believe in it to-day. Is this House prepared to adopt the principle of representation by population, as well as the principle of proportional representation or the alternative vote? I would like to have an expression of opinion on that. That is a question which concerns the people in Toronto, it concerns the people in Ottawa, and it concerns the people of the whole of the cities throughout this Dominion. At present the urban centres do not have fair representation. In the United States they have representation by population practically and there is no objection to it there. Why does this discrimination exist against the cities, why is this preference given to the country parts? That is the real issue.

I was not here at the beginning of this debate I regret to say, but I have listened with great interest to what was said to-night. I appreciated the statement of the Minister of Finance to-night, but he did not touch this question, nor did the right hon. leader of the Opposition touch it as far as I could hear. And yet this is a vital question and I appeal to my hon. friends from the constituencies of Toronto and York, to support me in this stand. I never read anything with so much interest as I read the last two nights in bed the latest

volumes of Mrs Asquith's Biography. I got through the two volumes in two séances of about four hours. But it was most interesting to me and this is the point: The whole of her story forms the history of the progress of parliamentary government in England, and the great instance she gives is the recent struggle —within the memory of most of the members of the present parliament of England—the recent struggle to curb the over-influence of the House of Lords after a clear expression of opinion had been given by the people through the House of Commons, either in a general election or on a reference of the special question to the electorate.

Now, the whole history of progress in connection with parliamentary government is of that kind and it is not finished. Undoubtedly the present system of voting is not satisfactory. The group system, to my mind and from my reading is not likely to end. I do not know in what way it is going to move, but perhaps the old two party system is very near its end. It is very near its end in the United States; that result has already arrived in many of our provinces; and as I size up the situation in the United States the prospect is that the next presidential election and the next election for congress, will result in a very pronounced manifestation in favour of at least three parties and the group system. Accordingly I am prepared to favour a full consideration of this question by a parliamentary committee, not only to consider the alternative system and proportional representation, but to consider a question far more important to all the cities in the urban population of Canada—the demand for representation by population.

One of the great cries of the illustrious grandfather of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie King) who now leads the House was representation by population in this country, which was denied in the old days. That demand has continued to this day, and there may be some trace of it in Britain yet. That abuse has got to be removed. It is a parliamentary abuse that denies equality between the citizens of this country. I believe in equality in citizenship, equality in responsibility, and equality in the right to shape the policy of the country. We have not got it in Toronto, it does not exist in Winnipeg, it does not exist in Montreal. Montreal is entitled to whatever representation is granted to the other cities. At present the urban population of the community, as the leader of the Opposition said to-night is not given a fair show. It is discriminated against in a way even by these proposals submitted to-day.

Therefore, I wish to say that I do recognize the group system and think it will prevail for a good many years in Canada, and it may expand. It certainly is recognized in Britain and, most surprising thing, after the recent election there, and when Mr. Bonar Law came into the House and announced this policy as the new Prime Minister, the other three groups in the House did something remarkable. Practically Mr. Asquith, and I think Lloyd George and others, recognized at once the group system, and as Ramsay Macdonald was the leader of the dominant section of the opposition, Mr. Asquith, Lloyd George and the others all rose and said, "After you, Mr. Macdonald," and automatically he was recognized as the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition. That shows progress, and that shows what took place in England, and also shows what is taking place all over. There will be a recognition for some years to come of the group system, and it not only goes to parliament, whether the British parliament, or American congress, or to the parliament in this country, as a recognized group system; but it obtains to-day in most of our provinces.

I am an absolute believer in progress in parliamentary reform. This can only be done by agitation, and it has been obtained only by discussions of this character, by the introduction of reforms, by their being tried, and by their investigation by committee. But when we are dealing with this question, I claim on behalf of the urban population of Canada that they are entitled before anything else to representation by population, and that the quality of citizenship is the basis of parliamentary government. It has been ignored in this country and ignored in some of the other commonwealths, and the first thing to do in our parliamentary system is to improve the system under which we select our members for this House. I would go further and would like to see a very much improved system in the selection of the Senate of this country.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate is always closed by the mover. If any other member wishes to address the House this is the time, because the mover will close the debate.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would like to draw the attention of the House to the difference in the form in which the resolution is introduced this year from the form in which it was introduced last year by the hon. member. The hon.

gentleman brought in a resolution last year which embraced both the alternative vote and proportional representation. I supported him at that time in his resolution, I intend to support him to-night in both resolutions, because I believe in the alternative vote and also in proportional representation.

An hon. MEMBER: How about representation by population?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, that, too. I must say I have been somewhat impressed by a line of comment which has been expressed in the course of the debate and in particular in a very direct and frank way by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) when he pointed out that in the minds of some hon. members of this House the introduction of proportional representation applicable only to one or two constituencies might create a sense of injustice with respect to the redistribution which we are now seeking to effect. Speaking for the government with respect to redistribution I wish to say we have only one object in view, and that is that the country generally shall be impressed with a sense of fairness and justice in that particular measure. I should be very sorry indeed to see injected into the present redistribution measure any phase which in any way would shake the confidence of a single group in the House in the government's sincerity in that particular. For that reason I am inclined to feel that there is a great deal of force in what has been said on both sides, that in introducing electoral reforms it is possibly wise to proceed one step at a time. The House has agreed on the first step which my hon. friend has proposed, that of the adoption of the alternative vote in certain constituencies. That is the natural course, it is a step which some hon. members apparently were not prepared to take, but are willing to acquiesce in. It will become a feature of our next electoral system. Having gone that far it would appear to be the part of wisdom for hon. gentlemen to consider whether taking the second step at this time is the wisest course. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no fear of the consequences as regards proportional representation being wholly in the interest of good government in the country.

I cannot agree with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition when he refers to proportional representation as being in any sense anti-British. Proportional representation is in force in several of the British dominions at the present time, and how he can say it is anti-British I do not understand. The whole trend of British electoral reform has been to bring about a completer representation of the preponderating shades of public opinion in the country. It is representation of opinion that is being sought. If there is in any country a body of opinion strong enough to be able to gain a majority support at the polls in any contest it seems to me obvious it is in the interests of good government that such opinion should find expression on the floor of parliament where questions are discussed according to constitutional usage, rather than that it should be left to rancour under a sense of injustice at being unable to find expression in a constitutional way, and as a consequence be led possibly to resort to extreme measures to gain expression. I believe proportional representation will help to give to holders of all shades of opinion a feeling that at least they have had opportunity to gain expression for their views in the House of Commons.

I do not agree with my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that because there may be half a dozen or twenty different shades of opinion seeking expression at the time of a general election it necessarily follows that the number of groups is going to be increased in parliament. The only persons to be elected under proportional representation will be those who receive a majority of the votes cast for the candidates entitled to be elected. The candidates who represent opinions that are very much in the minority are simply dropped out. They come in at the end of the race and are let go; they do not, however, feel that they have been entirely worsted in the struggle, because it is conceivable that their second choices or third choices may be for one or other of the successful candidates.

My own view is that in a general election held under this system in our country as it is at present one would find that the old traditional political parties, those which represent what is called the Conservative and Liberal attitudes respectively, by whatever names you may care to call them,—the two traditional attitudes which have existed towards public questions at all times in the past, and will exist at all times in the future, regardless of designations—that those two traditional parties will in the main secure the largest proportion of the votes for their candidates. I am inclined to think that of the second choices it will be discovered that most will go to one or other of the great political parties, and going to one or other of the great political parties, I am inclined to think that as a result of an election under

proportional representation the House will take on more of the complexion it had under the old party system than it has even at the present time, where we have at least four groups in the House, whose members were elected not under proportional representation but under the existing system.

In a word, I wish simply to emphasize what I have already said, that I think my hon. friend was well advised in dividing the resolution of last year into two parts, making sure of one step, and giving hon. members of the House who were really anxious to support him in that step, an opportunity of doing so without being embarrassed in case they, perhaps, did not wish to go the length the second step implies. But believing, as I do, to quote an old political maxim, that "that form of government is best which doth actuate and dispose every part and member of the state to the common good," I feel that the system of proportional representation which is calculated to inspire that feeling in the great body of the electorate is a system which is British in every particular, and is along the line of electoral reform leading to a truer representation of the people in parliament, and as such, I desire to give it my support.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the mover of this resolution and of the members generally to just one aspect of proportional representation which seems to be unfair to the voter in that it impairs his franchise and reduces his voting power in constituencies described in the resolution as multi-member constituencies. For instance, let us take a constituency which has the right to elect four candidates and that those four positions are coequal, one is of no more importance than another. Yet, the elector in voting for those four can really give only one first vote; to the second, he gives a number 2 vote or half a vote; to the third, a third of a vote, and to the fourth a fourth of a vote. That is, the fourth man he votes for has not as much opportunity of being elected because of his vote as the man to whom he gave his number 1 vote, although, as I say, the positions are coequal, just as important and the elector has just as much right to vote for the fourth man as he has to vote for the first. I have not heard that point touched on by any of the advocates of proportional representation.

I am not in favour of passing this resolution in this House at the present time, if for no other reason than that the matter has never been submitted to the electorate. The members of this House were not sent here to introduce any such legislation. We have had no expression of opinion from the electorate of Canada as to whether or not they are in favour of proportional representation, and I do not think this House should take to itself this opportunity of putting upon the shoulders of the electorate this new system with its imperfections as they have been demonstrated to the House to-night, in preference to the old system. For that reason, I propose to-night to vote against the resolution, and I should like to hear the mover explain the point that I have called to his attention and to the attention of the House.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P. E. I.): Mr. Speaker, I want to get a matter concerning which I am in some doubt cleared up before I give a vote on this resolution. Supposing there are 100 votes in any single member constituency with three candidates running. One of them gets forty votes, and each of the other two gets thirty votes. Is it possible under this principle for one of the men who gets thirty votes to become the representative? Then, let us take a double constituency and say that there are four candidates running. Two of them get twenty-five votes each; one gets twenty votes, and the other gets thirty votes. Is it possible for the man who got twenty votes and one of the men who got twenty-five votes to become the representatives for that district?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES: And so on in like manner. If that is possible, it appears to me that in our effort to right an injustice, to correct a wrong, we would be doing a greater injustice. If that point can be cleared up to my satisfaction, I would, perhaps, feel like supporting this resolution. But, if that is the result, I do not see how I could vote for this resolution, because as I have already stated, it would appear to me that we would be doing a great injustice to the man who got the largest vote of the group.

Mr. J. F. WHITE (London): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the debate to-day, and I can understand how proportional representation might be advantageous in securing a more accurate expression of opinion in municipal matters. As has already been pointed out, in municipal affairs there are no political parties and very seldom great questions at issue, and the policies are generally outlined by individuals. I can therefore understand

how proportional representation might be of advantage in those cases.

The first thing we have to consider, without going into the pros and cons of the figures in connection with this question, is the matter of confusion in the minds of voters. Any system that we adopt must have the confidence of the people before we take it up very seriously. We must make sure that the people are certain that their votes will be treated with perfect fairness; that the man for whom they wish to vote will receive the count without undue manipulation. Not only that, but the voter must be thoroughly conversant as to how to mark his ballot and as to the procedure afterwards. Unless that is the case, then our people will not have the confidence that they should have in the system. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) has touched on a point that I think is very important, namely, that the public have not expressed any opinion at the polls whether they wish to elect their representatives in this fashion or not. It struck me that it would have been the part of wisdom for the government of this country to have found out in some way the feeling of the people in this regard.

Mr. HOEY: Does the hon. member not know that proportional representation is in both the Progressive platform and the Liberal platform, and that the majority of the members of this House were returned on that principle?

Mr. WHITE: I know there are a good many things in the Liberal platform, but I have not seen them come to fruition yet. Another matter is the delay, after voting takes place, before the results are announced. If four or five or six constituencies are grouped together, there will probably be fourteen or fifteen candidates. The result will be that the ballots will have to be counted several times, or perhaps some of our Progressive friends can figure out some more expeditious way of counting them. But so far as I can see, a great delay will occur, and it will probably be a week after the election before the results are announced. We have made one experiment to-day without very much consideration, and I would be sorry to see another one made without more consideration than it has so far received. If we are taking up this matter of proportional representation seriously, I think we should give it further consideration, and I would therefore move in amendment:

That this resolution be referred to a special committee, to be appointed by this House, for further consideration and report later in the present session.

[Mr. White.]

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Recently there was a recount of ballots in the last election that was held in the city I have the honour to represent, and of the 80,000 ballots cast in that election there was less than one-eighth of one per cent improperly marked,—as found by the learned judge of the county court. This, I think, every hon. member will admit is proof that the present system is as just and equitable a system as one could devise, and one that does not seem to leave much room for improvement. Now, it has been my privilege to act for a considerable time as president of the Union of Canadian Municipalities, and I can assert that there has been no demand on the part of the people of Ontario for legislation such as is now proposed. It is one of the principles for which the United Farmers of Ontario stand, that before any far-reaching legislation of this character is proposed in parliament it should be submitted to a vote of the people; and hon. gentlemen of the Progressive party are now violating that principle. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the motions which hon. members of that party have seen fit to introduce in this House since the present session began provide a sufficient reason for the total abolition of private members' day.

Recently I attended a meeting of the council of the county of York, which comes within the constituency represented by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King); and I can assure the House that there is more solid work done in one afternoon and evening by that county council than has been accomplished in this House during the past three weeks, most of which time has been wasted by the Progressives, who indulge in the discussion of a lot of academic questions that have no practical import. The more they talk the more evident is their lack of knowledge; and the less they know the more they talk. If the Progressives in this House would only stand up and advocate something for the working classes, if they would only make practical suggestions as to how the poorer classes are to get coal to warm their houses, if they would only do something to reduce the high cost of living, it would be to very much better purpose than for them to worry the government. And goodness knows every government to-day, Dominion, provincial or municipal, has a hard time dealing with the problems that face it. As a distinguished member of the British House of Commons stated on one occasion, governments can do little without co-operation. I think my Progressive friends

ought at least to give the government a chance to get some work done instead of wasting the time of parliament discussing all sorts of academic theories.

The other day Mr. Gordon Waldron, a lawyer who draws about $21,000 from this so-called Farmers' government in Ontario, was invited to discuss the question of proportional representation in a Methodist church in Toronto. Let me tell my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good) that if the system which this gentleman was asked to expound, and which he is now proposing in this House, had been practised in the city I represent, which has a budget amounting to two or three times the budget of Ontario—between $34,000,000 and $35,000,000 per annum—instead of a thirty-mill tax rate the working classes would have to pay a rate of from 45 to 50 mills. That is what would happen under this system of proportional representation, which, after all, is nothing but a Yankee fad, which has been abandoned wherever it has been tried. If that system were in general operation in Ontario, it would tend to abolish public ownership, it would destroy the hydro-electric movement, it would mean a ten-cent fare on the street railways of Toronto, it would mean an increase in the water rates there, which are the cheapest in America today; and it would mean a deficit all along the line, because every fad would be put in the tax rate under this new system.

Now, with many of the principles advanced by the Progressive party, such as the public ownership of utilities, I agree. I am in accord with them on those things that tend to relieve the lot of the workingman. But I do not agree with the way my hon. friends try to do things in this House. The hon. member for Brant is good in deed as well as in name in a great many respects, but in this matter I think he is trying to accomplish something that is not in the interests of proper government. I believe in a low tax rate, but I do not think that you could secure it if you adopted proportional representation. Furthermore, proportional representation would create the group system of government, and I contend that such a system is not in the interests of the country. As Mr. Austin Chamberlain said in the British House of Commons once, you may criticise the party system as much as you like, but it has stood the test of time. No doubt it has its defects, and men may be actuated sometimes by political motives in the views they take on certain questions. And possibly in the present case the Progressive party may have an eye to votes in advocating this proposed legislation. But however much you criticise the party system, do not forget its virtues.

That system has proved the strength of representative government in the Mother Country; and in the province of Ontario, under the Conservative regime, it has given us the magnificent hydro-electric system which
10 pm. we have and which has meant a saving of 29,000,000 tons of coal to the people of that province between the years 1911 and 1921. The virtues of the party system more than compensate for any defects that may have become apparent in it in the course of time; and for every dollar spent under it by the Conservatives and the Liberals the so-called Farmers' government of Mr. Drury spend five dollars. Has that been representative government? No.

Well, Mr. Waldron, lawyer for the U.F.O. took the platform, and this reverend gentleman—I forget his name—announced that Mr. Waldron would speak on behalf of proportional representation. Mr. MacNicol of Parkdale, was to be opposed to him. Just here I may remark that the hon. Minister of Finance says that he very regretfully supports this motion. He is a gentleman who is respected by everybody, high and low, rich and poor, and I thought we could look to him for leadership in this matter. Well, what does Mr. Waldron say about proportional representation. I quote from the *Globe* report:—

> Mr. Waldron began by extolling the U.F.O. government—

No doubt it meant a very good thing for him. He got $21,000 a year out of it, from that brilliant little attorney general.

> —and expressed the opinion that it would be a calamity if it were not returned to power again.

Not one chance in a hundred of its being returned to power again. It is like our friends the Progressives in the House here; they can discuss academic questions, but when it comes to something of a practical nature for the working classes, what have they done? I have sat in this House for two sessions as the representative of a large municipality, and I have not heard one motion brought down by hon. members of the Progressive party for the benefit of the working classes. The report says further:—

> "There is nothing in the world the U.F.O. is not thinking about for your welfare," he told those assembled in the hall, much to their apparent bewilderment. It had been rumored, however, that the U.F.O. would favour the enactment of proportional representation, but he sincerely hoped they would not. The government in Queen's Park had won public favour to retain power, or to elect candidates in a city of such high ideals as were possessed by Toronto.

Then he goes on to say:—

If I were the Prime Minister I would not resort to proportional representation, even if my government were condemned to opposition.

Of course, he is prime minister de facto if not de jure.

The report goes on:—

Whether he was speaking as the mouthpiece of the U.F.O. or not, he did not state, but charged that all this agitation for the P.R. system had originated with the Liberal party in Ontario which, despairing of displacing the present party in power, sought this tricky means of squeezing in between the U.F.O. and Conservatives, while using the former as a tool to put it over. Then, turning his attention to the merits of proportional representation, he said it was totally opposed to the interests of the public. He had a profound respect for long established forms of public action and expression and would not want to see anything to break them down. What he was saying might have been called toryism ten years ago, but when he saw the lack of respect for social and established order now to be witnessed on every hand, he naturally became conservative in viewpoint, although not in the political meaning of the term, as the disrespect, if allowed to continue, would set up and arouse the mob spirit. It was for this reason that he opposed P.R. Under the present government in Queen's Park, the lunatics, wise men, lawyers and the various professions and occupations were well taken care of, he continued without a smile.

These are the remarks of the gentleman who was put up by Mr. Drury to speak on behalf of proportional representation. The present system is a fair system. What mandate have the Progressives to bring down this motion? What mandate have the government to adopt it? Has there been any vote of the people on the question? Was it discussed in North York? I attended five or six meetings in North York and I never heard the matter mentioned. What mandate has the hon. member for Brant to deal with the matter in this way? I was in his constituency, in the city of Brantford, and I am sure the matter was never mentioned during the course of the election. As I understand it, it was one of the planks in the U.F.O. platform that before any legislation should be introduced with regard to the matter there should be a vote of the people.

I will give the House an idea of what the effect of the adoption of this principle would be upon the hydro-electric movement in Ontario. For some years I was a hydro-electric commissioner, and during that time application was made to the board by some of the workmen for increases in wages that the system could not stand. They urged that the Industrial Disputes Act should be invoked but it was found that it did not apply. I say it is going to mean a ten cent fare on our street cars and all the people will have to pay. The average light bill of the working classes in Toronto is only 90 cents a month, but any increase in the cost of running the hydro-electric arising out of these causes and loading up the system to pay for every fad will mean that rate will be multiplied by two or three. You will have deputations wanting this, that and the other thing and my contention is that under the proportional representation system the commissioners will not be able to oppose all these suggestions that are made and which add to the cost of operation.

We have $120,000,000 invested in public ownership in Toronto. If this proportional representation goes through, it will have a pronounced effect upon our bond transactions. In the city I come from we used to sell our municipal bonds by private tender, giving the business to a broker, but when I became a representative on the treasury board I changed the system to that of calling for tenders, with the result that we got seventeen or twenty bids for about $17,000,000 worth of bonds. A leading banker said to me that if this system went through it would destroy the basis upon which the transactions connected with the bonded indebtedness of our municipalities are conducted, because no man will tender for bonds when he knows that the government of the day can change the hours of labour, can change the conditions of labour, can change all these things upon which the bond man figures when he is making his bid.

I want to point out to our friends the Progressives what that will mean. It is an unfortunate fact that in the province from which I come a large share of the burden of provincial debt is placed upon the municipalities. For example, the tax rate of Toronto includes 5 or 6 mills on the dollar of purely provincial responsibility, a tax placed by the province on the municipality. Consider all that the municipality has to maintain—registry offices, courthouses, hospitals—fixed charges, maintenance charges and so on on all of these; yet 5 or 6 mills on the dollar in Toronto alone go to meet what should be a purely provincial burden. Ontario spends a million and a quarter on education, on the public and separate schools in the province; the municipality of Toronto spends $12,000,000 on schools. When we consider all these things, when we think of all these fixed charges and the difficulties with which the municipality has to struggle, with its limited revenue and limited means of raising money, then we should pause and consider what the effect of the introduction of this system would be. When it comes to floating a loan for a bridge or something like that—

Mr. GOULD: I rise to a point of order, and it is that the hon. member is not discussing the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not confining himself strictly to the resolution. He is wandering a little away from the subject, but I must say that he is giving the House the benefit of his experience as to the application of the system of proportional representation. I have followed him as closely as I can, and in justice to him I must say that he is simply showing the House how the system in its application to municipal elections has proven a failure. I would ask him, however, in his further remarks to come closer to the resolution as submitted to the House.

Mr. CHURCH: I will come closer to the subject of the resolution. Let me ask the hon. member who has raised the point of order, has he or the Progressives made any of the working classes rich in this country? I would ask him further, does he propose to apply proportional representation to the election of directors of the grain growers, bank directors and elections generally? The hon. member and his friends sitting around him are very good at raising points of order and wasting the time of the House, but I can tell him that more business is done by York county council in one afternoon than has been done in this House for three weeks, for the time has been simply wasted by the Progressives bringing down academic resolutions, which have not the support of the municipalities. I challenge the hon. member to show that this question has ever been discussed by the Ontario municipalities. I was present at a municipal meeting last September and this question was on the order paper for discussion, but nobody was there. Did the farmers want it? No, nobody wanted it. I am not going to waste the time of the House as the Progressives have, worrying the ministers and the government all the time. Let us get down to business in this House, and the sooner this private members' day is abolished the better for the country.

Mr. GOOD: If there are no others who wish to speak, I should like to reply to some of the comments that have been made in the course of this debate, which has been very interesting to me. I find it very difficult to take some hon members seriously, but I shall try as best I can to believe that every one who participated in the debate spoke from the fulness of his heart.

The question seems to me to be a very important one, and I do not wish anyone to think that I encourage hasty action in a matter of this kind; but the subject has been before the country and before this House for many years, and surely we are in a position now to come to some conclusion in regard to the principle involved.

I would point out that the resolution does not ask for an unqualified endorsation of the principle. Personally I thoroughly believe in it. But surely if much is to be said for it, the least we can do is to give it a trial. We cannot adopt the system everywhere at once. We have to start somewhere, and although I quite agree with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the delimitation of the constituencies will no doubt be a thorny problem, that is a problem we can tackle when the time comes. We have to make a start somewhere, and if we do not do anything to-day the committee will never wrestle with the problem. We shall make no progress, and shall probably have to wait until after the next census is taken. So I think this is a very opportune time for taking some few steps in the direction of this reform.

I wish first to answer the question put by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) as to whether under this system a candidate who did not receive a majority on the first count could be elected on the final count. Undoubtedly that could happen. Perhaps I can best illustrate the point by referring to the case which he put, where one man gets forty votes, another thirty and another say twenty-five. Now supposing that all the twenty-five electors that voted for the third man as their first choice preferred the second man as their second choice, and that when the third man was eliminated those twenty-five votes were transferred to the man who had thirty votes on the first count. That would give him fifty-five. Does the hon. member say that that man should not be elected over the man who received only forty votes? It seems to me we must regard a second choice as practically equivalent to a first choice. The same question was raised by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) as to the relative values of first and second choices. Now if you consider the meaning of first and second choices, it seems to me that you must recognize their equality. What does it mean when a man records his second choice? It means that if his first choice has no chance of being elected, or has a surplus, the elector wishes his vote to be transferred. If hon. members will get the idea of a transferred vote, it will be apparent that that vote ought to be given equal recognition with the first choice.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the hon. member say that the fifth and sixth choices were equal to the first choice, according to his reasoning?

Mr. GOOD: I think that they would be so. In the event of the first, second, third and

fourth choices not standing any chances of election, I think the elector's fifth choice ought to have recognition. But in actual practice there would be very, very few cases of this sort. It has been pointed out already in the course of this debate that in actual practice where the system has been in operation the candidates who have come out on top on the first count are those who are generally elected finally, and one hon. gentleman in discussing the subject asked why, if the first count showed the wishes of the electors, we should adopt proportional representation and have further counts. My answer is this: We have to have a multi-member constituency any way to get our first count. If we go that far, why not go a little further and be quite sure that every elector's preferences are given recognition? It only means a little more work on the count, no more work for the elector, and just a little more time. Therefore if we have to go so far, might we not go a little farther.

The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) made a statement which I submit was quite erroneous when he alleged that under this system an elector in a four-member constituency had four votes. Now that is quite a mistake. Under the system which is proposed, an elector in a multi-member constituency has only one vote but it is transferable according to his own instructions.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) dealt with a number of apparent difficulties in the working out of this scheme, and I would like to reply to some of the points which he raised. He alleged that the individual representative really tries to represent his constituents. Now I submit that in matters of policy, in large questions, the individual representative of the majority cannot represent the minority in his constituency; it is absolutely impossible. I do not deny that he may represent certain local interests. He may answer the correspondence of his constituents, he may look after a number of matters of a local character, but in regard to the major questions of policy which divide the parties it is absolutely impossible, no matter how much he desires it, for him to represent accurately the opinions of those from whom he differs; and if we are going to accurately represent the various bodies of opinion, we must depart from majority representation and have some other system; and proportional representation, I think, is the best.

Now with respect to the allegation made by the hon. member that this scheme would reduce parliament to the status of a municipal council, I do not know whether to take that statement as a compliment or not. I do not know that a municipal council, so far as its discussions are concerned, deserves to be derided. I do not know that there is anything particularly contemptible about the methods of a municipal council, and I would suggest that, perhaps, it would be a good thing for this parliament if we could get rid of our party alignments and discuss every question on its merits. Personally I would like to see hon. members free themselves more from party affiliations, and let us approach every matter as we see it from our own standpoint and the standpoint of those we represent. I think in that way we would arrive at saner conclusions, and conclusions that would be better for the country.

The hon. member confuses also, as so many have done to-night, majority rule with majority representation. Now, there is nobody who does not agree with the policy of majority rule, that necessarily democratic principle. But we do not agree with the policy and practice of majority representation. As the Minister of Finance has pointed out, the province of Nova Scotia has had only majority representation in federal affairs for many years. That is not in the interests of Nova Scotia, or in the interests of Canada.

I may also state that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre has got rather sadly mixed up in his elucidation or attempted elucidation of the method of counting. I do not like to weary the House with the correction of what he said in that respect, but I submit—because I know the facts and I know the methods—that he has got seriously confused and that the difficulties and unfairnesses which he alleged in respect to the transfer of the surplus votes, and the transfer of the votes of those who were eliminated at the bottom of the poll, do not exist.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend be good enough to correct my error? I propounded what my hon. friend considers an error and as he states that he knows I would like him to correct it.

Mr. GOOD: I would be only too glad to go into this matter. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to deal with just one point, as I do not wish to devote much time at this late hour to discussing a question of this sort. I will deal with one point where the hon. member made a mistake. In the distribution of the surplus we do not take the ballots that are left over in an arbitrary manner. Supposing, for instance, the quota is

201,—I think that was the figure that was mentioned,—and a candidate has, say, 300 votes on the first count. Then 99 votes constitute the surplus and they are to be distributed. Now, we do not take 99 ballots by chance and distribute them. We find out by examining all of the ballots what the preferences of those 300 electors are, and then we divide the 99 in the same proportion.

Mr. STEVENS: That is exactly what I said myself. Will my hon. friend now follow the first man that drops out?

Mr. GOOD: Well, I seriously misunderstood the hon. gentleman if that is what he said. With respect to the first man who drops out—and others who drop out—the procedure is simply this, that all his ballots are divided amongst those candidates that are left, according to the preferences expressed on them. I cannot see what else you can do. The voter himself authorizes the returning officer to transfer his vote in a certain way and what else can we do, if we are going to be fair and honest with the elector, but transfer his vote according to his own instructions?

Mr. ANDERSON: Is it not a fact that there are quite a number of second choices not counted at all? You do not count second choices on men who are dropping out? That is not fair.

Mr. GOOD: It is not a fact that there are many votes that are not recognized. If an elector neglects to express any preferences, then of course you cannot recognize his preferences because you do not know what they are. But unless an elector omits to express his preferences, his preferences are recognized as far as possible. There may be, when you approach the last few counts, a few votes which are, perhaps, not given recognition.

Mr. ANDERSON: Let me ask another question: Take any single-member constituency where there are three candidates. The low candidate would be counted out and his second choices would be given to the others. What becomes of the second choices of the first and the second candidates? They are not apportioned at all.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. gentleman's question has reference to the alternative vote in a single member constituency. What need have you to consider the second and third choices of the man who is elected on the first count?

Mr. ANDERSON: Why are you talking about second choices?

Mr. GOOD: Supposing three candidates, one man is elected on the first count. There are certain second choices on the ballots—

Mr. ANDERSON: I am not talking about a man who is elected, I am talking about three candidates, none of them being elected on the first choice.

Mr. GOOD: There is absolutely no use in a case like that of distributing the second or third choices of the man who is on top. You have three candidates running in a single-member constituency; you have your first count which shows one man to be lowest. Whom can you eliminate but that one man, and distribute his votes between the other two? Then on the second count one of the two remaining candidates comes out ahead. I fear I have not understood the hon. gentleman's question, if that is not the point.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What is the hon. gentleman's opinion about representation by population?

Mr. GOOD: That is another question and a very important one, but I prefer not to discuss it to-night, as we have enough to discuss already.

With respect to the address of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) I want to commend him for the moderation of his criticism of proportional representation. He did make a worth while contribution to the debate. Perhaps I cannot express the same commendation of some of his other remarks, but his contribution to the discussion of this particular question was, I think, quite worth while. I should like to discuss a few of his points. But let me just in passing state that I do not think any of us here care very much about party labels, whether it is a Conservative-Liberal party or a Liberal-Conservative party. What we are interested in is progressive policies and progressive legislation. The right hon. gentleman stated that in his opinion we got the best result out of parliamentary government when it was party government. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one might believe that, without disapproving or disbelieving in an improved method of electing representatives. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, and as I could substantiate by a good deal of evidence, the system of proportional representation does not lead to the formation of groups, or the multiplication of groups, but rather the reverse, as I hope to point out in a few minutes.

I would like to mention also another point which the right hon. gentleman raised, that

there would be an undue emphasis placed upon the personality of the candidate. Honestly I cannot understand why that should be so. I do not think it has been so in the Winnipeg election, or wherever proportional representation has been tried. The personality of the candidate is always a factor in every election, and I think it ought to be a factor, but why it should be a greater factor under proportional representation than under the present system I cannot for the life of me see. I was very glad indeed to note the admission by my hon. friend—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Permit me to make clear what I was saying. In connection with the elector's first choice, personality would have just the same effect as under the present system. His first choice would be based mainly on policy, speaking generally, somewhat influenced by personal preference, but after he has made his decision on matters of policy, nothing whatever remains to decide his course except minor questions, notably personality.

Mr. GOOD: That may be so, but why should we not, if we are going to be democratic, recognize the elector's own instructions? He may have his own reasons for voting for such and such a man as second choice, and such and such a man as third choice. Why should we handicap him in any way, preventing the free expression of his choice, no matter what his reasons may be?

Mr. McMASTER: In that case would it not be likely that the second choice would be in favour of a candidate of the same political faith, or nearly the same political faith, as the first choice was given to?

Mr. GOOD: The experience we have had would indicate that that is so. In that connection I may refer to an analysis I have here of the Winnipeg elections held last summer which would, perhaps, answer the question and other like questions which have been asked. I find that the Labour party had 16,328 votes or 36.84 per cent of the total. On the final count that party had 15,759 votes, or 37.69 per cent of the total vote. The percentage of representation which they secured was 40. I shall not weary the House by reading all the figures, but on the final count the Liberal party had 25.24 per cent of the total vote and secured 20 per cent of the representation. The Conservative party had 19.27 per cent and secured 20 per cent of the representation. The independent parties had 9.64 per cent and secured 10 per cent of the representation. The Progressive party had 8.16 per cent and secured 10 per cent of the representation. So that this last election in Winnipeg shows very conclusively that that first count does give a very definite indication—

Mr. CARROLL: What election is the hon. gentleman speaking of?

Mr. GOOD: The Winnipeg election of last summer.

Mr. CARROLL: The civic election?

Mr. GOOD: No; the provincial elections. The first count does give a very good indication of what the final count will be and in the case under consideration there is a very remarkable accuracy in the representation. One hon. member stated with reference to the Winnipeg election in 1920 that it was not accurate, and that it did not secure what it aimed at. I will admit there is some justification for that comment, but the hon. gentleman must remember that in that election a good many independents ran; none of them got very much support. They were practically all eliminated, so that while the total vote of a dozen or so of independent candidates was considerable, yet when you divided that up amongst the dozen each received very few votes, and they were practically all eliminated. That accounted for the fact referred to that there was a very considerable vote classed as independent in the Winnipeg election that did not secure any representation at all.

May I suggest that the log-rolling practices referred to by the right hon. gentleman and which I think we all admit to be pernicious, are no more likely under conditions where there are several groups in the House than they are under the two party system. You always have the possibility of that sort of thing within the parties as well as between the parties, and there is no necessary relationship between the existence of log-rolling practices and proportional representation. Even if I were to admit, which I do not, that log-rolling is more likely to happen with several groups in the House than with two parties, it would not follow that the system of proportional representation would lead to log-rolling.

The right hon. gentleman has also stated that legislators in parliament must vote yea and nay, and that it would be very embarrassing for representatives from a number of groups to decide yea or nay with respect to any question. I really do not see the point. Take the situation as you have it here now. There are four groups in this House—three considerable groups. There are questions arising from time to time. We all have to make up our

minds whether we shall vote yea or nay, and I do not see that the situation will be a bit different if we have four or five groups here. We always have to come to a decision for or against any particular question.

Mr. CARROLL: Would it not be nice to bring proportional representation right into this House on the various questions that come up?

Mr. GOOD: I do not understand just what the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. CARROLL: If you do not like the way you vote "yea" first, you can vote "yea" and "nay" on the next.

Mr. GOOD: I must confess I do not see the point.—

Mr. CARROLL: That is not my fault.

Mr. GOOD: There is no case here of first and second choices. If we had a middle course to pursue, we might possibly devise some system of voting with first choice and second choice. but if we have to decide a question either for or against, there is no opportunity to apply the idea.

With respect to the statement made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as to the injustice of the isolated application of this principle, may I point out again as I pointed out last year, with an abundance of evidence, the serious injustice resulting from our present system. I admit quite freely and fully that you are not going to have correct representation by adopting proportional representation only in a few sections of the country; but it is not feasible to adopt it suddenly in all parts of the country.

Mr. MANION: Does the hon. member not consider that there are parts of Ontario, for example, northern Ontario, where it is absolutely impossible ever to apply proportional representation because of the immense area and the sparse population? While I am on my feet, may I ask another question? Supposing you group five or six or seven constituencies together, as you do under proportional representation, does that not give to the rich man, the man with immense amounts of money, very great advantage over the poor man owing to the rich man's ability to reach, by circularizing and various other methods, all parts of the group constituency?

Mr. GOOD: Answering the second question first, I do not see that the rich man, under those conditions, would have any greater opportunity of impressing the voters than he has at the present time. In fact, if any reference is suggested to bribery—

Mr. MANION: No.

Mr. GOOD: —the present system operates very unfairly, because there is a section of the electorate that is corruptible and under the present system the influence of that small section in turning the scale may be very considerable.

Mr. MANION: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman; but may I elaborate the question for a moment in order to make my point clear? The poor man could not afford to circularise four or five constituencies, or to get workers in those constituencies, whereas he might afford to do that in one constituency as at the present time, whereas, the rich man could hire workers for all the constituencies.

Mr. GOOD: I think I dealt with this matter pretty fully last year. I am sorry many members were not present. I showed last year that under proportional representation one does not need to canvass or to reach everybody in a constituency, in fact the labour of canvassing is reduced. I showed that mathematically. I do not wish to go into the question again now as the hour is late, but under the system of proportional representation the individual candidate does not need to reach as many of the electorate as he does at the present time.

Mr. STEVENS: Therefore, if he was elected, he would not represent the views of as many.

Mr. GOOD: Practically as many as at the present time. There would be very little difference in that respect. In fact there is not a great deal of difference, but the advantage is slightly in favour of proportional representation with respect to the number of the electors that have to be reached. I might state also that the labour of canvassing and of sending out circulars and so forth can be distributed amongst a number, can be undertaken by the party. I understand that in Ottawa, where two members were elected by the block vote, not by the single transferable vote, the literature in the last election was got out jointly and the expense shared in that way. The expense attaching to attending meetings and things like that could also be shared by a number of people interested in a particular party.

The point I was making was that we had to start somewhere some time, if we were going to make any progress, and I submit that the method which the resolution proposes is about as fair, reasonable and sensible as anything that could be suggested to get a start. Just in that connection, I should like

to point out that the recommendation of the Speaker's Conference in Great Britain was very similar to the recommendation which I have made in this resolution. It went, however, considerably further, and when the final arrangements were made, there were, I think, one hundred different constituencies in which it was proposed that this system should be carried out. But unfortunately, through some difficulty to which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred, in the delimitation of the constituencies, this method did not operate in the last election in Great Britain.

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon. member not consider it unfair that suburban members should force this device on city members, knowing that proportional representation can never be established in the country owing to its extensive districts and, that, therefore, it will be continued and applicable only in the cities? Is it not unfair to distribute an electoral process of that kind in that manner?

Mr. GOOD: I fancy that there are in Toronto, for instance, many electors who consider the present situation decidedly unfair to them. We have to recognize that, and I do not think we ought to assume that a city or any other section is opposed to proportional representation. Possibly we have not had a referendum on this matter in any particular constituency or group of constituencies; but I know for a fact that there are many who are exceedingly discontented and restless under the present system, who are discouraged because they can get no representation, and who consider the case practically hopeless. We ought to consider them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why not ask for a referendum first?

Mr. GOOD: I neglected to answer one of the questions asked by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) as to the difficulty of applying proportional representation in sparsely settled areas. I dealt with that pretty fully last year. It has not proven particularly difficult in South Africa or in some of the Australian countries; but I think we can cross that bridge when we come to it. I am not asking for that now. The difficulty may not be so great as we imagine it to be. This at least can be said, that in western Canada there are for federal purposes a number of constituencies much larger than, perhaps, a dozen constituencies in rural western Ontario. I do not think it would be a very serious difficulty in the part of Ontario from which I come to group four or five of the present constituencies and poll the votes throughout that whole territory.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince): By what means can you get the different constituencies to agree to a candidate that would be elected? For instance, one constituency will choose a man; the neighbouring constituency might not tolerate that man at all, and still he might be forced upon it.

Mr. GOOD: As a matter of fact, I think that question is answered by the way in which it works out in such a case as the city of Winnipeg. As a rule, nominations are made by organisations, and I take it that the method would not be different under proportional representation. For example, the four parties, the Conservative party, the Liberal party, the Progressive party and the Labour party, would take the initiative in the nominating of candidates for that particular multi-member constituency. There may be some little difficulty in changing from one system to another; we always have some awkwardness in changing methods. But when a great good is to be gained, we should not be paralyzed by a little difficulty such as the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Maclean) mentions.

I desire to say a word or two with respect to the criticisms of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson). I have already replied to his comment on the Winnipeg elections of 1920. He states further that proportional representation means the breaking up of parties and the formation of groups. I challenge that statement directly and emphatically. We have our groups at the present time; our parties are breaking up, altogether apart from any method of election. The hon. member also confuses majority rule with majority representation. Moreover I would point out that we do not by any means always get majority rule under the old system. Let me give one example which I referred to last year and which comes to mind at the moment. In the state of Indiana a few years ago the Republican party was split up into the old guard and the Progressives, and that party secured absolutely no representation. They had a large majority of the total vote but they secured no representation at all. At the next election, when the two factions in the party had become reunited, the Republican party secured all the representation. That is the sort of thing that happens under the present system. There was minority rule with a vengeance.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is not the object of proportional representation to give representation to the minority?

Mr. GOOD: Certainly, the object is to give proper representation to minorities, but we give a sort of representation to minorities under the present system. When a minority becomes sufficiently influential it may get undue representation; that is the trouble. For instance, we have it in Ontario at the present time. I admit frankly that the Farmers are unduly represented in the provincial legislature at Toronto, and I do not think it is a wholesome thing. For a long time the farmers were not fairly represented and then suddenly they became unfairly represented. Under the old system the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other.

Mr. ANDERSON: Will not the new system lead to more groups?

Mr. GOOD: It has been alleged to-night by a number of hon. members that proportional representation will tend to multiply groups. I have considerable evidence to the contrary on that point. Here is a little item from the report of a royal commission appointed in 1910 by the British government to inquire into electoral systems. With regard to the Tasmanian elections the report states:

> On that occasion, the general election of 1909, when the transferable vote was used for the first time to elect the whole of the lower house, the actual result was to evolve a two-party out of a former three-party system by the elimination of the third party and the coalescence of groups into one more or less solid party of opposition to the Labour party.

Here too is a little press despatch from Zurich, in Switzerland, published in the Quebec Chronicle of December 16 last.

> It lies in the very nature of the system of proportional representation that once adopted it tends to stablize the party forces in Parliament and to prevent fundamental political changes as the consequence of parliamentary elections. In that regard it is significant that, in Switzerland the proportional system as a means of just representation of the minority parties took ground for the first time in the canton Ticino after the revolutionary events of 1890.

Experience has shown the stabilizing effect of this reform. I have other evidence to show that in the Australasian countries as well as in Europe there has been a tendency on the part of a number of groups to coalesce into larger parties. I submit that where you have five members to be elected in a multi-member constituency it is absurd for any party which represents, say, only one-twentieth of the voting strength of the constituency to nominate a slate. They cannot possibly expect any success, although they might nominate one with the hope that he would receive some transferred votes. But experience,
11 p.m. which is extensive to-day, shows that this fear of the splitting up of parties into groups, and of groups into smaller groups is quite groundless. I do not wish to take up the time of the House going further into these matters, but there are one or two other remarks I would make before closing. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) advanced the opinion that in an election under proportional representation the issues were forgotten and that personalities were unduly emphasized. I submit that in the case of the Winnipeg elections that statement cannot be substantiated at all. I have here the facts of the election of last summer. In that election there were five different groups represented, Labour, Liberal, Conservative, Independent and Progressive. Each party no doubt had a fairly definite platform; the issues were fairly well defined.

Mr. McMURRAY: Does the hon. member find the name of one Downs in that list? Does he know what his platform was?

Mr. GOOD: The names are not on this page.

Mr. McMURRAY: Did Downs not run on a separate platform, a platform of his own?

Mr. GOOD: That may be so; I do not know the details of the Winnipeg election. I know, however, that there are not very many in Winnipeg who are dissatisfied with the system as it has worked there. I have a number of quotations from influential men in public life in Manitoba commenting favourably on the election of 1920, and they have all, without a single exception, endorsed the system as it was tried there in the first election. As to the second election, although the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) might disapprove of certain candidates, I have no doubt at all that the wishes of the electors were very fully recognized.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) asked me some questions during the afternoon which I would like to answer. I do not see any connection between the question of the unity and the joint responsibility of the Cabinet and the method of electing members to this House. The groups are here, and the problem arising therefrom must be dealt with. But I see no connection between the advantage—or disadvantage, as you may look upon it—of cabinet unity and cabinet responsibility and a method of election.

There were some other points that I wished to deal with, but I think the House is getting tired and that I should forbear. I should like, however, without discussing it, to mention just one point in conclusion. No criticism was offered this afternoon respecting the difficulty of holding by-elections under propor-

tional representation. I dealt with the point last year, and since then another suggestion has been made of a sixth method of meeting the situation. Nobody need be afraid of adopting proportional representation on account of any apparent difficulty in carrying on a by-election.

I appreciate the point raised by the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister in regard to the alternative vote, but I did not know when this resolution was placed on the order paper that that point would be gained. I am thankful indeed that we have got so far, but I should like to see an expression of opinion on the part of the House with regard to this question of proportional representation also because if we are going to make any headway during the next few years, this is the time to start.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to take the vote, might I be allowed to ask the hon. members to assist as much as possible the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk in their heavy task when the vote is being polled in the House. The first one to vote generally, according to the custom followed in this House and the British House of Commons, is the leader of a party or the leader of a group, then his followers on the first row rise, one by one, not all at one time. I would ask hon. members to assit the clerks by having the vote taken in as orderly a way as possible.

The House divided on the resolution of Mr. Good, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Brethen,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Carmichael,
Chevrier,
Coote,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Drummond,
Elliott (Dundas),
Evans,
Fansher,
Fielding,
Forke,
Forrester,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Good,
Gordon,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Hoey,
Hudson,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston (Last Mountain)
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Leader,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Maclean (York),
McGiverin,
McMaster,
McTaggart,
Milne,
Morin,
Motherwell,
Murdock,
Neill,
Papineau,
Pritchard,
Reed,
Robb,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Savard,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Thurston,
Wallace,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—72.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Archambault,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Benoit,
Binette,
Black (Yukon),
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bowen,
Boys,
Cannon,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Clifford,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Duff,
Fafard,
Finn,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Gendron,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Grimmer,
Harris,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Kay,
King (Kootenay),
Ladner,
Lapierre,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McIsaac,
McKenzie,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marler,
Martell,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Munro,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Porter,
Power,
Preston,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Roberge,
Robitaille,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
White—90.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Tuesday, February 20, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): With the consent of the House I desire to move that the Auditor General's Report for the year 1921-1922 be referred to the standing committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE HON. JAMES A. STEWART

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received this day a letter from Mrs. Stewart conveying to the House her sincere thanks for the sympathy expressed in her deep sorrow.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE COLONEL BAKER. M.P.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) moved:

That the following members of parliament, to wit: Messrs. Ross (Kingston), Boivin, Kay and Mewburn be appointed a special committee to act with a like committee of the Senate in further considering and determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieut.-Col. Baker, M.P., who lost his life on the field of battle, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: By Rule 40 this would require two days' notice, but I suppose it is moved by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP

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

That the name of J. A. Clark be taken from the list of members comprising the standing committee on Mines and Minerals and that that of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen be inserted in lieu thereof, and that the name of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen be taken from the Banking and Commerce Committee and that of J. A. Clark be inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 22, to amend the Companies Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GERMAN: If hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to read the bill, it would not be necessary for me to explain it. It is to amend the Mining Companies Act in order to allow mining companies to pay dividends out of capital. At first blush that would seem to be not quite a proper thing to do, but the matter has been inquired into and the law officers of the Crown have decided that this is quite a proper act to pass. It has been thought that companies whose property has depreciated through the taking of wealth out of the ground should be allowed under certain circumstances, which are safeguarded in this bill, to pay dividends out of capital. Prior to doing that, they must satisfy the althorities that they have ample assets to pay all their liabilities.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN WINNIPEG

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): I wish to make inquiry of the government concerning the unemployment situation in the city of Winnipeg. I am in receipt, as I believe also are the other representatives of Winnipeg constituencies, of a communication from the mayor of Winnipeg enclosing a letter written by him on the 15th of February to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), together with a copy of a resolution passed by the city council. It purports to state that an order in council—No. 220—was passed by the government, in which the government undertook, under an arrangement made last year at the Unemployment conference, to make provision for one-third of the relief that would be granted to the city under certain circumstances and after investigation. This order in council, I believe, dealt only with the case of ex-service men. The resolution in question, which I understand was sent to the Minister of Labour showed, that in Winnipeg at the present time the unemployment relief office is looking after 6,181 unemployed, which would mean that 1,500 would be taken care of under the assistance granted by the government. I am instructed to make inquiry of the government what attitude they purpose taking in connection with this demand for further assistance from the city of Winnipeg.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, during the month of December representations came from the Prime Ministers of Manitoba and British Columbia, to ascertain what the purpose of the federal government was to be this winter relative to the conditions of unemployment that were alleged to exist. After very careful consideration of the unemployment problem as it seemed to exist generally in Canada, it was determined by the government that it would be unnecessary to adopt any general unemployment relief scheme such as had been in effect during the two preceding winters, and on December 22, a telegram was sent to the Prime Ministers of Manitoba and British Columbia indicating the view of this government on the subject. From that telegram the following, which evidences the position of the government, is taken:

Information reaching the federal government does not lead to the view that any situation exists at the present time which is at all comparable to that prevailing during the two last preceding winters.

The situation, therefore, as it appears to the federal authorities, is not one which justifies action on their part in assuming at present any portion of the obligations falling customarily to the municipal and provincial authorities.

That information was conveyed to the mayors of a number of cities east and west that had also inquired what the attitude of the federal government was to be during the present winter. During the past thirty days, certain deputations waited upon the government, and representations were made indicating that in certain municipalities in Canada there was a condition of unemployment particularly affecting returned men, that the municipal and provincial authorities had taken no action to alleviate, the result being that in those municipalities relief bodies had been formed composed of returned soldier organizations, charitable organizations, and other welfare societies, with, in some cases, representatives from the municipal authorities on these bodies. It was believed that in such cases it might be advisable for the federal government to assist such organizations formed in that way. The result was that Order in Council No. 220 was passed on the recommendation of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. This order provides that in the case of unemployed ex-service men requiring relief, and not being in a position to secure proper assistance from municipal or provincial authorities but obtaining aid only from the organizations to which I have just referred, the federal government would participate to the extent of paying one-third of the disbursements incurred since January 1, 1923. That, in brief, is the position that has been taken up to the present time, and there does not appear to be any necessity whatever for changing the general policy as applicable to the entire Dominion. I am not clear at the moment whether Winnipeg, under Order in Council No. 220, will be able to participate in any way whatsoever, or to secure any assistance from the federal government.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the date of that order in council?

Mr. MURDOCK: The order is dated 5th February.

Mr. STEVENS: It is retroactive to 1st January, is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister place the order in council on the Table to-day. This is the first information that I personally have had about it.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will be very glad to do that.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It will be remembered that on this question of unemployment the premier last year accepted, and the House passed, a resolution to this effect:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask with regard to the resolution in question whether the government proposes, during this session, to bring down any measure which will implement the opinion expressed by this House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not heard the resolution, I do not know just what its terms are.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I can make my position clearer if I read the resolution which was passed by the House on 24th April, last year:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment with which the municipalities and provinces find themselves unable to cope, it is desirable that the federal government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation.

My question is, does the government propose to bring down at this session of the House some measure which will implement the resolution which was passed by this House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In reply to my hon. friend I may say that the present view of the government, in regard to the matter to which he has just referred, is that it cannot be met in the most effective way by legislation. There have been conferences between the federal government and the provinces which, I hope, will have the result of implementing, in large measure, what is mentioned in the resolution, but the government does not contemplate legislation at the present session.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of bill No. 15, to re-adjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

CONVENTION OF COMMERCE WITH FRANCE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee on the following proposed resolution.

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide that a certain convention of commerce dated the fifteenth day of December, in the year one thousand

nine hundred and twenty-two, entered into at Paris by Plenipotentiaries appointed by His Majesty and by the President of the French Republic be approved, and to give effect to the provisions of the said convention.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: The best customer for the surplus products of Canada is the Mother Country, and I have no doubt it will continue to be so. Next to the Mother Country in the volume of our trade is the great republic to the south of us. I have no doubt that, even in the face of the adverse tariff conditions existing to-day, we shall still do a large volume of trade with that country. In comparison with the large figures of the United States and Great Britain our trade with other countries is not great, and I confess that in the present state of European affairs I do not look for any large development of our trade with any European country. Nevertheless, it will be felt, I am sure, by the House, that we should have a watchful eye upon the trade conditions of these countries, and make an effort to obtain the best available terms for the products of Canada, even though the trade to be anticipated may not be very large. In the earlier years of our Dominion our trade with France, as well as the trade with other countries, was carried on under the operation of old British treaties. Some of those treaties are still in operation. Thirty years ago it was deemed desirable that we should have a special arrangement with France. Indeed it is an interesting fact that the only foreign country with which up to the present time we have made a commercial treaty is France. We are now making a treaty with Italy, but up to the present time our only trade treaty with a foreign country is with France. Our first treaty was made in 1893. In every treaty that has been made with France, the British ambassador at Paris has been associated with the Canadian representatives. I am safe in saying that the British ambassador has always recognized the fact that the business was Canadian and has left the negotiation of the treaty to a Canadian representative. I have no doubt that was the case in the early treaty with which I had no connection, in the days of Lord Dufferin. But I can testify that has been the case in the years in which I have had some knowledge of such transactions. In the treaty with which I had something to do, as far back as 1907 and 1908, we had the association of the British ambassador of that day, Sir Francis Bertie, afterwwards Lord Bertie, now dead. In the recent negotiations we had the pleasure of being associated with the British Ambassador at Paris, Lord Hardinge of Penshurst. I want to testify that in the case of both these negotiations the Canadian representative at all times received from the ambassadors the most cordial sympathy and co-operation. The first treaty was signed in 1893 by Sir Charles Tupper. I am not mentioning the British ambassador, because he was associated in each case. In 1907 a treaty was negotiated by the present Mr. Justice Brodeur and myself. In 1908 a supplementary treaty was negotiated by myself, to make good a defect that had been found in the earlier treaty. In 1921 a treaty was signed by Sir George Foster as Minister of Trade and Commerce. In the treaty which I now present to the House the signers were my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) and myself. I again say that in all the negotiations the British ambassador was associated with the Canadian representative, and in all cases the British ambassador gave his cordial co-operation. The negotiation was conducted and controlled entirely by Canada's representatives.

The two treaties of 1907 and 1908 remained in force for a number of years and a considerable volume of trade was developed under them. On 10th September, 1918, France gave a general notice to terminate her commercial treaties. In that case I am sure there was no particular intention to legislate against Canada or against any other country. It was the aim of the French government to have freedom of negotiation in regard to commercial affairs, in view of the new situations that were arising. Notice was given to Canada in consequence of that general determination of the French government. Later the French government agreed to continue the treaty for a further time, changing the period of notice required for its termination. In the treaties previously existing, which they were proposing to terminate, the condition was that they should be terminable on a year's notice. The French government agreed to continue them for a short time, on the condition that they should be subject to a three months' notice. This arrangement was confirmed by an act of the parliament of Canada in 1919. Subsequently, in 1920, the Canadian government gave notice to terminate the treaty. I find that the order in council of that day was passed on the recommendation of the then Acting Minister for External Affairs, Hon. Mr. Rowell. The records do not show any particular reason for giving this notice to terminate the treaty. The notice had been previously given by France. Then France had suspended this notice and agreed to continue the treaty for a while. In

the end the Canadian government, for reasons which I have no doubt were satisfactory, but which are not set forth in the order in council, decided to give notice. The notice to which I refer was given in 1920. Then, in 1921, a new convention was signed by Sir George Foster and was confirmed by legislation a little later. In that new convention provision was made that a number of things for which we had had the minimum tariff before were no longer to take the minimum tariff, but a system of percentages of reduction was introduced. It was also provided in that treaty that it could be terminated at any time on four months' notice. A reading of the treaty plainly shows that it was regarded as only a temporary arrangement, and the expectation was that at an early date Canada would enter into a negotiation for a more comprehensive treaty. The French government applied in the year 1921, through their consul in Montreal, for a negotiation on that subject. It was at a time when the late government was no doubt busy with other things; at all events it was not found convenient to take up negotiations at that time. That was the situation when the present government came into power. The French Consul General at Montreal came to see us shortly after that, and we had some preliminary negotiation and it was then agreed that the matter should be further considered by a conference at Paris. It was under these circumstances that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself went over to Paris during the recent summer. The treaty which appears before the House contains a number of schedules. The first schedules A. B. and C. touch the question of what France offers Canada. Schedule C. refers to what shall take place in the case of the island of St. Pierre; and then the later schedules D. E. and F. touch what Canada shall give to France.

It would be very desirable if we could get an exchange of minimum tariffs; but for reasons which were strong in the minds of the French government, that could not be accomplished. We shall find in schedule D that France is to receive a fixed rate on a number of articles, those rates being in most cases a little below the Canadian intermediate tariff. On some items where the preferential and the intermediate rates were the same, there is a reduction of duty which will apply, of course, both to the preferential and to the intermediate. This does not, however, affect British manufacturers seriously, because as regards the items referred to the British do not seriously compete. The principal item on which we give them a fixed rate of duty is wine. On wines of a lower strength we give them the same rates as were in the old treaty of 1907-08; but on the stronger wines, on which they received reduced rates in 1907-08, we do not give them any reduction. The rates of duty on that class of wine have since been made higher, and on the stronger wines we do not give anything below the present rate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think, if my hon. friend will allow me, there is a reduction of 10 per cent on the heavier wines. They are included in schedule E as getting a reduction of 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Our rate of duty is 55 cents per gallon, and we do not reduce it. My hon. friend will, I think, find that is correct; but on wines of lower strength they get the same rates as were in the old treaty.

Schedule E comprises quite a long list of French products on which a reduction is made in the form of a discount of 10 per cent on the amount of duty under the intermediate tariff. That is not to be construed as a reduction of 10 per cent in the rate of duty; it is 10 per cent on the amount of the duty. For example, if the duty is $30, and the customer has to pay to the custom house $30, he will receive a discount of 10 per cent, which practically reduces the rate of duty to $27, instead of $30. I might give other examples of that, but that is unnecessary. In schedule F we have three tariff items, touching chiefly woollen clothing and fabrics. While the items are not numerous, they are rather comprehensive in their character, including a large volume of imports. On those three items, it is proposed to apply the same principle, but to increase the rate of discount from 10 to 15 per cent. This would work out in this way. If a duty under the intermediate tariff is 30 per cent, or $30 on $100, a reduction of 15 per cent on the $30 is made. The duty to be paid is thus reduced from $30 to $25.50. Where not otherwise specified, French products are to receive the benefit of the intermediate tariff. Provision is made that in schedules E and F the proportionate difference between the intermediate and general tariffs shall be maintained. The provisions of the old agreement for the encouragement of direct trade are substantially renewed. Then, there are other provisions such as are usually found in commercial treaties, provision under which the parties mutually guarantee to one another equitable conditions.

The loss of revenue in this matter is worthy of consideration. We have to remember that

whatever conditions we grant to France, we shall also grant to a number of nations which enjoy what is called the "favoured nation" principle. On a rough estimate, taking into consideration the business on the basis of last year's operations, our trade with France and with the nations affected by the "favoured nation" arrangement, I estimate that there will be a reduction of duties under the treaty amounting to about $850,000. The favoured nations which are included in this, that is to say the nations which are entitled to what is called the most favoured nation treatment, are Argentina, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela. Whatever we grant to France under this arrangement must, of course, be granted to those countries, and I have included the trade from those countries in my estimate of the reduction of taxation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that my hon. friend's treaty with Italy will add to the "favoured nation" clause.

Mr. FIELDING: I will say that we have in this estimate included Italy, Italy is not at present a favoured nation, but Italy will come in, and the trade with Italy is included in this rough estimate.

Let us turn to what, in the minds of many, is a more important question, as to what are the terms on which our products are to be taken into France. As I have said, it would be convenient in many ways if we could have simply the French minimum tariff; but the French government will not grant the whole French minimum tariff, nor the "favoured nation" principle generally, to anybody. They treat these things as instruments for negotiation. The French minimum tariff is a moderate tariff; the French general tariff is much higher. By a system of what is called coefficients, the French multiplied the rates of tariff, and the result is that the general tariff is very high. Practically speaking, if the general tariff had to be applied to us, I am afraid it would in most lines of trade be prohibitive. If then, we cannot get the whole minimum tariff of France—and that is the declared policy of France in dealing with all nations—our object must be to get as large a list of items under the minimum tariff as we can. Another point we ought to have in view is that our great competitor in the French market will be our friends to the south, the United States. They are producing many of the same things that we are producing, and if we are to meet competition in the markets of Europe, we must consider the position of the United States. They have at this moment some advantage over us and I shall have occasion to refer to that later. But one of the strong points that we had to keep in mind was to see that whatever might be the rates of duties levied against our products, we should take pains to get at least as good terms as those given to our chief competitor, the United States. That is a strong feature of our aim, and I am glad to say that in that respect we have fully accomplished our purpose.

We have a large list of items which are given under the minimum tariff, and it will be found that these include most of our important products. In addition to getting the minimum tariff, we get what is very important, a guarantee that as respects all the articles in that list, we shall receive what is called the "most favoured nation" treatment; that is, France will not grant to any country better terms than she grants to Canada as respects articles named in that list.

Then we have another long schedule of goods which are not admitted to the minimum tariff, but which are made the subject of special rates of reduction. The list is somewhat long. Both that list and the minimum tariff list contain a number of items which, perhaps, on first reading, hon. gentlemen might think were of no importance; but it is well to remember that Canada's industries are developing and that we are producing to-day some things which we did not produce a few years ago. There is every reason to expect that with the development of our trade and our industrial life we shall be able to produce some things which we shall want to export in the future to a larger degree than we have done in the past. That is why many items are included in these schedules which on the first reading may possibly be regarded as not of great importance. On the minimum list we get the best that is going to-day, and we get a guarantee that as respects the wide world no country shall obtain better terms in connection with any one of the items mentioned in the list. That, we think, is an important point. When you come to the next schedule, which is not the minimum tariff, but where you get a certain percentage of reduction, we receive, we are pleased to know, an assurance that in regard to that long list we shall obtain the best terms that are enjoyed by our neighbour, the United States. So that as regards neither the first nor the second list have we any reason to fear the competition of our brethren to the south of us. There is a friendly rivalry between us and we have taken pains to see that we have been given a guarantee that whatever the rates may be, we shall fare as well as the neighbouring republic. In

that respect we can claim we served the purposes we had in view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister not sweeping in his statement as to Schedule A? Is France not free to grant lower tariffs than she grants to us, not only to her protectorates —which, of course, we cannot object to— but also to enemy and adjacent countries?

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps my right hon. friend has been reading Article II.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: That article reads:

> The grant of the minimum tariff for the products enumerated in schedule A means the treatment of the most favoured nation as respects such products, but does not entitle Canada to claim the benefit of any preferential advantage which France may grant to her Protectorates or the benefit of any tariff resulting from economic agreements which France may enter into with border states, or the benefits of any tariff which France may grant for products the importation of which is designed to facilitate financial settlements with those countries that were at war with France during the years 1914-1918.

The first part of that article is a simple assurance, which we readily accept, that we are not to ask the benefit of any preference which France grants her colonies. And we do not permit her to receive the benefit of any preference we see fit to grant any part of the British Empire. The second part of the article, to which my right hon. friend presumably refers, has reference not to the ordinary trade and commerce of the country, but to a peculiar condition that exists to-day in Europe. France is expecting reparations and is taking strong means in her endeavour to obtain them. She may have to make arrangements with Germany by which she will receive German products for the rehabilitating of the devastated regions of her country. That is outside the ordinary channels of trade and commerce, and we thought the request of the French government in that respect was not an unreasonable one. Nor do I think that there is any likelihood of any serious competition arising under that clause. At all events, that is the explanation. Since France expects to receive from Germany many things which do not come within the ordinary scope of trade and commerce but are intended for use in rebuilding the devastated regions, the French government considered that they should not be treated as a matter of ordinary trade, and we were of the opinion that that position was not unreasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the significance of the reservation as to border states? What states would that include?

Mr. FIELDING: There is in almost all treaties some provision for a small area on the border line which is not brought under the operation of the customs. My right hon. friend will find something of the kind in the last treaty. There is a zone on each side of the line in which there is practically free trade between the two countries concerned, and my hon. friend will find a provision of the kind, I am sure, in the last treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With all deference to my hon. friend, who I am sure knows more about it than I do, I hardly think that that could be the significance of this reservation. This article reserves the right to France to enter into treaties with border states, such as Switzerland, Spain, Italy, and Belgium.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend will find that a similar provision is incorporated in most commercial treaties. The explanation is as I have stated, and I know that we had some such arrangement in the last treaty. However, I shall have to look further into that point. Next, we have a provision that if at any time France may grant to the United States larger percentages than are accorded Canada—it is provided that they must give ns the same treatment to-day —then Canada's percentages shall have to be increased to the same extent. These, I think, cover most of the provisions of the treaty.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How do the United States get their preferential treatment to-day?

Mr. FIELDING: The United States some years ago were lucky enough to make some arrangement with France whereby the provisions of the tariff of 1910 were to be continued, and the United States were to enjoy certain rates. That condition remains to-day, but I have my doubts whether it will continue very long. At all events, it is a fact to-day that the United States enjoy advantages which other countries do not, advantages which we in Canada have reason to regret have been granted.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): But how did they obtain those advantages—by legislation of their own?

Mr. FIELDING: By treaty and negotiation with the French government. They were able to stipulate that while other countries would have to pay increased tariffs the United States would not. However, my impression is that that is a condition of affairs which is not likely to last.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How would it be abrogated?

Mr. FIELDING: The arrangement could only cease by the French government giving notice of its termination. That is not a matter within our control. But so long as that arrangement exists we shall get the benefit which so far we have been deprived of. I think it might be well for me to read a few items giving the rates which apply to the United States and to Canada to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister does so, would he say whether or not it is correct that the United States enjoy these rates without having given any concession, and that they do not to-day give any concession to France in their tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think they give any concession, but our main point is that they do get these rates and we do not. My recollection is that they do not give any concession, and I think the arrangement is so unsatisfactory to the French government that in all probability it will not long continue. But so long as it does continue, the inequality and discrimination which have existed in the past as against us will no longer obtain. Here are a few items by way of illustration. On tissues of pure cotton, plain, twilled and drills, per 100 kilogrammes, the rate to-day which Canada pays is 1,364 francs, while the United States enjoys a rate of 440 francs. We shall obtain that rate when this treaty goes into force. On general machinery Canada to-day pays 128 francs and the United States 48. Under the new treaty we shall get the lower rate. On detached parts of machines, etc., the Canadian rate is 344 francs, while the rate which the United States receives, and which we shall obtain after the treaty goes into force, is 107.50 francs. On component parts of copper, pure or alloyed, moulded, wrought, etc., Canada to-day pays 360 francs and the United States 90. We shall hereafter pay that lower rate. Another item on which Canada to-day pays 504 francs under the treaty will be subject to the reduced rate of 126 francs, which is the American rate.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Is any preference given the United States to-day by France on the importation of a Canadian product like nickel?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not tell my hon. friend offhand how nickel is affected. The articles I have mentioned are clearly those in which there is discrimination. I shall be glad to go into the nickel question and let my hon. friend know later.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend has covered nickel in this treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. On component parts of machines and shafting, not specified, of two or more metals, etc., we are paying now a rate of 350 francs, the American rate is 140 francs, and we will get the benefit of this reduced rate. On another item of the same class we are paying a rate of 306.25 francs, against the American rate of 122.50, and we will get this lower rate. On another item we are paying at the rate of 262.50 against the American rate of 105, which rate we shall of course get the benefit of. On another item we are paying 175 francs, and we shall get the benefit of the American rate of 70 francs.

On screws, eyebolts, strap hinges, etc., we are paying 784 francs, against the American rate of 294 francs, which reduction we shall get the benefit of. On another item in the same class we are paying 616 francs, while the American rate is 252 francs; we will get the American rate. On another item of the same class we are paying 476 francs, and we shall get the benefit of the American rate of 189 francs. On another item of the same class we are paying 392 francs and shall get the benefit of the reduction to the American rate of 147 francs. On another item of the same class we are paying 1064 francs, and will get the benefit of the American rate of 399 francs. On another item of the same class where we are now paying 840 francs we will pay the reduced American rate of 315 francs. On another item of the same class on which we are paying 616 francs we will get the reduced rate of 231 francs. On still another item of the same class on which we are paying 560 francs we shall get the benefit of the American rate of 210 francs.

On all these things which I am enumerating the Americans have the advantage to-day, and in some cases that advantage to them and disadvantage to us seriously affects our manufacturing interests.

On household wares and all articles of iron, steel, etc.,—quite a large list—Canada is paying 184.45 francs, the American rate is 59.50 francs. We will get the benefit of that rate. In another case in the same list we are paying 195.30 against the American rate of 63 francs, which of course we get the benefit of. On another item of the same group our rate is 217 francs against the American rate of 70 francs, and we get the advantage of this reduction too. On porcelain we are paying 76 francs, while the Americans are paying 23.75 francs. We will have that reduced rate. On another item in the same

class we are paying 256 francs while the Americans pay only 80 francs. We will get the benefit of that reduced rate. On another item in the same class we are paying 192 francs and will get the benefit of the reduced American rate of 57.60 francs. On still another item we are paying to-day 320 francs against the American rate of 96 francs—another reduction we will get the benefit of.

Upon skins and hides prepared, varnished, we are paying to-day 2500 francs and we shall get the benefit of the American rate of 625 francs.

On other kinds of nails we are paying to-day 196 francs while the American rate is 66·50. We will get the benefit of this rate.

All the above-mentioned goods originating in and coming from Canada will
4 p.m. enjoy the same tariff rates as like goods the produce of the United States. I think hon. gentlemen will admit that in that respect the treaty removes a very great disadvantage.

I do not wish to magnify the importance of the treaty. As I have already said, the volume of trade we have with France is not very extensive, but whatever it is, it has been the policy of this country for the past thirty years to make special efforts for better trade relations with France, and in that spirit we have approached the negotiations. Of course, it takes two to make a bargain, and more than once in the course of the negotiations we doubted if we would succeed. However, the French government, although looking out for number one, met us in a good spirit. While each side would no doubt like to have something better, I think that we are able to state to parliament that on the whole the arrangement is a fair and reasonable one, and in so far as any treaty can do will help to promote trade between France and Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister recited quite a number of items without giving their names and compared the old duty with the new, that is, the American duty that we get to-day with the duty we have been paying heretofore. Will he say that in respect of all these items Canada actually produces them for export?

Mr. FIELDING: We are advised by the manufacturers' representatives that all the items I have read are of importance to their interests. As I have already said, in looking over the list you will see many articles which to-day are not important in our export trade. But the development of our manufacturing interests is going on very rapidly to-day, and many of these items which hon. gentlemen may think of little or no importance to-day have been included in the treaty at the special wish of the manufacturing interests of Canada. They felt that in view of that rapid development it is wise to make provision for the best terms available in order that we may reap the advantage when we do begin to export those items.

Mr. GOULD: Presuming the French government will withdraw these concessions from the United States, do our concessions likewise terminate at that time, or do we revert to our present tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: I have no authority to say that the French government will withdraw these concessions from the United States, but I can imagine it might be possible. If my hon. friend will read Article 5 he will find it is in these words:

> All products originating in and coming from Canada other than those mentioned in schedules A and B to this convention shall be subject in France to the rates of the general tariff of 1910 as long as by virtue of the French decree of March 28th, 1921, such tariff shall continue to be applicable to the products of the United States of America other than those specified in schedule A and schedule B to the French law of March 29th 1910.
>
> If the United States of America should at any time cease to enjoy the benefit of the French decree of March 28th, 1921, products of Canada other than those enumerated in schedules A and B to this convention shall enjoy a reduction of twenty-five per cent on the difference between the French general tariff and minimum tariff, whatever the rates of these tariffs may be.

So long as France continues the arrangement we get the same rates. If the rates are withdrawn that will be a matter then for negotiation between the United States and France, but in any case we get the reduction specified in Article 5.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In Schedule D under the heading of wines, I notice that the rate of duty is 15 cents a gallon for wines of certain alcoholic strength. I would point out to the minister that wines of that strength manufactured in my constituency bear an excise of 30 cents a gallon, so that the wine manufacturers and grape growers are at an absolute disadvantage of 15 cents a gallon as against the imported article laid down in Montreal or any other part of Canada. Is it the minister's intention to do away with the excise, or is our native industry to be left at this big disadvantage?

Mr. FIELDING: That raises quite a different question, I can say to my hon. friend. This rate is established under our agreement with the French government, but what rate we shall otherwise establish for any article affected by this treaty is entirely an open matter for the government and parliament.

I am not unmindful of the point raised by my hon. friend, but that would have to be dealt with by a separate act. It could not come into the treaty itself.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I naturally understand that the two things will go together. It is a very important matter. While in a general way I am in favour of this treaty, because certainly some of the things that the minister has accomplished have taken away some of the disadvantages that other people are under, at the same time it seems to me very unreasonable to place a district such as that where I come from under such a disadvantage. For the minister's information I may say that since the grape growers became aware of this treaty they had a meeting in the county of Lincoln only recently, and the president of their organization advised the farmers of the county of Lincoln not to plant any more vineyards. The despatch says:

> At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Niagara District Grape Growers, Limited, President Welstead in his address referred to the proposed treaty with France under which French wines will be admitted to Canada at fifteen cents per gallon duty, at which rate wines from that country can be unloaded at Montreal cheaper than wine can be manufactured in Ontario. The president also stressed the importance of not adding to new vineyards as there is now sufficient acreage grown to care for the demand.

Mr. FIELDING: I can only suggest to my hon. friend that he might accept the philosophy that is commonly ascribed to a former prime minister of Great Britain—wait and see. This treaty deals with an agreement with the French government. I might remind my hon. friend that any changes we make in our ordinary Canadian tariff would come most properly at the time of the budget, and before this treaty can be ratified and confirmed the budget will be down. I hope my hon. friend will reserve his conclusion until he hears that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I just wished to point out this matter to the committee. I am not finding fault without good reason. I am quite aware, as the minister has told us on other occasions, that you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs, but I do not want the farmers of my county to have all their eggs broken.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the people who have been advising against the growing of grapes must have been intending to encourage the prohibition movement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid I shall have to make a few general remarks on the subject of this treaty and to take, somewhat sharply, issue with my hon. friend on some of the matters he has covered. In the first place I entirely agree with him in the general sentiment that he expresses as to the advisability of maintaining the closest commercial relationship with France; I think that is something on which we are all agreed. As he pointed out, this action, which was taken in the first instance by a Conservative administration, has been followed by every administration since. We want to deal with France.

I also agree with my hon. friend in what he says as to the unfortunate position of Canada, and agree entirely with what he says as to the unfairness of that position. Why, in some items as a result of the concessions given by France to the United States, the duties are such that it is quite impossible for Canada to compete at all with the United States. My hon. friend went on to say that a great deal might be said as to the unfairness of that, and I entirely agree with him. Our position was that that treatment was entirely unfair, but I am quite sure also that it was not a matter of fixed and definite policy on the part of France. It was something that was done in the general hurry, and we felt quite confident that if the matter had received that share of fair and open consideration which it deserved, those direct discriminations would be removed. They were very bad; business could not be carried on under them.

There is one thing I want to add to what my hon. friend has said historically. He says that he does not exactly know why Canada in 1920 acted under the three months' notice clause. Of course, the House will recollect that France denounced the treaty, and then said that it might stand—that she wanted to take a general survey of the situation, and that the treaty might stand subject to three months' notice at any time. We gave the three months' notice because the treaty was not doing France any good and was doing us a great deal of harm. We gave notice because under the favoured nation clause Japan, Switzerland and other countries in whose markets we had no direct advantage were reaping the benefits of the treaty. The sale of silks and the like had been largely transferred from France to Japan, which country was doing a great business in silks. Switzerland was also doing a great business in embroideries. The country needed the revenue. And so the notice was given. But after giving the notice the matter was immediately taken up with France for the purpose of arriving at some fair and proper basis under which the business of both countries could be materially advanced.

I want to go further, I want to say that even at the last session of this House, so convinced were we that something ought to be done that from my place in the House I urged that the government send the Minister of Finance over to France for the purpose of making an agreement. I am sorry I ever said a word, very sorry. When I urged that, I thought that one of those planks in the platform of 1919 would not be overlooked. I had thought that luxuries were going to be taxed, that there would be a general large increase on luxuries, and that a cut would be made in favour of France. But I was wrong, absolutely wrong. It used to be a Liberal doctrine, not practised, I admit, that luxuries should be taxed, and heavily taxed. That was endorsed, in 1919, but again the party is in office and it is not practised. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when the former leader of my friends to my left left the government in connection with the budget in 1919 he made the declaration that his interest in connection with customs and excise was to cut down the cost of living, to make cheap the necessities of life, and he wanted a heavy increase on luxuries—make them as high as you can. Why, this country during the war period, just at a time when every single cent of revenue was required, when we put a 7½ per cent increase on all articles coming through the customs, with one or two exceptions—anthracite coal, I think, was an exception—had to except luxuries, which instead of paying 7½ per cent extra should have paid a tremendously increased percentage at that period; and she had to do that simply because of the French treaty negotiated by my hon friend in the year 1908.

This treaty, so far as we are concerned, does absolute violence to the principles both of the Progressive and Liberal parties, for it is a treaty cutting down the duties on luxuries. Now I am just going to give you one or two items. Take the first schedule, and what do we find?—

Perfumery, including toilet preparations, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes and all other perfumed preparations for the hair, mouth or skin.

Then we find:

Embroideries, laces or manufactures of lace;
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets and plush, silk fabrics, ibbons, feathers and manufactures of feathers; artificial eathers, fruits; grains, leaves and flowers.

All these luxuries come in under the lowest rate in the first schedule. Then if we take the next schedule, that is the schedule providing for a discount of 10 per cent under the intermediate tariff, we find that it deals with some other luxuries. For example there are:

Sweetened biscuits; sugar candy and confectionery—

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

There is a whole string of articles under item 141. The Minister of Finance said the heavier wines get no special consideration. They do; they get a discount of 10 per cent off the intermediate rate. Let us see what else we find:

Brandy, champagne, paintings, pictures, engravings and similar works of art; manufactures of gold and silver, Turkish rugs and carpets; pianos, organs and musical instruments, musical instrument cases and fancy cases or boxes, portfolios and fancy writing desks, satchels, reticules and so on; ornaments; statues and statuettes; jewellery; precious stones and imitations, etc.

That is what we have. Of course the people who are having difficulty in this country today are very much concerned with the amount of duty they have to pay on works of art, statuettes, diamonds, silks and velvets. It is the people that are interested in such purchases that my hon. friends opposite have very special interest in.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friends may laugh but it is hard to get away from facts. We used to have denunciations of this kind of thing ad nauseam from hon. gentlemen opposite in other days, but—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If this treaty facilitates the sale of Canadian products in France surely that is a matter of interest to those to whom my hon. friend is directing his remarks?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman. There is some good in everything, there is a little good even here; I will come to that later. I was not addressing myself to the question of the sale of these articles. I was just pointing out that there was one way in which this thing could have been done easily and properly: All those rates could have been very properly increased against other nations and then cut down in favour of France. It is the preference that she wants.

Mr. MACDONALD How would you make a treaty?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend asks how I would make a treaty. Well, I do not know—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —how my hon. friend would make a treaty. I do not exactly know how the United States made their arrangements. I do not exactly know how it is that they have got all of these tremendous advantages that Canada was denied. But seeing that the hon. gentleman knows so

much about the matter perhaps he can tell how it is that the United States gets so much advantage, while Canada gets so little.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: When was the treaty negotiated between the United States and France?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman had properly followed the remarks of the Minister of Finance he would have known all about it. I think the decree that was referred to by the Minister of Finance was the decree of March, 1921 which gave these special privileges to—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who was in power then?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In France?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend really think we were a party to it? If he does not what sense is there in asking such a question?

Now I want to deal with another aspect of this luxury question. After all, this is an agricultural country. We can raise fruits, for example. Last year our imports of fresh dried and prepared fruits was over $29,000,000, and a special low rate affecting these is given by schedule D, I think item 105. We grow vegetables in Canada, and we have canning factories in this country, and last year our imports of canned vegetables amounted to $6,400,000. Well item 86, schedule D, gives a fixed rate of 1¼ cents especially to France. We have fishery products in Canada. We import fishery products to the extent of over $3,000,000; and item 120, schedule D, gives special fixed rates, lower than in the case of other countries, to France. Of animals and their products the importations amounted to over $46,000,000; and item 8, of schedule I gives a rate of 29 per cent on:

> Canned meats, canned poultry and game; extracts of meats and fluid beef, and soups of all kinds.

Of silks and silk products the importations last year amounted to only $21,000,000; in 1920 they reached a total of over $34,000,000. And hon. gentlemen know the special rates that are given. We have the same thing in connection with ribbons and the like. Of books and periodicals we imported, I think, twelve millions. Then novels and works of fiction, advertisement printing matter also get special rates. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend ever wants to adopt any fiscal policy which is going to help production in Canada this treaty is going to make it somewhat more difficult for him to deal with the question.

Now, the Minister of Finance tells the committee that the minimum tariff which he gets from France covers most of our important items. I want to go over a list of those items and see whether we can agree with the hon. gentleman. I am going to take what he thought were important items when the treaty of 1908 was brought in. There are two lists under the treaty—there is the minimum tariff list, and then there is the other list which gives the percentage of reduction in the general tariff of France. Now, these are the items which are taken from the minimum list, and put into another list where they do not get anything like the same advantage: Oxen, cows, bulls, steers and heifers, poultry, fresh meat, pork and beef. I ask my hon. friend if those imports are not important. I think that he will say they are. Going further down the list we find: Salted meats, pork, beef and other meats, animal fats, tallow, condensed milk, milk condensed with the addition of sugar, milk food with the addition of sugar, salt, butter and honey. Why, Mr. Chairman, all those things are matters of most vital importance to the agriculturists of this country. They are all matters for which my hon. friend got the greatest assistance in his last treaty. They now take second place. Fishing industries are similarly looked after Take the item 47—fish, preserved by pickling or otherwise prepared are also put down. Then item 74: malt and groats, grits (coarse flour) pearled or clean grain; then pulse and potatoes, lupuline, clover seeds and so on—a long list of agricultural articles which in the old treaty came under the minimum tariff, having the right to go into France at the lowest possible rates but which are taken from that list and put in the higher list. I hope my hon. friend will show us why all these products are so treated. Then my hon. friend says that the minimum tariff is absolute as against the world. That has already been discussed, and I think it is pretty clear that it is not absolute as against the world, because the United States can get better terms, and Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and others—and Germany, of course, can get better terms. Then he says that if the United States can get better terms—well we are to get the same. My hon. friend did not say that while the United States gets everything for nothing from France, Canada has to give value—if the States get anything more, well, Canada can have it, but must pay for it. That is the whole extent of that particular concession as you will find in reading the provisions of Article 5.

But the great objection I see to the whole of this treaty is that France does not agree

to maintain any specific rates at all. She gives no specific rates on any article. She preserves her tariff autonomously. France does more than that. France does not say that a minimum tariff shall be preserved at all, or that the general tariff shall be preserved as it now is, and of course it is perfectly clear that the only benefit we get under this treaty is the difference that there is between the minimum tariff and the general tariff. There is no obligation on France at all. On the other hand, my hon. friend gives specific rates of duty. He ties his hands and he ties the country's hands. Further, not only is he content that there shall be this maximum list that France can always get, but he goes further and covenants on behalf of Canada that the percentage of difference between the intermediate and the general tariff shall be maintained, so that the benefit that France gets can never be taken from France under that treaty, because this is positive, and her favourable percentage is preserved. We get no positive list, and we have no covenant that the present tariff rates are to be preserved. In any percentage that we get we have no covenant that it is to stay there for any time at all. Now, I put it to hon. members in this way: Let us forget the present position of things in Canada and let us suppose that everything is right—and, of course, the condition of things that we have to-day merely emphasises it—and that we have lots of money and lots to give away. As a matter of principle, where ought the heavy taxes to be? Ought they to be on wool, or ought they to be on silk? Ought they to be on lace or ought they to be on boots? Can there be any question as to these things? And if we are interested, as I think we all are, in getting such an adjustment of the tariff as will keep things going properly in Canada, we will make it bear the least heavily on those who can least afford to pay, those who are least interested in luxuries and the like. What do hon. gentlemen think of the treaty, brought down to-day, which deals with two items—I will just take two though there are lots of others—the items of laces and the item of wool, and makes a reduction of the intermediate on wool? Oh, yes, it makes a reduction there of 15 per cent, and it cuts down the intermediate tariff on wool from 35 to 29¾ per cent, and yet fixes a duty of 15 per cent on laces. Now, that is the manner in which one of the most important questions which we have to consider and can consider in connection with our national prosperity is treated.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

On the other question I agree with my hon. friend that he has removed the disabilities from a large list of articles. There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt that in some instances we have a very real interest in the question. I have no doubt some of these items will prove of some account—largely so. I think there is an awful lot of padding in the list, but there are some real items. I am going to ask my hon. friend to let us know just what this treaty means in dollars and cents. In the first instance I think the House ought to have information as to the bank rate, as to what the French rates are, having regard to these different items. We have not got that. I also think that we should have information—and I have no doubt the minister has such information, because no doubt he has looked into this matter before making the treaty—as to the amount of business done under the different items, so that the House will be in a position to consider their relative importance.

Mr. FIELDING: The requests of my hon. friend appear to be reasonable. And so far as may be possible, I shall be happy to obtain the information. As regards one or two other points on which my hon. friend has spoken, I should like to make a few remarks. First, he tells us that we are reducing the taxes on luxuries, and he mentions a long list. Does my hon. friend not know that the French are producers largely of luxuries? Does he not know that the products of France include wines, silks, embroideries, perfumery, and if we go to France and say: "We shall have nothing to do with you on the basis of luxuries," they will tell us: "You had better go home,"—for you cannot make a treaty with France unless you make some concession to her on the things that she has to sell.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any reason why my hon. friend could not have put into force the doctrine of his party in 1919,—greatly increased the customs rate on those luxuries and then given the French the proper preference?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not want to discuss questions of past policies; my hon. friend and I would hardly agree on those matters. I want to make this treaty understood by the House, and to get it through as I think it should be put through. But I point out to my hon. friend that France produces these luxuries, and if we go to France and say: "We will not make a treaty with you and make any concession on those things," France will tell us to go home. If my hon. friend admits

that we want to make a treaty with France, he must admit that we must be prepared to give France a concession on the things that she produces. Is that not reasonable? My hon. friend says that we have reduced the duties on luxuries. He complains that we have reduced the duties on laces. In the next breath he condemns us because we have reduced the duty on woollen goods.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, my hon. friend complained that we are going to reduce the duty on woollen goods.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was pointing out the small contemptible reduction from 39 to 29¾ per cent on wool as against a rate of 15 per cent on laces.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend think that we should have reduced the duty on woollen goods to a lower figure?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I think is that my hon. friend should have increased his general rate on luxuries to a very high figure, and then given France just as much preference on it.

Mr. FIELDING: We are not dealing with the general rate at all; we are dealing with a treaty with France. I understand that my hon. friend is complaining that we reduce the rate on luxuries, and I say that unless you make some concession on those luxuries which France produces, you cannot make a treaty. My hon. friend knows that is a fact, and that in past negotiations that is what has occurred. I should like him to face this question squarely—if he complains that we have not reduced the duty on wool enough, does he think we should reduce the duty on wool to a lower rate?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not mind answering my hon. friend's question at all. I remember a time when he reduced the duty on wool under the British preference, but he found that he was destroying Canadian industry, and accordingly he increased those duties again. He went into that question; he ought to know. But I still say that my hon. friend could have got just the same results if he had raised the duties on these luxuries.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not an answer.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid my hon. friend's answer is not convincing; but if he wants a discussion on the question of destroying industries of this country; if he wants a comparison between the condition of Canada under a Liberal administration and the condition when the Conservatives were in power, if he will spend an evening some time, we will take up the subject, although the comparison may not be to his liking as regards the story of destroying the industries of the country. I do not want to go into the past; but my hon. friend almost tempts me. Has he forgotten the picture presented by Sir Charles Tupper when he spoke of the sorrowful wail of the manufacturers of Toronto and Montreal rising up to protest against the tariff? He is repeating these to-day about destroying the industries of the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I really must ask my hon. friend not to put words into my mouth. What I said to my hon. friend is this—and I want him to correct me at once if I am wrong—under his original British preference he put in a rate in connection with wool in favour of Great Britain, which rate he himself increased afterwards because he found that the woollen industry in this country was being hurt.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend means that if I find a defect in the tariff I am willing to correct it, I plead guilty at once.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And cover it up.

Mr. FIELDING: And cover it up, all right. My hon. friend then pointed out that under the former treaty some articles were under the minimum tariff, and he said: "But you do not have them under the minimum tariff to-day." That is true, but the world has moved since 1907. Many things have occurred since then to change the policy of the French government, and they will not make as generous a treaty to-day as they did in 1907. We have to meet the French government on their ground or come away and not meet them at all. When my hon. friend admits that we ought to cultivate trade with France, he must admit what follows—that unless we make a concession on the things in which France is interested it is nonsense to talk about making a treaty. In 1921, my hon. friends opposite made a treaty with France and curiously enough, you find my hon. friend contending to-day that things which were in the minimum tariff in 1907 ought to be in the minimum tariff to-day, but under the treaty of 1921—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Temporary for four months.

Mr. FIELDING: One of the headings in that treaty is "goods that are no more under the operation of the minimum tariff." He had to recognize the changed condition of France and transfer articles from the minimum tariff

to a higher rate. The world has moved since 1907. My hon. friend admitted the movement in 1921, but he evidently thinks that it stopped in 1921. The French policy in that respect has changed, and we have to face that changed condition. Our own tariff is in some respects changed, and we could not go to France to-day and say: "Everything we had in 1907, we are prepared to take to-day." The world has moved. In that respect my hon. friend had to admit that the minimum tariff could not be maintained in regard to some things, and we have had to make the same admission.

My hon. friend has mentioned silks, laces, works of art, perfumery. I want to emphasize the fact that you cannot make a treaty with France unless you are willing to make some concession on those articles that she manufactures. If my hon. friend takes the ground that there should be no concession on those things, he takes the ground that there should be no treaty. My hon. friend says that the United States gets something for nothing. How long they will get those concessions, I do not know, and we are not responsible for what the United States get. "Oh," he says, "we have to pay for them." How are we to pay for them? By reducing the taxes of the Canadian people.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On luxuries.

Mr. FIELDING: By reducing the duty on articles which the Canadian people want to receive. I do not mind making a reduction of that kind when the revenue will stand it, and when it will not hurt our own industries. That is in line with the long-declared policy of our government.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to ask my hon. friend a question and if he has not the information to-day, he can give it to us later. Can he say what countries under the "most favoured nation" clause will secure the privileges that are set forth in schedule D, for instance, regarding items 178, 82, 220 and so forth?

Mr. FIELDING: Whatever rates we give to France in any respect under this treaty, we are prepared to give to the "favoured nation" countries. I read a list of them a little while ago. They are Argentina, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela. Russia was in, but I leave her out now, and we may practically put in Italy because she will be in this under the new treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the minister leave Russia out?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: All treaties with Russia ended, and I do not know what is to be the future of our negotiations with Russia. She is no longer under treaty with us.

Mr. CHAPLIN: When the minister spoke a moment ago about reducing the tariff, I was glad to hear him put in a provision that he would do that only when it would not affect our industries. Item 581 in schedule D carries a duty on French products of 20 per cent and the same articles, silk products, appear under the intermediate tariff, which gives a further discount of 10 per cent. Now, I desire to call the minister's attention to a certain fact. Last year a company started in my city to finish and dye raw silks, and the minister, on representations made to him, granted this company a tariff protection of 10 per cent, which was, in their opinion, and no doubt in the minister's opinion, little enough protection. That industry was started with over $100,000 invested in it, and I want to show the effect upon it of this treaty. On the item I referred to in Schedule D the tariff is now changed, so that the protection this firm gets is now 2½ per cent. I was very much pleased, naturally, to hear the minister say that when he reduced tariffs he would do so only in such cases where the reduction would not affect industries. I wish to make a suggestion to the minister. On these unfinished raw silks the tariff is now 17½ per cent. The protection these people have for the work they do is 2½ per cent, and I think it would be only reasonable further to reduce the tariff on these raw materials so as to give this industry a chance for its life. I understand readily enough that this treaty is fixed and cannot be altered, but I am making the suggestion to the minister. Last year, under item 581-A, this matter was taken care of, and a new item was put into the tariff. I suggest that under 581-A the tariff on raw silks be slightly further reduced.

Mr. FIELDING: On all matters relating to any change in the tariff I can only say that any suggestion offered will receive our careful consideration and will be dealt with one way or the other at the proper time.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am not asking the minister to give a decision now; I am only calling his attention to the matter. He has his adviser with him and this is a matter that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: I promise at once, unqualifiedly, that it will be taken into consideration. In regard to item 581 my hon. friend seems to think that we are doing something to hurt a Canadian industry. But I am

advised that the class of goods mentioned in that item is not made in Canada at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think the minister is mistaken, because I can give him information in regard to a company in the province of Quebec which has a capital of over $1,000,000, and which is weaving raw silks. That company has been in operation about a year, and the industry in my own city has been operating now between twelve and fifteen months.

Mr. FIELDING: I can assure my hon. friend that the matter was carefully thought out, and he will find that my statement is substantially correct, that in this particular case the article is not made in Canada and the item will not affect any Canadian industry. At all events, that is the information which I have received, and I am almost sure it will be found correct.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I could furnish the minister with facts that would absolutely and teetotally falsify his information.

Mr. FIELDING: On item 581?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, item 581, which I have referred to.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall of course be glad to receive any such information, but still I think my information is substantially correct.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I certainly cannot accept that statement of the minister, because I can furnish the name of the firm in Quebec which is making the woven silk, and of the firm in my own city which finishes and dyes the woven goods.

Mr. FIELDING: I can only ask the hon. gentleman to await further investigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not help but wish, when the minister (Mr. Fielding) was displaying such manly vigour in his address, that he had displayed some of the same preparatory to making the treaty, and indeed in the negotiations. I want to make, not a lengthy nor a detailed statement by any means, but a summary analysis of the treaty. The minister has come back again with a reference which he said was made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1897, having to do with the tariff which was brought down that year. I do not know that I have ever heard the minister make a speech in parliament in which he has not made this same reference, never making it correctly, never stating the whole of the facts, and always seeking to leave the impression that the tariff which actually went into effect was preceded by predictions on the part of Sir Charles Tupper such as he mentions this afternoon. The fact of the matter is that the minister, when he made his tariff in 1897, suffered from the same paucity of information that he suffered from in making this treaty with France. When he made his tariff in 1897 he appeared to be totally unaware—indeed, he was unaware, as the answers to questions in the Commons clearly showed—that the concessions he was then giving in the British preference he was bound to give, under treaty obligations, to very numerous countries in the world, and those concessions were of tremendously greater importance than what he was doing in the way of strict British preference. The consequence of what was brought to his attention in the course of the debate was that the minister later, months later, went back and succeeded in having a provision made whereby the weight of these favoured nation obligations was not only reduced in the main, but mostly wiped away, and the tariff as respects which the predictions were made really never came into permanent operation or anything like permanent operation.

The minister tells about industries flourishing under his government. Did they flourish under the tariff promised in the Liberal convention of 1893? Or did they flourish under the tariff of 1879, by denouncing which the hon. gentleman got into power?

I venture to say now that though there will be instances, due to the oversight of the minister, of manufacturers suffering under this treaty, the man taken care of best is the manufacturer of this country, while it is the rest of the country that is allowed to suffer. And I venture also to append this, that if any of the concessions given France now bear down on those who actually were behind the minister in the contest of 1921, it is the consequence of an oversight and was never intended on his part. He comes to the House and says he has secured a better entrance for Canadian products into France. Canada suffered because of a discrimination which France had imposed against us; Canada came under the incidence of a greatly increased French tariff. The United States had a treaty with France, the effect of which was accentuated by the French decree of March, 1921, and became entitled to a lower tariff than we. Of course, they being our great competitors, that put us under a disadvantage. All this is quite correct.

The United States got those concessions apparently without any quid pro quo on their part. They enjoy them to-day without any quid pro quo. I do not think the United States are entitled at the hands of France to better treatment than is accorded this Dominion, and if the case had been fairly and

strongly presented to the French government, I do not think that government would have persisted in maintaining a situation under which our chief competitors got tremendous advantages over us. I believe France recognizes that every act of friendship this country has ever had opportunity to display has been shown to that republic. I believe France recognizes that the United States have at no time in their history shown more affiliation for France than we have. I think she recognizes that the friendship of this country is important to her, and I see no reason in the world why on a mere argument of justice and right we should not have prevailed on the French government to give us the same tariff as is given to the United States. That being done, then what we were after would have been secured.

Now, the minister according to his claim—and I think he is right so far as I have been able to examine the treaty—has placed this country, in respect to some of our exports to France, in the same position as the United States. But he has given in return for that concessions which not only tie our hands in framing our Canadian schedules, but which throw out of line vast sections of our tariff, making it compulsory on this country to impose heavy duties upon necessaries that we must import, and at the same time putting at a very low level indeed the duties on luxuries that ought to be taxed away above the levels of necessaries.

The minister says in explanation: I had to put low duties upon luxuries because those are what France sells. I know those are what France sells. That is where the minister went wrongly about his task. He had his tariff in a position where he was not able to bargain at all. France had her tariff in a position where we had to go to her and say: We want to be put on a level with the United States, and if you insist we pay, we will do so. And we have certainly done it. We have placed the duties on silks, velvets, brandies, champagnes, laces, toilet goods, perfumes, and similar, luxuries at a level away below the duties on woollens, cottons and all those other essential imports on which the duty ought to be the lowest consistent with the continuance of the industry of producing them in this country. Not only has he done that, but he has put the grape farm producers of this country—not a few, but thousands of them—in a position where they cannot compete. But he intimates in the House to-day that when the budget comes down he may, by reducing the excise on wines, restore them to a position where they will be on an equality with their competitors in France. There is another concession he has to make, and he is not around the circle then. He will have to keep on reducing the revenues of this country on the very things we ought to get revenue from, reducing them item after item in order to pay for securing what the United States got for nothing. There should first have been a revision of the tariff, when France raised her duties as she did. The revision of our tariff which last session we were in a position to make because we knew then definitely the position of the American government and the position of the French government,—that revision should then have been undertaken, a revision that would have enabled the minister to go to France and maintain at a high level the taxes on luxuries and still give a preference to France that would have at least secured all he has secured by means of this treaty.

Not only that, the concessions he has given mean vastly more than what he fully discloses to the House. I venture to suggest
5 p.m. that under this treaty he has given just about as much concession to Japan, if not indeed more than he has given to France, and he gets nothing from Japan at all. He has given a concession to Japan on silks and other importations, of which we get large amounts from Japan, which will be very serious for our revenue, and which on other goods will be serious as well in respect of Japanese competition.

I will give another instance where the minister went unarmed and returns even now without any appreciation of the bargain he has made. It will be observed that in respect of articles on which we get the French minimum tariff, France has reserved a right to give to French dominions and protectorates a better tariff than we get. No objection, of course, can be made to that. I would expect the minister to grant that reservation. That is all right. We do likewise in this country in respect to Great Britain and any other nation of the Empire that gives us like concessions. But the treaty goes on to make a reservation in respect of any economic arrangement France may enter into with "border states," and the minister seems to feel that that makes no difference. Why, he says, that only refers to a small strip along the border which for trading purposes is considered virtually as part of France, and he says a similar reservation was embodied in the previous treaty. Yes, what he has described was embodied in the previous treaty. But what was embodied in the previous treaty is not here. The previous treaty provided—I have it before me—that

there should be a reservation on the part of France in respect to goods granted the minimum tariff applicable not to border states, but applicable only to fifteen kilometres on each side of the boundary. The minister has not incorporated that restriction in this treaty. All the border states may make treaties with France and secure a minimum away below our minimum or France may give them lower duties without any treaty at all. Such reservation applies to Spain, Italy, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland—all those countries are excepted.

France reserves the right to make treaties with all her border states giving them duties below the minimum that we get on this narrow list of articles; she reserves the right to make treaties with her own protectorates on a lower basis; and she reserves the right as well to make treaties with the countries with which she has been at war, for purposes, it is true, of securing goods by way of reparation. But although such may be the purposes, the effect is just the same so far as we are concerned. All those countries may have lower tariffs with France than we get under the very best of this treaty. Such is the prize which the minister comes back with. It is for this that we fix our duties on thirty-one lists of articles of luxury at a very low minimum, the lowest, I think I may safely say, that we have ever had in this country, We have fixed them permanently there as long as this treaty lasts. Whereas those lists in the old treaty contained only twelve classes of luxuries, their number is raised to thirty-one by this treaty, against which we do not get admitted to the French minimum tariff a list anything like as effective as we got under the old treaty.

There is besides the extensions of these concessions which naturally this country has to make arising out of our favoured nation treaties with the nations named by the hon. minister. Now that is what the minister comes back with, and it is not very satisfactory, I think to this country. At best, even with all these reservations, he has nothing save what the United States, our chief competitor got for nothing, and he has given in return away beyond what we gave for far greater results in years gone by.

Mr. FIELDING: There are two or three points my right hon. friend has made that I should like to make a brief comment on. Sir Charles Tupper is dead and gone, and nothing is further from my thought than to make any reflection on that distinguished statesman. But when my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance declares that our government had ruined the industries of the country—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I never said that.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will look at Hansard he will see that he did. When he said that, I could not help recalling that incident about Sir Charles Tupper. My right hon. friend is mistaken in his statement of what happened at that time as to the attitude of Sir Charles Tupper. The question of the treaties was not in issue at that time. Sir Charles Tupper's own explanation, I may say to my hon. friend, when he was challenged with that, was that I had afterwards made changes in the tariff in the same session. That was true. In a previous case changes had been made and credited as clerical errors. When I make changes I admit that I make them. I do not accuse the clerks and say that they were clerical errors. I was able to say that after the changes had been made and the tariff had been enacted, he attacked the tariff all the same. So my hon. friend is not quite correct in that. But Sir Charles Tupper is dead and gone, and it is of no use to discuss that.

By the terms of this treaty concessions will go to Japan, it is true. Does my hon. friend objeet to that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do object to that. I say it adds very seriously to the concessions on our part.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend knows that before we went for the treaty at all any concession that is granted to France or any other nation goes to Japan. He knows that: then what is he complaining about?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the minister did nor arm himself before he went. I am showing this country what these concessions mean.

Mr. FIELDING: Because the minister did not arm himself first of all, he says, and I am glad he mentioned that. He says we should have first jumped the general tariff up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On luxuries.

Mr. FIELDING: What difference would it make then? If we reduced the duty on luxuries coming from France we would have had to reduce them, acording to his own admission, on luxuries coming from other countries. My hon. friend's argument is that we should have raised the tariff high in Canada. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of jumping up the tariff if he wanted to. He spent a couple of years in talking about it and promising to

do it, but he did not do it. He went out of office leaving that duty to be performed by somebody else. He said yesterday that it is easy to be brave in opposition. He is brave in opposition on a question of the tariff, but when he had the handling of the tariff he did not do what he proposed to do, and he should bear that in mind.

My hon. friend also speaks of what we are giving in reducing our duties. My hon. friend's idea is that the reduction of duty is a great evil. Our idea is that it is a benefit to the consumers of this country. When we can buy access to foreign markets by reducing the taxation on the Canadian people I am always willing to purchase access on terms of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why not reduce them a lot more?

Mr. FIELDING: Wait and see. Another thought. My hon. friend says we ought to have put ourselves in this position. He had many years during which to put the tariff in this position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The condition that brought this upon us resulted from the French decree of March, 1921.

Mr. FIELDING: I have never seen any evidence that my hon. friend made any protest against that French decree. I would not say he did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was not only protest, but action, all that could be done before revision. Would the minister suggest for one minute that after that date while our protest was being continued we should have revised the tariff before the end of that session?

Mr. FIELDING: I might have an opportunity to find out what he did after the 21st of March. The radical difference between my hon. friend and myself is this: he treats these reductions as an evil. I again repeat, every change of that nature which reduces the taxation of the people is a benefit and is to be regarded by the people as a benefit, and not as an evil, as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not then take it all off?

Mr. FIELDING: We may do it by degrees.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why by degrees?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend will find that day by day, in every way, we are getting better and better. We must be patient.

[Mr. Fielding.]

While I do not present this treaty as a piece of perfection, I believe under all the circumstances it is as fair and as good as we can get, and one which I believe will work beneficially to both Canada and France.

Mr. GERMAN: Coming back to what was said by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), regarding the duty on wine, though it may seem like going from the sublime to the ridiculous after the discussion to which we have just listened, I would call the minister's attention to the fact that the wine industry in the Niagara district is a highly important one. There were about 500,000 gallons of native wine produced in the Niagara district last year. About two-thirds of that is sold outside the province of Ontario and one-third within the province. That is a very considerable industry, and I trust that it will not be injured by anything that may be done under this treaty. The grape growing industry for wine is a very important one in the Niagara district. As was stated by the hon. member for Lincoln, the native wine produced there is the light grade, which would come into competition with the French wines which we now admit at 15 and 20 cents a gallon. The excise duty is 30 cents a gallon on our native production in the province of Ontario. Though it cannot be done in this treaty, of course, I would ask the Minister of Finance very seriously to consider whether there should not be a substantial reduction made in the excise duty on native wine so as to allow the manufacturers of the Niagara district to compete successfully with the foreign producers, because I am assured by them that with this treaty in force and an excise duty of 30 cents a gallon on the native produce, the native industry will be put out of business. I would ask the minister to consider this matter very seriously so that when we come to him later, as we shall do, to procure some concession in that direction, he will be prepared to grant it.

Mr. FIELDING: I can only repeat what I said to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), that the matter is receiving fair consideration.

Mr. DUFF: Under the new treaty what will be the rate of duty on canned salmon and canned lobster from Canada to France?

Mr. FIELDING: Canned lobster is under the minimum tariff. Canned salmon will pay a duty of 35 francs per hundred kilograms, while the American rate is 50 francs. The situation will not be quite as good as it is to-day, but we shall have a rate of 15 francs less per 100 kilograms than the United States.

Mr. DUFF: Do I understand that the duty on canned salmon, which is a very important industry in this country, would be greater under the new treaty than it is now?

Mr. FIELDING: Slightly.

Mr. DUFF: And that on canned lobster the duty will be the same as under the old treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Mr. DUFF: I am very sorry to hear that.

Mr. FIELDING: About the lobster?

Mr. DUFF: About the canned salmon.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The suggestion is made by one of the members from Toronto that it might be of considerable advantage to the members of the House and to exporters of goods to France if it were possible to have printed the French duties on articles that we now have entering that country. As it is now, the French tariff is almost impossible to read. It would be a great convenience to have that information.

Mr. FIELDING: I will endeavour to meet my hon. friend's request before the matter is finally through parliament.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister give a comparison of the French duty on canned salmon referred to by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), that is the Canadian rate as against the rate on United States, Japanese or Russian canned salmon? Have you the information?

Mr. FIELDING: I stated a moment ago—perhaps my hon. friend did not catch it—in answer to the question of the hon. member for Lunenburg that under the treaty our rate will be 35 francs per hundred kilograms. The American rate at present is 50 francs per hundred kilograms.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister could not say, I suppose, what the rate is on Japanese salmon? My reason for asking is that the Canadian packers of canned salmon are finding the competition of the Japanese packer perhaps the keenest they have; and furthermore, a great deal of this Japanese salmon is packed in blank tins and then is sold as Canadian salmon on the British and French markets, which is very unfair.

Mr FIELDING: My hon. friend will see at once that the terms and conditions upon which things shall be admitted into Great Britain and into France must be governed by their own local regulations. With regard to Japanese salmon going into that market I could not tell my hon. friend definitely but I do not think Japan has any special treaty with France on the subject. However, I would not like to be definite on that point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Having in mind the pledge to which the minister was a party, to increase the British preference to 50 per cent, will he be prepared to admit that as respects most of the articles, if not all—I have the list here showing the effect—covered by this treaty he has almost wiped out the British preference?

Mr. FIELDING: The British preference is not dealt with by this treaty; the British preference will be whatever this parliament sees fit to make it. Another point: I wish my hon. friend would not so often resort to his undoubted powers of invention to bolster up his case, as he does when he makes the statement which he made as that I promised to increase the British preference to one half. My hon. friend, notwithstanding his powers of invention, knows very well that I never made such a promise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I attributed to the hon. gentleman the commitment of his platform—to which I am informed on the authority of the publication that came out, all present agreed—in which it is stated that the Liberal party would increase the British preference to 50 per cent. Now, the minister says this treaty does not deal with the British preference. It does deal with the British preference. Every time a French duty is reduced it gets down that much nearer to the existing British duty, to the existing preferential duty. The difference between this duty and the British duty is affected, and that is the preference. It is the difference that is the preference and as respects the greater part—I have not gone over all the items but I have gone over many, and I can give the figures to the House—the duty on competing articles with Britain is down so nearly to the British preferential level that the British preference is practically wiped away.

Mr. FIELDING: I have already stated this treaty does not deal with the British preference at all. The British preference will be whatever the government and parliament of Canada see fit to make it. Every reduction that is made on a product of any foreign country in that way reduces the British preference. Does my hon. friend therefore say we should have made no treaty which would have resulted in a reduction? Does he say that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I say the minister or his party should not have made a commitment

which they must have known was impossible and which they now admit to the House was impossible.

Mr. FIELDING: Again the right hon. gentleman is drawing on his powers of invention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING: We had a discussion of that kind on another occasion when I told the right hon. gentleman that I never made any promise or entered into any engagement to make the British preference one-half. I stated that before in the right hon. gentleman's presence, he knows that I did so, and he should not indulge in fabrications of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister stated that he did not vote for it?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, if that is any good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Liberal leader and the Liberal party voted for it even if my hon. friend did not do so.

Mr. FIELDING: I am content to be judged by the House and by the country. The country has passed judgment on these things but my hon. friend does not approve of its judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The country passed judgment before it knew the minister did not vote for the convention tariff resolution. He kept that quiet until he was safely in office and then surprised the country by giving it the information. But though the minister did not vote for the resolution he was a member of the convention which passed it, and a member of the party which published it on the very eve of the election and which commissioned every speaker throughout this Dominion to promise that policy to the electorate. Now he comes here and says "I paid no attention to it whatever"; and when I charge him with being a party to it, because he was at the convention, he says I am a fabricator.

Mr. FIELDING: I was not at the convention when it was passed and I never voted for it. I never concealed from anybody in this House that I did not approve of it, and the right hon. gentleman knows that quite well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg the minister's pardon, I never even suspected that he did not vote for it; I understood he was the chairman of the committee which prepared the resoluion. I must say that in the past I have suspected that he did not believe in it. I had the strongest suspicions of that and I let the whole country know—

Mr. FIELDING: Did you?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly I did. I let the whole country know that I did not believe that one who had been finance minister for one week would think such a course was practicable. I understood he voted for the resolution until he told the House he did not. I accepted that statement, but I say that he should have told the country he was opposed to the resolution and differentiated himself from the party that committed itself to it. I say that the minister was obligated by that resolution, he was a party to it by his silence and obtained power under that obligation, that is what I said; it is more than what I said and every word of it is true and all Canada knows it is true.

Mr. DUFF: Carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course it is carried. My argument would carry in any audience.

Mr. DUFF: It did not carry in December, 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That argument?

Mr. DUFF: Your argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That argument is based on facts which this country did not know in December, 1921.

Mr. DUFF: Yes they did. They knew all about you too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen opposite are now boasting of the success with which they deceived the electors of Canada.

Mr. DUFF: You ought to get over your grouch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend asks me to get over my grouch. I have no doubt at all that the hon. member for Lunenburg would adopt a similar ruse if he thought he could secure the election again in his county.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, come down and run against me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will adopt some method—

Mr. DUFF: Yes, any method at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly my hon. friend will adopt any method at all.

Mr. McMASTER: As so much criticism has been directed against this treaty, I do not like to have it pass without a warm word of personal commendation to the ministers who were able, when Europe was in the condition in which it is, to go there and get from one of the greatest powers a treaty which will help the fortunes of the

producers of natural products of this country.

What is the matter with Canadian business to-day? We are going through hard times. What is the reason for it? As I see it, the prosperity of Canada depends upon the prosperity of the producers of the natural products of the country—the products of the farm, the forest, the sea and the mine. Now the products of the farm, especially, are greatly reduced in price and why? Because the purchasing power of the customers of the producers of natural products has been reduced because Europe, having passed through the most awful war in history, is unable to purchase from us what she has been able to purchase in the past. Now, in order to help Europe to purchase from us we have to be prepared to purchase from Europe. International trade is, after all, not a question of selling goods for money as it is in private stores—it is a question of barter. Great Britain understood that almost a hundred years ago. She followed the axiom that those who wished to sell must be prepared to buy. Anything which helps to foster trade between Europe and this country is worthy of our support, and anything the government has done or can do along those lines should receive our strong approval. I do not think an occasion of this kind should pass without some word being spoken as to the soundness of the treaty as a whole. There may have to be some changes in the excise law to correct possible inequalities in regard to some of our producers, but that is not the question before the House to-day. I wish to express, for what it is worth, my strong approval and to thank the ministers for what they have done for this country.

Mr. ANDERSON: I should like to ask the minister with regard to a few items in schedule A, dealing with the products of the farm, wheat, oats, barley, rye, maize and buckwheat and their by-products. They are to receive the benefit of the minimum tariff. On looking up the tariff of France for 1921 I do not find there is any minimum tariff. There is only one tariff which is the maximum. I was wondering if the tariff had been changed.

Mr. FIELDING: There are some cases in our own tariff where the item is the same in both columns, and it is so in that case. The general and minimum are the same, but whatever the minimum may be from time to time, we get the advantage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could the hon. gentleman tell me the difference between the duty under the old tariff on poultry, for example, and the new treaty? It is item No. 14 in schedule B, which used to be under the minimum tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: In the old treaty it was under the minimum tariff. It is not now under the minimum tariff but is in the second schedule, where certain percentages are provided.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. minister does not give the figures and I am in a difficulty to know whether we are hurt and how much. The question was the duty under the old tariff on item 14. What is the duty to-day?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not off-hand give you that information, but I will at a later stage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the hon. minister could give the information on all these agricultural items?

Mr. FIELDING: As far as possible, I will give the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the hon. minister tell us the duty on wheat going into France previously per bushel?

Mr. FIELDING: Seven francs per hundred kilograms.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. minister get the information per bushel?

Mr. FIELDING: The franc is worth about 6 cents. That would make it 42 cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A bushel?

Mr. FIELDING: The franc is worth 6 or 6½ cents, and of course it varies from day to day. Those duties are paid in francs. It was pointed out with some truth that while the minimum tariff of France is a moderate one, when you pay it in the depreciated currency it works out to a low rate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And that would be 42 cents for how much?

Mr. FIELDING: Two hundred and twenty pounds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could the minister tell us what change was made in that item? What was the rate on wheat before the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: I think there was no change in it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am pretty sure there was no change, and there was no advantage obtained there. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that in the case of a number of items no change takes place at all. What about oats?

Mr. FIELDING: The same. If we get the minimum what more can we get?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am just pointing out that there are not these vast gains referred to by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) for the producers from the soil. They are left where they are very largely.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, with this difference: that the old treaties are at an end, and if we do not negotiate a new treaty we come under the old rates which are higher.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In some cases.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister does not propose to carry the treaty in committee without taking it up item by item?

Mr. FIELDING: No. I will introduce the bill and it will come before the committee in due course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not going to suggest holding up the resolution now, but when the bill is presented the treaty will be taken up clause by clause?

Mr. FIELDING: If anybody wishes it. It is the schedule to the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the treaty which is important and not the bill.

Resolution reported, read a second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 23 respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved the recond reading of the bill.

He said: The bill will then go into committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we had better follow the usual course. There is a lot of information which should be prepared.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well; next sitting of the House.

SUPPLY

AGRICULTURE—EXPERIMENTAL FARMS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Experimental farms, $1,525,000.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is rather a large increase. I should think the minister would really like to tell us why he is spending so much money and what he is doing with it.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): In reading the discussions in Hansard for a number of years before I had the honour to come before this House, I noticed there was always a long and interesting discussion surrounding the appropriation with respect to experimental farms. Last year, it will be recalled that we had the same experience, and I remember that there were a number of features around which the discussion centred. For instance, what was to be the future of our experimental farm system? Had it any new objective? Were we going to establish any new experimental farms? There were a number of other questions of that nature. I think the discussion at this time might be facilitated and, perhaps, expedited if I made a brief statement with respect to our objective as regards the future of these farms.

Since the House prorogued last summer, I took the opportunity of visiting a large number of these institutions between here and the Pacific coast and also within the province of Quebec. Time would not permit my extending that visitation to the Maritime provinces; but outside of that I visited nearly all the experimental farms. The policy that I partially announced last year was, that before we spend very much more money in the establishment of new experimental farms, the government would be well advised to take care of the existing farms. During the last eight years, four of them being the war period and four since, our experimental farms, of necessity, had more or less to mark time. That was due to no one's fault; but as a matter of fact, while that is so, the very policy of standing still meant, in some respects, as regards some of the farms, a going back. No growing institution can stand still; it must either go forward or go back. Having regard to that fact and having visited many of the farms, I am more than ever convinced that our policy should be to put the present twenty-two branch farms, including the central farm, in a state of good repair and efficiency before we extend this system to a larger number of farms, particularly in view of the fact that we have not at our disposal sufficient money to do both at the same time.

As regards some of the older farms concerning which there was a good deal of discussion last session, particularly with respect to those on the prairie and the initial four farms,

that is the Nappan farm, the Brandon farm, the Indian Head farm and the Agassiz farm in British Columbia, which four farms with the central farm constituted the original unit, some of these farms, as well as some additional ones, have largely exhausted their experimental work in connection with cultural methods. When I say largely, I do not mean entirely. For instance, the farms at Indian Head and Brandon have pretty well demonstrated to those areas on the prairies just what kind of cultural methods are necessary to get the best results. Forty years ago, the prairies were a secret to most people as regards the best methods of cultivation in order to get the best results. We have blundered on from year to year until many of us have found out something about that great country. The experiments and experience of individual farmers plus the experiments and experience of those experimental farms have blazed the way towards reasonably good cultural methods.

So, to-day, in the light of present conditions, in the light of world demand for high class products, especially live stock products, it is well at this time to extend the activities of those farms more than ever before in the direction of live stock production. In the history of Canadian agriculture, there was never a time when the export demand for live stock products was more difficult and hard to please than it is at the present time. We are competing with highly developed and specialized countries in the production of practically all our meat and dairy products. There is one staple article upon which I think Canada has the edge upon the rest of the world, and that is the production of hard wheat. That we get by nature, due to no particular ability on the part of ourselves, but to the soil and climatic conditions of the West. With respect, however, to live stock and live stock products, we have to compete with specialized countries such as Denmark, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina and other countries. Consequently, at this time, the activities of, especially, the older experimental farms should be extended in the direction of more attention to live stock. I think the time has come when we should make these farms largely live stock breeding depots, so that the adjoining territory may be more conveniently supplied with breeding stock from those centres. Possibly, at times, one might be able to establish regular sales of live stock at those centres to which breeders could come in order to secure their requirements.

In visiting the farms in British Columbia, I found, of course, an entirely different condition of affairs. While they are interested in live stock, they are primarily interested in dairying, poultry raising and fruit growing. I did not visit the farm at Invermere, although it was my intention to do so. It is not very easy to get at, and a good deal of time is required to give it the attention it should receive. Possibly at some subsequent date I may be able to visit that farm. But I visited the farm at Summerland on Okanagan lake, and there I found the question of irrigation was one of the uppermost problems. They had difficulty in regard to the supply of water. They were endeavouring to irrigate without the necessary available supply of water, and that question confronted, not only that experimental farm, but many private farms throughout that district. Then there were the questions of fruit growing, of cover crop, of extending the area to be devoted to farming, of what manurial agency should be supplied to the land there, of raising the necessary live stock. I found that one of the problems, a problem which may sound strange to prairie farmers, was to get the necessary quantity of straw to supply bedding to their live stock, two carloads of which they usually fattened during the winter months. Straw cost them from sixteen dollars a ton laid down at Summerland, and to buy manure from the live stock yards at Calgary would cost them six or seven dollars a ton, so there they were confronted with the difficulty of growing live stock on an experimental farm in that irrigation area. Notwithstanding that, however, they have found it profitable to fatten live stock every winter. Even at the expense of buying dear straw, they found that more economical than not to have any live stock and to have to buy manure from the stockyards at Calgary.

Going further to the West, visiting one of the old initial farms, the Agassiz farm, we found conditions there, from an artistic and a horticultural standpoint, particularly interesting. It was like an old-established farm in some of the more beautiful parts in old England. The shrubbery and trees resembled old country plantations because of their variety and luxuriance.

We found that dairying and poultry raising were given exceptional attention there, and I ran across the cow that subsequently proved to be the world-beater in the matter of producing butter fat. This particular Holstein cow was about half way through her twelve months' period of test, and at that

time, while not making a record with respect to milk production, she promised to be a record maker and breaker with respect to butter fat. The end of the twelve months' period with respect to that cow showed a test for the twelve months of 1345 pounds of butter fat, which is equivalent to 1683 pounds of butter. This is the largest amount of butter fat and butter produced by any single cow we know of in the entire world. This shows what British Columbia can do in dairying; because it would be impossible for any cow to make such a favourable record if the natural conditions were not propitious.

Last year I tentatively intimated that I should like to carry out what seemed to be the policy of my predecessor in regard to the location of an experimental farm on the Canadian National line somewhere between Prince Rupert and Fort George. We found a number of localities suitable for such institutions; and in my opinion, when that part of the country is supplied in this respect, it should really have two farms to meet the situation. However, there may be a difference of opinion with regard to that. After returning to Ottawa and getting down to the preparation of these estimates, however, I found that for another year or two we would have to abandon the prospect of establishing a new farm in that district, although when we do establish one I think that is where it should be located. It is not a very good practice to make too many forecasts, because we have such financial limitations to face. But some day we shall be extending the number of our experimental farms, and I have no doubt that this locality will receive one. My predecessor is of the same opinion, as, I understand, are all the members of the departmental staff.

Coming back by way of Edmonton I visited the Lacombe and Lethbridge farms, which are doing excellent work. At Lethbridge they are also taking up the question of irrigation. This is a comparatively old farm and is well established being in the heart of southern Alberta. It is situated in one of the driest places possible in the West, but notwithstanding that fact, and independent of irrigation, it has shown splendid results this year. With irrigation, of course, the results are greater still. On all of these farms a great deal of attention is being paid to live stock, particularly dairy cattle. Not only at Lethbridge and at Lacombe, but throughout that part of the country, the inquiries that come from the public would indicate that the farmers generally are in quest not only of live stock but of better live stock. Every superintendent I interviewed reported that when a man was making an inquiry for a brood sow he would always specify an animal of the bacon type. This shows that the farmers realize that if they are to compete in the British market they must produce as good an article as little Denmark and Ireland.

I visited one of the newer farms at Scott and also the farm at Swift Current. Swift Current is the last acquisition to the chain of experimental farms and was established two years ago. It also is located in the very centre of the driest part of Saskatchewan, and despite that fact it is showing excellent results. It has been demonstrated there that with very small precipitation, and with proper cultivation, you can grow crops in spite of the drought. By means of the silo and the cultivation of inter-tilled crops, like corn and sunflowers, they can produce fodder in any year. It would have to be drier than it has been in the past before you could beat that country in the production of fodder suitable for ensilage purposes. Speaking of fodders, this has been the problem which during the dry years has confronted most seriously the live stock men in southern and southwestern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. We have had a vote in the estimates in the last three or four years providing for free transportation of fodder to and from different parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Under the method of growing tilled forage crops, such as I have described, there should be no necessity for ever resorting to that practice in the future, because we can grow these commodities right at home wherever the land is of such a character that it will retain the moisture when conserved. There are a few areas here and there of gravelly or sandy subsoil to which this does not apply. But throughout that country as a whole, in spite of any drought, there is no reason why these fodder crops cannot be grown. And I do not see how the country out there can get much drier than it is. Some years we do not have more than two inches of rain during the growing season, and it would have to be drier than that before we should be unable to grow fodder for large quantities of stock.

The farm at Scott is in the centre of a peculiar type of soil. Quite adjacent to it the land is exceedingly heavy, while around Scott it is not so heavy and in some parts is comparatively light, although not so light as not to be able to produce profitable crops. And yet we do not get the same results from the summer fallowing system there that we obtain on any other farm in the prairie region. The results are not as good. It is obvious, therefore, that there are many things to be discovered of a cultural character in regard to that farm, and experimental work along that

line will continue there until we can extract from the soil some of the secrets which it hides.

With respect to the farm at Indian Head, with which I am more familiar than any other part of the country, that having been my market town for many years, I may say that the shelter belts, due to the invasion of tree insects, look rather dilapidated at the present time, especially from the railway. Notwithstanding that, however, this farm has announced a first class herd of dual purpose shorthorn cattle, which is creating a great deal of interest in that former wheat territory. The shelter belts are being renovated, different trees being replanted. I have almost concluded that planting box elder or native maple in the shelter belts in the open plains of the West is a mistake. True, it is still to be found in some places; but there are other trees that will do much better and are less open to insect attacks. Around Brandon we had something of the same experience. When you get further east, around Winnipeg, the box elder makes a reasonably good tree; but we have several trees that make better shelter belts. At least, so far as the experimental farm system is concerned, we will not plant many more box elders. We are devoting our attention to replanting the shelter belts where necessary. But we shall not have to plant them so extensively as formerly, because we are giving more attention on the farms to live stock, so that we shall not need so many shelter belts to overcome the soil drifting tendencies which we have had to contend with.

Coming to Brandon, another of our original farms, I found part of it had been destroyed by the freshets of a year ago. The overflow of the Assinboine river, which occurs at irregular intervals, inundated a very considerable part of the farm and seriously interfered with experimental and general crop production. A tree belt had to be removed, partly because of invasion of insect pests and partly because it was too thick. It demonstrated to us that in planting shelter belts we should select a more permanent tree than the box elder. I did not have an opportunity to visit the Morden farm. In the vicinity is the farm of the late Mr. A. P. Stephenson, in his day probably one of the foremost horticulturists in the West. The Morden farm, although established only eight or ten years ago, is making satisfactory progress. I should like also on my way east to have inspected the Kapuskasing farm. I passed through there on a Sunday and had not time to wait over. The train stopped, however, sufficiently long for me to see from the railway the work done, although of course in a very cursory fashion. I could see that where formerly was coniferous wooded land—which as a rule is not very productive land in eastern Canada—luxurious crops either growing or in the stook gave evidence of a fertile soil, and I gathered that the country around Kapuskasing has a great agricultural future.

Coming to this province, I have not had an opportunity of visiting our tobacco farms in western Ontario, but I was able to visit four of our experimental farms in Quebec. That province has often been spoken of as not quite so progressive as some of the other provinces. That just depends, of course, on what we call progressive. I had no thought of using the word in a political sense, Mr. Chairman. I found a very large measure of contentment in that province, and the neat farms nestling close to each other, with their whitewashed outer buildings and cosy homesteads indicated substantial prosperity.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before we rose for dinner I was endeavouring to describe the workings of the various experimental farms throughout Canada, and I shall continue, beginning with Cap Rouge, which is about twelve and one-half miles from Quebec.

I have already drawn some comparisons between agriculture in the province of Quebec and some of the other provinces of Canada. Nothwithstanding the small farms in Quebec, at no place that I visited did I see greater evidence of contentment, happiness and thrift than in that province. I do not know whether this can be attributed to the fact that Quebec is noted for small farms and large families, while out in the West we are noted for large farms and small families; but possibly the happy medium between these two would be better than either extreme. We cannot apply the small farm system to the western prairies, but possibly we might modify the size of our farms and make them more of a self-contained unit, such as we find the farms in old Ontario to-day. I am familiar with the conditions during my youth, and I am also familiar with the glory and the great temptation to go into extensive farming operations. On the large farm, if you hit it right, you can make a lot of money, but on the other hand, if you do not hit it right, you can go broke very quickly especially during these days of deflation.

The Cap Rouge farm has the largest herd of what we call Canadian cattle; some call them the Canadian Jersey. They have been in Quebec for over three hundred years, and have maintained their purity and are now a recognized breed in our Canadian records. They have also there the largest herd of Canadian horses, the black Normandy horse, which has come down through all these years and maintained its purity and is a registered pedigreed animal.

From Cap Rouge we motored to St. Anne de la Pocatière, where the experimental farm is located, and even in that portion of Quebec where fruit growing is not supposed to be one of the characteristics we found well conducted farms. The country looked very beautiful, with the majestic St. Lawrence on the one hand, and numerous villages nestled at the foot of the hills, all betokening contentment and happiness.

We motored back over a rougher part of the province through what is known as the asbestos country. I understand that Quebec has ninety per cent of the asbestos of the world. One would think the whole earth was turned inside out on account of the mining operations that are being conducted there. That did not interest me very much from an agricultural standpoint, but I understood that agriculture in that neighbourhood is helped out very considerably by opportunities of work during the winter months and at other times in these asbestos mines.

From there we motored to the Lennoxville farm in the Sherbrooke district, passing through the old historic constituency of Brome. We passed the country home of the late Sydney Fisher, and it was very interesting to me, recalling, as it did, old historic associations. We found that the Lennoxville farm had been largely reclaimed from swamp land. It has shown great evidence of development during recent years. The farm is more or less scattered and comprises a number of small farms, but when the buildings become consolidated I am sure the work there will show great progress. It is doing well now. There is another farm located in the north on the National Transcontinental railway.

I understand from our Maritime friends that the best is yet to come. We have four experimental farms down by the sea, one in Prince Edward Island, at Charlottetown, one at Fredericton, New Brunswick, one at Nappan, and another at Kentville, and I am looking forward with pleasure to visiting these farms. I hear from some sources that one of them is no good and should be abandoned, and from other sources that it only needs to be brushed up and put in good shape. There is great work for it, for agriculture in the Maritime provinces, particularly live stock, requires taking care of just the same as it does in any other part of Canada.

Speaking of the question of live stock I was distressed to find, wherever I went, that the live stock required developing, whether it was for beef or dairying, throughout the whole interior of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Furthermore, having regard to the recognized fact that agriculture cannot permanently exist without live stock as its chief support I am impressed more and more with the importance of making these experimental farms breeding depots for the adjoining or contiguous country.

My attention was drawn when the committee took recess, to the fact that I had overlooked the Rosthern farm, and also the farm at Sidney on Vancouver Island. The farm at Sidney is a very interesting one, doing a lot of work along dairy and poultry lines for which the country is noted. It is very inconveniently located. Apart from that, it is advantageously situated from the climatic point of view, and is doing good work and getting results.

The question of continuing the Rosthern farm was raised by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) last year, because of its proximity to the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, where practically similar work is being conducted. I think when the time comes it will probably be found of advantage to move the Rosthern farm, but I do not think it is wise at this time to take it from there. I am a new administrator on this work, and I would not like the impression to go abroad that I was going to start a policy of moving the location of any of these farms. Unfortunately the Rosthern farm was located before the university was established. It is the fault of no one in particular, but the work overlaps. It is the policy of the department to try, as far as may be, and work in co-operation with the provinces. Until we know the policy of the provincial government and the Saskatchewan University with respect to the location of their sub-stations—one of which they are going to build this year and six others later—until we know something of the location of these sub-stations it would not be wise to move the Rosthern farm. In the meantime it can do a good work. There is a certain portion of the farm you cannot salvage. You cannot, for instance, move a pit silo and then there are feeding yards. A good deal of the facilities there would be

wasted by moving, and for the present I hope we can continue there. Nevertheless, I think that sooner or later such action will be taken, and the sooner the Rosthern farm is moved to some other part of Saskatchewan I think the better it will be. In the meantime we are not making any more capital outlay at Rosthern; we are merely continuing activities with the facilities we have at hand. I discussed this matter very fully with Mr. Munroe, the superintendent of the farm, and he felt just as I do, that we could not justify the continuance of the operation of the Rosthern farm so close to Saskatoon from which it is only forty miles distant, and he thought that if we were going to move the farm the sooner the better, because naturally capital outlay would all be suspended in the meantime and they would be more or less simply marking time. Moreover you cannot move a farm without incurring a large expenditure for your new site and for the new buildings that would have to be undertaken at the same time that the old building was being operated. When the new farm was ready you could move your whole equipment and live stock to the new location. That would involve a very substantial additional expenditure which we are not prepared to undertake at the present time. Ultimately, I think, the location of that farm will be changed to some other part of Saskatchewan, presumably in the north which is to-day without a farm of this nature.

I have reviewed this work more fully than I did last year because I wanted to report to the House the result of my investigation. I find wherever I go some individual here and there who takes the ground that an experimental farm cannot justify its expenditure unless it can show an actual balance on the right side at the end of the year's operation, in dollars and cents. I do not mean indirectly but directly. Now an experimental farm properly conducted can never accomplish that result; and if I found any of these farms paying in the sense of which we speak about private farms paying, I would come to the conclusion that they do not carry on experimentation. On the other hand I do not know any better investment that Canada has made in the past than the establishment of these farms. We are confronted with a situation that I do not think even the farmer with the most intimate knowledge of markets realizes. We have the most fastidious foreign demand for farm produce that we ever had to cater to; we have the keenest competition; we need all the assistance we can get from every available source; and I am satisfied that these farms, notwithstanding the good work they have done in the past, have a greater work to perform in the future.

I think that I should now afford the opportunity to members of the committee to ask questions with respect to those farms. I have merely given a resumé to indicate—first, what has been accomplished; second, what we have in view; and third, that the way to get the best results out of these farms is not by dissipating activities by the establishment of more farms, but by bringing those existing into even a higher state of efficiency than now prevails. Therefore I would invite the co-operation of the committee with respect to any form of betterment. I am awfully sorry that I cannot hold out the prospect to members of the committee of one or two new farms in the future. I think the situation with respect to agriculture to-day is too serious, and the members of the committee have before them other fruitful fields of discussion without threshing out the threadbare question of whether we shall have new experimental farms.

Mr. LEADER: I have listened with interest to the very optimistic address of the minister, but I regret that the first appropriation for which he is asking shows an increase of $200,000. When a government pledged to economy comes back from the elections and at the first shot over the box asks us to vote for this particular purpose $200,000 more than we did last year I do not believe it is right. I say in all seriousness to the minister that in my opinion he should be satisfied with the appropriation that was granted last year. This is no time for experiments. I am opposed to unnecessary expenditure at any time, and most decidely I am opposed to it now.

Mr. MARTELL: Do you not want the Hudson Bay railway? Is not that an experiment?

Mr. LEADER: We are not discussing the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will permit me, does he not say it is no time for experiments. In that case I ask him and those associated with him why they are trying to experiment with the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. HOEY: Did the Liberal government consider the Hudson Bay railway an experiment in the first instance?

Mr. LEADER: I was discussing what is before the committee. I do not think this is the time for making such experiments. I am not in a position to say whether these experiments would appeal to the taxpayers of

Canada or not, but I can say that the money to be voted for this purpose has to be extracted from the overburdened taxpayer and therefore I am opposed to it. I said that I was opposed to unnecessary expenditure. I am certainly not opposed to what I think is legitimate and necessary expenditure. There is such a thing as false economy. Further down in the estimates there is something for which I am going to ask an increase. I believe the expenditure in question is legitimate, and that an increase is necessary to successfully carry on the work which it has reference to. Any good cause must be prosecuted if we wish to obtain good results. I do not feel like voting for this increase in the present estimates, in fact I would advise the minister to cut off the increase of $200,000, and be satisfied with the vote he got last year in view of the conditions which prevail in this country at the present time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend has any plan calculated to put these farms in better shape without involving the expenditure of money I am open to receive suggestions from him. There is no royal road to farming, even in the case of experimental farms. Such work involves expenditure for men and for other purposes. The question is, are we going to leave the farms in the condition in which some of them are, or are we going to put them in a fair condition of efficiency so that they may function in the way that the originators of this scheme intended they should function, and undoubtedly they require to function today as they never did before. You would only put Canada on its feet through the medium of the development of its natural resources, particularly farming. These must be developed or else we might as well close up. This is not a question on which we should differ very much from the party standpoint, for this reason: all parties and governments have stood behind this system since its inception. It was started by the Conservative government under Sir John A. Macdonald and carried on by successive governments until to-day, and the testimony not only of those who know the most about these farms, but those who have studied systems elsewhere, both on this continent and in Europe, is that we have got a better system of experimental farms than any other place on this continent. I have had an opportunity of investigating them in Europe also, and while I would not make as sweeping a statement as that, I am convinced they will compare favourably. What are we going to do? Are we going to run them in a cheap way? Some of them are sick sisters, it is true. These are the ones we want to build up, and if there is any mesmeric way of getting at the result except spending some money, then I am open to suggestions from any source whatever. I recall that my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) was desperately anxious about a certain vote last year, when I was trying to get the compensation for animals slaughtered on account of tuberculosis reduced somewhat in proportion to the reduced value of the animals. My hon. friend made such strong recommendations, that in a moment of weakness I yielded to him and restored a portion of the original amount. Now, this question all depends on how it affects one's self. I am going to bring down a bill reducing the amount to where I suggested it should be last year, as compensation for pure-bred cattle, and I will give my hon. friend an opportunity of displaying his ideas of economy when that bill is presented. In the meantime my best thought is that $200,000 cannot be spent better than in putting our experimental farms in first class shape.

Mr. HOEY: Will the minister indicate just how the money should be spent? Perhaps he gave that information before I came into the chamber, but I should like to know just where that money is to be spent. Is it to be spent at all the experimental farms, or are there certain farms that are going to benefit to this extent?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend mean the individual farms? Does he want to know how much we propose to spend on Morden, Brandon, Indian Head, and so on? I think we cannot give the individual expenditure in detail in regard to each farm.

Mr. HOEY: I had in mind the increased expenditure.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will give my hon. friend an idea of the line along which these increases will be made. We have, in animal husbandry, an increase of $3,000 for equipment, for a sheep farm and for increased hog testing work. Then, for bacteriology, we have an appropriation of $5,500. This is a new line of work not before provided for. This is for the central farm at Ottawa. I may say, with respect to this question of bacteriology, that it is a matter a very great number of people do not take much interest in, but at the same time certain bacteria have developed in our cheeses this year, and we find that it was on the point of poisoning some of our customers in the Old Country—at least, so it was reported. On investigating this matter we have been able to trace this cheese

back to the respective creameries, but we have not been able to isolate, as we call it, the bacteria. What we want to discover is what particular acid or what particular bacteria is working in some of these factories and affecting some of their cheeses, because this will tend to destroy our markets overseas. If we had two or three more instances like that which occurred last year in regard to our cheese in the British market, we would soon take worse than second place to New Zealand in the cheese market. There is an increase of $1,500 for the expansion of experimental work in plant pathology at the central laboratory. That has to do with the investigation of plant diseases, rust and such like.

Then with regard to cereals there is an increase of $2,000 for conducting milling and baking tests and work with imported seeds. New varieties of grain cannot be put upon the market or even recommended to the public until we know something of their milling properties.

Then for extension and publicity there is an increase of $3,000 for preparatory work in connection with the Overseas Exhibition to be held in London in 1924. In the superintendent's division there is an increase of $2,000 for much needed construction of roads and sidewalks. In field husbandry, there is an increase of $2,000 to take care of the expansion of experimental work. For forage plants there is an increase of $2,000 for new lines of work in connection with the breeding of forage crops. When one remembers what has been accomplished in the development of forage plants, in making use of plants that ten years ago were looked upon as not only useless but actually harmful, it will be seen that it is a good experiment. Take the case of sweet clover and take the use that has been made in recent years of the sunflower, which I mentioned this afternoon; the development of these and the experimentation with them has resulted in possibilities in forage, especially in the West, that were never dreamed of five or six years ago.

Then in horticulture there is an increase of $7,000 for expansion of experimental work in pomology, in canning, and preserving and in the breeding of new varieties of fruits. Let any man go into our fruit areas and tell me if the government is not justified in extending a helping hand to this particular industry. It is more necessary in this than any other branch of farming that I know of, because of the fact that it deals which what I call a perishable commodity, which is not capable of being warehoused for an indefinite period like grain.

Mr. FORKE: Is not marketing and distribution the great trouble with the fruit industry to-day?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No question about that. I will come to that in a moment. We have to-day a large number of cattle that are being, not stall-fed but winter-fed, most of them loose in the yard. We have about twenty carloads in all. My hon. friend knows that there has been a great deal of expectation roused in the farmers' breasts with respect to the removal of the embargo, with the result that we have three or four cattle all over Ontario being fattened and fed this winter for one that was fed last year. Ocean freight rates, even after their recent reduction, are such that a great many people think an experiment should be made in the shipping of chilled meat to the British market. We intend to take these cattle that are fed at our experimental farms and start an experiment in shipping chilled beef, putting, say, two carloads on the market each year for eight or ten consecutive weeks. We may not be able to have enough to complete an experiment sufficiently long to establish the value of our chilled meat on the British market. Some of our breeders have been conducting these experiments, but they have lost money by it, partly due to the fact that they have not had this product on the market long enough to beat down the Old Country prejudice against chilled meat. We hope to take those animals that have been fed on our farms, grain-finish them in order to give them the best bloom and offset any prejudice they might occasion as a result of the chilling process, try out the experiment of sending so many carloads of chilled meat and so many carloads of live animals to the British market, and compare results. That is one of the propositions we have in mind, and it is under way as regards preparing our cattle for that market.

Mr. FORKE: I do not wish to interrupt the minister or to hamper him in any way; but did he ever see chilled meat on the market in Great Britain?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have never been there, but my deputy has recently come from there.

Mr. FORKE: If he had, he would understand what is the trouble with chilled meat. People call it "shiny." It looks shiny; it does not look well, and the British people will not eat shiny meat.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It does not what we call, "stand up;" it has not on it the bloom

that fresh meat has. Notwithstanding that, the Argentine Republic send meat there, not only chilled, but a large portion of it actually frozen. That meat has to "de-frost," and it, of course, does not look as attractive as fresh meat. There are certain exudations from it when the frost goes out of it. But something that has to be experimented with is to have the meat "de-frost" without its having that messy appearance that is so much objected to. This is, however, an experiment in preparing chilled meat. and the success or failure of chilled meat shipments to the old country in comparison with shipments of live cattle, can be determined only by trying out the experiment.

Mr. SHAW: Is it not a fact that private capital is now engaged in experimenting in placing chilled meat on the market? If that is so, why should it be necessary for the department to engage in similar experiments where private enterprise is now leading the way?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The answer to that is this, that a great many people have so exercised the public mind against abattoirs that the public will not accept the result of experiments from that source. I have no reason to doubt the bona fides of that experiment, but I take the ground that it was not continued long enough to indicate what the ultimate result would be—success or failure. If you put any article on the British market, intermittently, you will not get successful results. An article must be available all the time before you can get the full value of the experiment. When you put a new article like Canadian chilled meat on the British market this week and none next week, that does not do the article justice. Furthermore, my information is that private enterprise thinks it has gone about as far as it can afford to go at this time, because it is losing money, and if anybody should experiment, it should be the government so that all parties might benefit thereby. The abattoirs take the ground that they have gone as far along the line of experimentation as they might well be expected to go. That is the reason why the government is experimenting at this stage, and with our own cattle, these experiments can be conducted at the minimum cost. The cattle are there now, owned and fed by the government.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I do not think the minister quite concluded his explanation in regard to questions asked about details of the increased expenditure. I do not feel myself in a position to criticize the increased appropriation, and, indeed, if it is properly expended, I regard it as one very capable of justification.

I was interested this afternoon in hearing the minister's account of his tour of inspection, when he mentioned that he had visited the experimental farm in my constituency at Summerland. I can assure him that his visit there was greatly appreciated. In my opinion, we have as superintendent of that farm, in the person of Mr. Helmer, a most capable and efficient officer. I know he is a man who gives a great deal of attention to research work at all times, and the exhibits from that farm which he puts up at the annual provincial or local exhibitions are of very great interest. The farm is limited in area and his opportunities of increasing his usefulness are considerably restricted on that account. In this contemplated addition to the appropriation, is anything included for addition or expansion in that Summerland farm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend refers to the Indian land adjoining that farm?

Mr. MacKELVIE: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are purchasing that. I do not know whether the contract has actually gone through yet, but it has been agreed to. We are also providing for what is very much more needed, and that is a new water supply. You cannot irrigate, I find, without water and plenty of it. The arrangement that was made before did not meet the situation, so that we are securing not only more land, but more water for that farm, two things very much required.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Has any request come to the department for a pre-cooling plant there for fruit?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am sure we have all followed, with a good deal of interest, the statement which has been given to the House to-day by the minister in regard to the experimental farms throughout the country. I am inclined, however, to think that when his statement is published throughout Canada, there will be a feeling of disappointment as a result of his explanation regarding this increase of $200,000 which we find in the estimates. There is no denying the fact that the experimental work which has been done on our experimental farms has resulted in great benefit to the country. I would not say that the money has been always wisely expended; but I must rise to express my surprise

at and my disapproval of the proposed increase of $200,000 in this item, if the increase is, as the minister has explained, to establish live stock depots at those farms for the breeding of live stock to supply adjacent districts. This was the main feature of the minister's remarks to the House on this item. The live stock breeders in this country have experienced a rather trying period during the last few years. The deflation which has taken place in the case of live stock is such that, I think they will view with alarm the fact that experimental farms of this country are going to be used now to operate in competition with Canadian breeders of live stock. Many of our live stock breeders have expended much money in the development of the live stock business in Canada, and after all is said and done, I think every reasonable person will acknowledge that Canada owes more to those importers and breeders than it does to the experimental farms as regards the improvement of live stock. That is only natural. I do not believe it is possible for a government to manage a business as well as a private individual can manage it himself, when he is vitally interested in the success of that business; nor do I think it comes within the province of a government to enter upon a field of industry which rightly belongs to the people themselves. I must protest against this proposed plan of making live stock breeding depots of experimental farms to enter into competition with the breeders of live stock in this country.

If, as my hon. friend says, the usefulness of many of the farms has passed, then close them by all means. Let us practise economy to-day if we can possibly do so, and do not let us continue the work on these farms just because they are in existence. With regard to the Central Experimental farm at Ottawa, I think we must all view with alarm the enormous expenditures that are there being made, not for experimental purposes, but in order largely to maintain the farm as a show place for visitors. I think that the amount which has been spent during the past few years, which runs into millions of dollars, for the labour alone that has been employed on the farm, is not justifiable, especially under present conditions. However, I have risen principally to protest against the government using the money of the people to establish experimental farms to undertake the breeding of live stock to supply the wants of the people, which I contend is a business that rightly belongs to the farmers of the country. I do not think that this move on the part of the government is fair or has any tendency to encourage agriculture in Canada. Furthermore, the government should not go into this business until they know that they can carry it on as well as private individuals can. And it is generally conceded that no government, I care not of what complexion, is competent to carry on work of that kind as well as it can be done privately. Nor do I think it comes within the province of this government, under the conditions that prevail to-day, to paralyze the live stock industry of the country further by an increase of $200,000 in an item which I think is altogether too large considering the results that have been obtained from the experimental farms.

I was amused to hear the minister tell the committee that in his tour of inspection he had seen, I believe from the platform of the train, the experimental farm located four or five hundred miles from here in the bush in northern Ontario, at Kapuskasing. The day being Sunday, he could not take a further view of the farm than he was able to get from the station. If you go to the furthest point west in the province of Ontario you will find only a small station for experimental purposes in the growing of tobacco, and I do not know whether the minister proposes to discontinue the growing of tobacco there in order to set up a live stock industry. I should be surprised if he did, because that station, for some reason or other, has been practically self-sustaining and has not entailed any great expense upon the Dominion. Perhaps, however, it will probably be closed, because the minister has intimated that when any station or farm becomes self-sustaining it has ceased to be useful and it is time to close it. I have protested for several years against the treatment which has been meted out to Ontario in regard to experimental farms. That province has to do the work in this direction itself, while at the same time it contributes largely to the upkeep of the work that is carried on in the other provinces. The live stock industry has been encouraged in the other provinces to a degree which the province of Ontario has not enjoyed. The minister also states that his department is now going to try to dispel the British prejudice against chilled beef, and that an effort will be made to ship that commodity over to the Old Land to convince the Englishman that it is better than the beef to which he has been accustomed. In view of the removal of the embargo against Canadian cattle, and the fact that ocean rates are now about one-third what they were some time ago, the prospects for the live stock industry are no doubt much brighter than they

have been for some years, and I am surprised that the government at this stage finds it necessary to enter upon any large expenditure in the endeavour to remove this prejudice from the minds of the British people. That argument was not advanced a year ago when the grading of hogs formed a part of the government's programme. But it was agreed we should have to supply the article which the British public demand. I think the minister will have on his hands a bigger contract than he thinks in convincing the Old Country citizen that chilled beef is as good as the meat he has been using, and which we are now in a position to place on the British market. I fear therefore that this money will be largely wasted if any attempt is made to carry out the plan which the minister contemplates. I want again to point out the glaring injustice which will be done to the live stock industry and the breeders in this country if the government attempts to enter upon the breeding of animals with the view of supplying the market in the various parts of this Dominion. This is something that ought to be left to the people themselves, and I will venture to state that the government have not been asked by those engaged in the industry to seek an increased vote for this purpose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I expected that an objection might be raised to these farms devoting more attention to live stock. These farms have been gradually drifting into live stock activities, especially on the prairies during the last two or three years, and we merely want to accelerate that tendency to meet the altered conditions that face us to-day in agriculture. When the government enters into a business like live stock, or say, seed growing or forestry, experience has shown in the past that instead of hurting it has stimulated private enterprise. Take the nursery farms that have been established throughout the country. When they were first mooted it was thought by the nursery men that they would simply invade the average private man's domain and tend to destroy his business. Now it is found that the activities of the Forestry branch have had the effect of increasing private business. The government sends into a district that has not hitherto taken any interest in the matter a consignment of fruits, etc. The neighbours look on and see the industry develop and immediately they send in orders, if not to the government, to some nursery man, who accordingly finds his business increased. The same is true with regard to seed. The seed merchants of Canada were at first very diffident about the government taking any part in the distribution of seed. Now they come here and assist us in organizing and extending our activities, knowing that every new convert we get to better seed means more business to them individually. And the same can be said in the matter of live stock. Every district that is induced to put in a club breeding animal establishes a centre that becomes an example to the neighbourhood, and the result is that in a short time orders are placed with private breeders for pure-bred stock. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) that while I expected the argument which he has so well advanced, experience in the past has nevertheless shown that similar fears have been groundless in regard to other activities. Not only this government, but the provincial governments in the three prairie provinces have been engaged actively in the distribution of live stock for the last ten or twelve years, and I do not know that a single objection has been raised by any stock breeders out there. Why, I really am at a loss to know what to advance to meet my hon. friend's arguments. Those arguments were common stock fifty years ago. But are we going to revert to that day, and must I take up the time of this committee to meet those ancient arguments?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have done my best to show that my hon. friend's fears are unfounded. With respect to the experimental farms, my heart did bleed freely last year when he described in such harrowing detail the abuses that had been heaped on good old Ontario. Although she had a majority in the preceding government, yet even during their term of office those abuses were afflicting the province. We have three experimental farms in Ontario—the Central Experimental, which I think is equivalent to two or three average branch farms, the Kapuskasing and the Harrow. The Harrow farm has been conducted for about ten years under lease, but recently we purchased the freehold. That farm has been so successful in developing many acceptable varieties of tobacco leaf that to-day our tobacco makers are using a large proportion of our domestic leaf to mix with their imported tobacco—something that they would have considered wholly impracticable twenty years ago. Our purchase of this farm is a good indication that we do not propose to abandon it. Nor did I say that we were going to convert all our farms into live stock breeding stations. I took the ground that in the fruit areas our activities would be along lines suitable to those localities. My remarks in regard to live stock breeding stations were confined to the Maritime and the prairie

provinces, and if anyone with any knowledge of live stock will say on his reputation that this industry does not require developing in those provinces, I am open to receive instructons from him. I say again that our live stock industry has receded from the highest point of efficiency and excellence which it occupied even eight years ago, and as compared with thirty years ago our exportable beef to-day is far below the standard of those years. There is a reason for that which I do not need to enter into here. I hope I have allayed my hon. friend's anxiety, but from my experience last year I have my doubts. I will do my best to remove any objections that may be raised in respect to this policy. The only objection, as I have intimated, came from a gentleman who was not an expert on live stock matters, and he took the same attitude as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland); and while the reasons with which he supported his objection looked quite plausible, I have not heard further from him. I wrote him fully in reply and from his silence I must conclude that I have converted him. I hope to have the same experience with my hon. friend.

Mr. HARRIS: Before this particular vote is passed, Mr. Chairman, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not congratulate the worthy minister for the travelogue he gave to the committee before recess. Perhaps before these estimates are passed some other members of the ministry will give us equally interesting stories of their travels—not across Canada, but in other lands. I congratulate my hon. friend upon seeing Canada first. His colleagues perhaps will come more in line with the words of the man in the street who on meeting an ordinary parliamentarian says to him, not knowing perhaps to which party he belongs, "Why don't you join the Cabinet and see the world?" The hon. Minister of Agriculture, however, is Canadian enough at least to see Canada first.

But I submit, Sir, that he has not told the committee the why and the
9 p.m. wherefore which justify him in increasing the estimates of his department by $200,000. We admit that this particular increase perhaps does relate to our basic industry, but surely at a time like this when those who are engaged in this particular industry have to cut down their expenditures to the bone, the department itself should at least try to get along with the same vote as was granted last year. Coming from one of the oldest parts of Ontario, where we have a township of the finest farms in the whole Dominion, settled by pioneers some hundred and fifty years ago, and knowing how their descendants in plying their vocation to-day have retrenched their expenditures to an extent which brings great credit to them, but which, I regret to say, is not exemplified in the administration of my hon. friend's department, I cannot conceive how the minister can justify this increase. I fail to see why the government in one of the very first votes should say to the people, we want more money from you to run the Department of Agriculture. In all fairness I ask the minister to tell this committee where and how this money is going to be spent; if he intends to establish more experimental farms; if any economies were effected last year and, if so, where he is allocating those savings. If he can convince the committee, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has pointed out, that it is necessary for his department to embark on this particular live stock enterprise, then I will permit the vote to pass, but otherwise, Sir, I shall oppose it.

Mr. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I feel at some disadvantage in following the eloquent member for East York (Mr. Harris). However, I think I understand something about the purpose of these experimental farms. Some hon. gentlemen seem to be under the impression that our experimental farms should be run at a profit. I have never regarded them from that point of view. The purpose of these farms is to experiment along a great many lines that the individual farmer is not able to attempt. These experimental farms are not established as money-making concerns. I do not know whether the hon. minister has convinced the committee or not, but as a stock man all my life I know that to-day the live stock business in our western country is in a bad condition. We have got to help the live stock business back into a prosperous condition in order to make Canada prosperous. I do not know the policy of these farms all the way through, but I do not feel that it is necessary for these farms to compete in a way that is injurious to our live stock interests. I do not imagine that is going to happen. As a stock man I have seen the time when I very much appreciated the opportunity to go to the demonstration or experimental farm in Alberta and get young bulls. I have done that, and I did not feel that those farms were putting me out of business or competing with me when I did so. I have got better bulls than I could get anywhere else right from those farms, and I got bulls that were bred along the lines

that I wanted. I feel that if the experimental farms continue to do that, it will much more than offset any danger of competition with the stock man. There are many stock men in this country who are discouraged to-day, and Canada cannot afford to have the stock business go down hill. It should be our effort to keep the business up to where it ought to be.

I hold no brief for the government as to the expenditure of this money, but I do feel there is a chance for them to use the increase this year to good advantage on the experimental farms. I should like to impress upon the House that these farms are making money for the individual farmer. I thought I knew the business pretty thoroughly myself, but I have had a good many pointers from the experimental and demonstration farms. I could not afford to do that experimenting myself, but I took advantage of their experiments and applied what I learned to my own farm, to my profit. That is the light in which I look at the experimental farms.

I am not going to enter into any dispute as to whether or not the government will use this money rightly, but I am not here to oppose the government in something which I think it is possible for them to make of service to our country. Agriculture has never had the encouragement and money expended upon it that it should have had, in proportion to the importance of the industry in Canada. I do not care to make a speech on this subject, but I did want to tell the House how I felt about it, and I have been a stock man all my life. If there are other lines in which part of this money is to be spent, the minister has not told us about them; there is plenty of room in the stock business alone to use all that increase, if it is expended in the right way, and I am willing to support the government and give it a chance to make good on this item.

Mr. GOULD: It might be well to point out that this item of $1,525,000 which is credited under the Department of Agriculture is a sum to be spent on experimental farms, which in turn furnish opportunities to each and every individual throughout the whole Dominion. Usually a vote of this nature is supposed to be wholly and solely for the purposes of agriculture, which represents, we will say, possibly fifty per cent of the people of Canada. But that is an absolutely erroneous view to take of the question.

I would also point out that I have great faith in the present Minister of Agriculture, as I had in the previous Minister of Agriculture, and I have always supported the estimates brought down by both these hon. gentlemen simply because I have always felt that agriculture in Canada has been starved and has never received its fair proportion of the public moneys that was its right, and was necessary to establish the industry and give it a fair chance as compared with other governmental activities. One of the reasons why I say a complimentary word of the present Minister of Agriculture is because in my own province I had the pleasure of working for him in a small way for twelve years while he was Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, and I know whereof I speak. That is one of the reasons why I do not question his action when he comes to this House and asks for an increase of $200,000 in this vote, because I feel sure that it will be expended wisely.

As I stated before, a vote of this kind will benefit each and every individual in the Dominion if they like to accept the opportunities afforded through the experimental farm system. I do not approve of the idea that it would be economy to cut that off. There is such a thing as false economy, and if you put the number of people who are interested in agriculture at 48 or 50 per cent of the population, this amount is very, very small indeed to be allotted to agriculture. The sum of $200,000 is a mere bagatelle; it is not nearly enough. I stated to the minister last year that under his jurisdiction I would be prepared to stand in my place and ask for an increase of $1,000,000 for the purposes of agriculture this year. I would point to this fact in support of the statement I made when I first rose, that for about five years only the small sum of approximately $3,000,000 was voted in this large Dominion for the purposes of agriculture. I say it was a crying shame that governments in this country should have continued so long to pay so little attention to the merits of agriculture that they allowed it to get along with a paltry $3,000,000. We have protested, and our protests are now being heard At the same time we recognize the extreme importance of keeping down expenditure in this country. But there is wise and unwise expenditure, and I have no hesitation in passing my judgment at this time that this $200,000 is a very wise expenditure, and if any fault is to be found with it at all, it is that it is too small.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I was pleased to hear the minister this afternoon outline his policy of encouraging the live stock industry, particularly in the prairie provinces. I agree with him when he says that permanent agriculture requires the development of live stock. There

is one feature in the development of live stock which I hope the minister will not neglect. While I come from a grain-growing district, I am particularly interested in the development of live stock with the growing of grain. The minister spoke this afternoon about the development of fodder crops, but I would point out that in the territory that he mentioned this afternoon, particularly southern Manitoba, southern Saskatchewan, and southern Alberta, in order to go into the live stock industry we must have something more than the fodder crops that he mentioned. We have not got in that country up to the present time a grass or fodder crop suitable for pasture in the summer or for hay. I do not say that that question has been neglected, but I say that the progress has not been made that the case demands.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What county is that?

Mr. STEEDSMAN: I refer to southwestern Manitoba. I feel that it is absolutely necessary that some of the money expended on the experimental farms up there should be devoted to experiments along that line. I am convinced that stock raising must come to make agriculture permanent there. Not only do we want development of the live stock industry, but we must have those plants I spoke of in the interests of rotation. We must have a satisfactory rotation of crops that will restore the root fibre to our soil, and in that way prevent the drifting of the soil which is becoming prevalent in the older parts of that country. I would like to ask the minister if he will make a note of that, and see to it that experiments along the line of developing grasses, clovers, and fodder crops shall be continued in that part of the country.

Mr. MILLAR: I shall vote with a great deal of reluctance for any increase in national expenditure, and yet I do not feel inclined to oppose this particular outlay. It is some thirty years since we first commenced to agitate for the British embargo on Canadian cattle. Now when it is removed we find that the British farmer desires our store cattle provided they are of the right type. It is quite evident, I think, that there are great possibilities in this direction, and that we should be able to develop a very large trade if the matter is properly handled. For that reason, knowing so well the Minister of Agriculture, in whom I have, like the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), the very greatest confidence because of his administrative ability, having lived in the same province where he successfully handled the department of agriculture, I have decided to vote for this item but I would like to make two or three comments about the experimental farms.

In the first place I would ask the minister if any plans have been laid down in connection with the raising of pure-bred stock at the farms for so distributing the different breeds that the purchasers will not be under the necessity of paying freight for a long distance. For example, we have two experimental farms, one at Brandon and the other at Indian Head, perhaps raising the same breed of stock—Shorthorns. I do not know that both are doing that, but I know that one is. Then if in another part of the Dominion two farms near together were raising Herefords and in another corner of Canada two farms were raising Aberdeen Angus it could be readily seen that it might be very awkward for those who wished to purchase this breeding stock. It would be better if they were more scattered.

One other comment, and this may seem very strange especially to those who have not been in the stock business, and that is that the cattle that are now being raised on our experimental farms, at least some of them, do not exactly fill the bill, if they are to be regarded as types for the ordinary farm, and for the reason, that they are too well cared for in their young days. We know that animals that have been raised in what I might term a pampered condition and not allowed to rustle for themselves, when placed side by side with cattle raised on the ordinary farm present a very poor appearance, a very sorry sight. I have seen them myself in very poor flesh compared with cattle raised on the ordinary farm under ordinary conditions, although the latter was in splendid condition, and that continues year after year. I remember quite well a conversation with that grand old stock man of Manitoba, Mr. Bedford, in which he stated that one of the great difficulties he had with his cattlemen on the farm was this: They were inclined to keep the windows of the barns always closed and the cattle never were allowed to be out in the cold very much. He said he was always at them to keep the windows open so as to allow the fresh air in, and permit the animals to rough it a little bit. I think every stock man knows that the young stock raised under such conditions when distributed throughout the country and kept under ordinary farm conditions will give very much better results.

These are the only comments I have to make. Perhaps the minister will answer the question I asked him, if there is any plan for the distribution of the various breeds of stock.

Mr. MILNE: We have been asked for some criticisms with respect to our experimental farms. Let me say that I am glad to know that the government have undertaken a new policy. I used to be of the opinion, and still think, that the experimental farms have been following too closely an ancient plan that was laid down several years ago. I am now glad to learn that they are adopting new views, and are going to change the former policy.

The first criticism I would make is that the appropriation for this purpose does not seem to be so arranged that we can discuss it intelligently. What I mean by that is this: Coming from Manitoba I only know, in a general way, what the experimental farms are doing in that province. So far as the farms in the East are concerned I cannot say whether they are accomplishing the results expected of them or not. I appreciate the work that the experimental farms have done and have this to say in regard to the development of our Marquis wheat. The origination of that variety of wheat alone has probably meant more for the Dominion than would be required to carry on our experimental farms for the next hundred years or more. I realize that in experimental work an investigator may labour for practically a life time and finally, when he is almost giving up in the belief that he has accomplished nothing, he makes some discovery which may be productive of marvellous results. I repeat that I fully appreciate the work the farms have done in the past, and any suggestions I may make are advanced in the hope of aiding them to assist our farmers to a still greater degree in future.

In the next place I think there is overlapping between the federal department and the provincial departments. Personally I should like to see the experimental farms conduct their various experiments in the interest of the agricultural industry, and then continue those experiments further and demonstrate that work along these lines could be successfully undertaken on the average-sized farm. So far as I know, in Manitoba at any rate, the experimental farms have not been giving any demonstrations. I would suggest that demonstration stations should be established if at all possible. Perhaps the manager of an experimental farm might get in touch with some of the farmers in the country and persuade them to adopt methods that have been proven to be superior to the ones they are following. For example, he might select a farm that is overrun with weeds, or the soil of which has been impoverished, and there demonstrate some of the conclusions arrived at on the experimental farm. I believe this would be a good work to get before the people.

I want to say further that the experiments carried on at the experimental farms do not seem to be known to a sufficiently large number of people. I would suggest that the government by some means induce people to go to the experimental farms and see the work that is going on. So far as the reports are concerned, I do not know whose fault it is. I have no suggestion to offer as to how to get information to the people, but I should say that the information that has been obtained on the experimental farms to-day is not getting to the people, and what is the use of experimenting if the farmers do not know the results. Practically speaking that is the condition of the country. A few who are more energetic visit the farm occasionally, but I think if records were available of the number of people visiting the farm we would find a very small percentage of agricultural people among them. They are more likely to be townspeople, driving out to the farms to see the flower beds, the hedges, the shade trees and so on. I say that I appreciate the work the farm is doing, but I claim that there is an overlapping of the work of the experimental farms: that is the federal experimental farm and the provincial farms. I claim that the work that is being done on the farm should be communicated to more people. It will be of no use to carry on experiments, if the results are not known, except by a few townspeople and the people working on the farm.

Mr. GARDINER: Did I understand the minister to say that a certain amount of this grant was for exhibition purposes?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will allow me, I will answer the question asked by my hon. friend under the gallery, who promised to support the vote if I would give him a reasonable justification for it, and tell him where the money is to be expended. I will answer the last question first. The sum of $2,000 is to be used for the expenses in connection with the Imperial Exhibition in the Old Country in 1924, for grouping material together for that exhibition. I do not think I need go over all these items, Mr. Chairman, but just for the purpose of giving the House some idea of where the money is going, I may say that I will start down by the Atlantic ocean. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, is to receive an increase of $6,000 over last year for the purpose of carrying on experimental work on the area recently acquired for

this farm. We acquired 40 acres to supplement the farm that was too small. That has to be developed, fed, and drained. At Nappan, N.S., there is an increase of $2,000 for experimental work in marsh lands. This is one of the farms that requires taking care of. As a matter of fact, as I have intimated, they have all had temporary care during the last eight years. At Fredericton, N.B., there is an increase of $5,000 for experimental work in general; at Ste. Anne de Pocatière, an increase of $2,000 for experimental work; Cap Rouge, an increase of $3,000 for dairy equipment, fertilizer work and work in horticulture; at Lennoxville an increase of $5,000 for experimental work; at La Ferme, Que., an increase of $4,000 for clearing and draining and increased work in horticulture; at Kapuskasing, Ontario, an increase of $5,000 for experimental work and provision of a second assistant; at Morden, Manitoba, an increase of $4,000 for new roads and fences and additional planting in the orchard; and at Brandon, Manitoba, an increase of $15,000, $12,000 of which is for the purchase of new land, the remainder for an increase of the work in forage crop breeding. That was because of the flooding of the land in the valley of the Assiniboine. We cannot rely upon that district any longer for experimental purposes. It is liable to break up at any time. Then at Indian Head, Saskatchewan, there is an increase of $5,000 for providing two additional assistants and clearing up the forestry and shelter belts; at Rosthern, Saskatchewan, an increase of $8,000 for expansion of the work in animal and field husbandry, and the appointment of an additional assistant; at Scott, Saskatchewan, an increase of $5,000 for the purchase of feed and appointment of an additional assistant; at Swift Current an increase of $9,000 to complete the work of the establishment of this new farm; and at Lethbridge an increase of $25,000, $20,000 of which is for the purchase of new land for irrigation experiments, the remainder for the carrying on of these irrigation experiments. They have not yet taken up to any great extent the matter of irrigation. They have done it only in a small way. At Lacombe there is an increase of $12,000 of which $10,000 is for the purchase of new land, and the remainder for increased feed for live stock experiments; at Summerland an increase of $15,000, of which $10,000 is for the purchase of land, and the remainder for irrigation experiments. So it goes on through the list.

In reply to my hon. friend from Neepawa (Mr. Milne): the tall, fine-looking gentleman who speaks of the necessity of more publicity—

Mr. McMASTER: There are very many that answer that description.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I mean the tall one. I am impressed with the fact that we know more about farming than we make known and carry out, and that there is a great deal of work done on the experimental farms that a great many of the people never hear anything about. I do not know how we are going to correct that. The reader of to-day is a headline reader rather than a serious reader, who will sit down and read a government bulletin. In spite of that we find some encouragement in the fact that a great many applications are made for bulletins or folders A little bulletin is sent out called Seasonable Hints, published quarterly, and in that will be found an invitation to all and sundry to send in an application for any bulletin that they might be interested in. If they do we will send it to them. The old way was to distribute these bulletins indiscriminately; if you were not in the right humour to read them you threw them into the waste paper basket, and if you were not an active supporter of the government you would not take any stock in them. Now, we send them out on application, and still, in spite of that, we feel that the information does not get to the people as much as we would like. If my hon. friend has any suggestions to make as to how we can make the work more popular, take more advantage of it, have the people read more about our experiments, we would be glad to receive them. I ran across a farmer in Saskatchewan at Christmas time who had put up a silo in my own district where I have lived for forty years. The silo was quite a joke even last year, after some people in other parts of the province had started to use them. After this gentleman had filled the silo with sunflowers he had some over, and he found his cattle ate them, standing in the field. I asked him how it came about that he started to build a silo and experiment with ensilage and feeding the cattle with this fodder that was never heard of before. He said that he had been reading some of the bulletins some guy from Ottawa had sent him, that he had become interested in them and that after reading about the matter in various publications he had come to the conclusion that there must be something in it and he tried it.

Mr. BUREAU: Who was the "guy"?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He referred to all and sundry that wrote bulletins as "guys". But the information he received made him a

convert to this silo method, and he went into it, in spite of the fact that his neighbours made fun of him, because the feeding of sunflower as ensilage was looked upon as a pretty good joke in a wheat territory. That is the way to get the information. It is just like any kind of missionary work; it takes a great deal of planting to get any harvesting; but nevertheless, the good work must go on. I hope that is sufficiently exhaustive for my hon. friend.

Mr. HARRIS: Are there no savings at all anywhere throughout the country?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does the hon. member mean in the improvement of these farms?

Mr. HARRIS: Were the budgets from any of these particular farms any less than they were last year, and how was the money allocated that came from such places?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I went over them all and they all called for additional expenditures. My hon. friend must realize that not only the experimental farms, but practically every provincial and federal Department of Agriculture in Canada, when the war broke out, simply sat tight and marked time. When that is done for four years and then followed up with a similar procedure during four more subsequent years, one can understand the need for expenditure to put those farms into proper shape.

Mr. HARRIS: Does the minister not remember that last session he told us in this House that he would keep the vote down?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, that I would keep it down as low as true economy would permit; but good economy and the best kind of economy is sometimes wise expenditure. My hon. friend must have been out of the House before dinner, because he asked me if we were going to establish any new farms and where. I made it quite plain that we were not for the present, until we got the old ones into shape.

Mr. SPENCE: The minister is establishing a new farm at Swift Current.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is comparatively new. It is what we call our baby farm. We sometimes use that appellation in connection with people who are ten, twelve or twenty years old. It is the last farm to be established; it is, comparatively speaking, a new farm. The matter of freight rates and breeding certain kinds of stock on certain farms is a difficult one. We find the tendency throughout Canada is to introduce too many breeds of sheep, too many breeds of swine, too many breeds of dairy cattle, and the more you do that, the greater is the tendency for cross-breeding. The result has been the encouragement by all governments of community stock breeding, to induce groups of farmers to engage in breeding along the same line and with the same breeds of animals. This is cheaper, but it is very difficult to bring it into effect. We shall have to keep, let us say, three standard breeds of dairy cattle in a dairy district. In the Indian Head district with which my hon. friend is more familiar, as I am, we have a dual purpose, Shorthorn breed of cattle. Some people are of opinion that there is no such thing. We have in Brandon, where there is a similar herd, a record of 11,000 pounds of milk annually, and that is pretty good for even a dairy breed. In this way we are doing what we can to encourage community breeding, but it is a hard matter, indeed, to say that we shall not take on, say three breeds. We are pretty nearly compelled to do so inasmuch as there are three standard breeds of both beef and dairy cattle. There are two outstanding breeds of bacon hog, if not three. If we could reduce that to one, I am satisfied that we would be further on; but you can hardly get the thing down so fine that you are going to be able to size up just where you are going to save on freight rates to the market from where the prospective demand will come. I have not, at least, been able to work out any policy. The main idea in a district like Indian Head, where the farmers have been exclusively wheat growers for forty years, is to encourage the variety and particular breed of live stock that will be most attractive to wheat growers. I think the average wheat grower would prefer to go into something that would make beef, rather than to breed dairy cattle, or, perhaps, go into hog raising, or poultry raising in preference to that. That is what we have in mind in developing a herd, or a flock as the case may be, at any particular station.

I think an hon. member from Manitoba spoke of the advisability of having more excursions. At Indian Head, that provided some of the best publicity that farm got in the early years. We had regularly organized excursions from all parts of the country. Not only was an excursion a social outing; but many practical lessons were learned, and hundreds and thousands of farmers went away to the open prairie filled with enthusiasm from seeing the homelike surroundings of that farm and what could be done in the direction of tree growing as well as crop growing. I do not know why these excursions have been abandoned,

unless it is because farmers have now become familiar with these farms and because we do a certain amount of illustration work. That is another thing of which my hon. friend spoke. There are a hundred illustration farms carrying on demonstrating what has been accomplished on the experimenal farms. In the province from which my hon. friend comes, I understand there is not one illustration station, and there are none in Ontario. These illustration stations are established on request; we do not force them on the public, because if we did, the farmer who would take the thing up under anything like persuasion, would not be very likely to make a success of it. But if my hon. friend has in view any man who is of an experimental turn of mind, who likes that kind of work, who is already dabbling in it, we shall be glad to do illustration work on his farm on the usual terms. That costs probably three to four hundred dollars per farm per year. We have one hundred of these illustration stations and they are doing a great deal of useful work. They will be accelerated in those districts I have spoken about that are waiting for experimental farms, out on the National Transcontinental between Prince Rupert and Prince George.

Some remarks were made by my hon. friend (Mr. Steedsman), I think, perhaps, as a result of misunderstanding my remarks with respect to the development of forage plants. I merely mentioned sunflower and sweet clover, as extremes, in the development of what was looked upon formerly as comparatively useless plants. That has been a feature in a sense; it has provided the unexpected source; but in addition to that a tremendous amount of experimental work has been done in developing fodders along the line of domesticated grasses. I am quite frank in admitting that I do not know, especially for the dry areas, any recognized grass that will give what we call a catch successfully by seeding down with a crop one year with another, particularly in the drier parts of Saskatchewan and Alberta. If we can develop a dry-land plant that will give us a catch of grass when sown with grain, then we shall certainly have brought about a revolution in the drier parts of Saskatchewan and Alberta and in some parts of Manitoba.

I do not know where we can get such a plant. The nearest approach to it possibly, is the sweet clover, and the annual variety is a very promising plant. Many people do not like either of them; but nevertheless live stock get quite accustomed to and fond of them. When stock eat sunflower, they will certainly come to eat sweet clover. A great deal of work remains to be done in that connection still, I admit; but that only proves that the work of experimental farms is not anything like exhausted yet. I read articles written by young men about a proper rotation including grass, let us say, in Saskatchewan or the drier parts of southern Manitoba or Alberta. I have never seen one worked out successfully yet, although I do not say that that cannot be done. I think possibly some drought-resisting grass may be found; but I think if one is to look for the best results, seeding down of grass in those dry areas must be done alone. That is expensive, and that is the reason why grass-growing and stock-raising has not been as successful as it should be, and has not been tried out as much as it should have been in those districts. That is the reason we turned to ensilage such as I have described, namely, corn and sunflowers, because these are annuals and they will grow a crop whether it is dry or wet, the crop being of course better when there is a reasonable amount of moisture. Now I think I have covered all the questions raised.

Mr. SPENCE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the explanation of the minister and to the remarks of different hon. members who have spoken. The minister has given us a long list of increased expenditures embracing various items from $3,000 up to $20,000 in connection with these experimental farms. I am willing to-night and at any time to support any reasonable expenditure for the maintenance of these farms, but I am not willing at this inopportune time to support any undertaking to go into the further development of them when the money market is so bad; and I think that the minister is extravagant in his tastes when he suggests that we ought to vote all this money. The minister made the statement to-night—I do not know whether he meant it or not—that these farms were already in a high state of efficiency. That being the case, why does he suggest spending $200,000 more, especially after having received an increase last year of $150,000? There are more fads introduced into this department than are being introduced into the schools and colleges in the big cities of this country. And that is saying a great deal. My hon. friends to my left will never vote a dollar for anything in the line of industry, but they are all with one exception willing to vote millions for this particular purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPENCE: Well, that attitude has been evident to-night. One hon. gentleman said

that it was a shame to reflect that at one time the department was run with $3,000,000 and he added that it should have been millions more. To-night I think the item calls for $6,000,000 odd. I think that when private individuals are trying their best to cut down overhead expenditures the government should set an example and economize, but how the minister expects the public debt to be kept down when he asks for such increased expenditures as this I cannot see. I have always been a supporter of the men who work on the farms, I am willing to vote money for the improvement of agriculture and I would willingly vote for the expenditure of this increase of $200,000 if the country were as prosperous as it should be. To-night I asked one of my colleagues why it was that we had not been given the details of the item of $1,500,000 and I was told that it would necessitate too much printing. Well, it would have saved the minister a great deal of explanation, and hours of the time of the House, if he had given those details. So far as my friends to my left are concerned, I think the cheapest thing would be to establish sufficient experimental farms and place upon them all the genuine farmers of that group. At least it would save the time of the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was somewhat surprised at the remarks made by the minister before six o'clock and shortly after recess, in which he said that the department would practically revolutionize the experimental farm system. I have listened with much interest to the statements he has made, and he is now trying to impress upon the House that this increase in the expenditures is to be applied to various branches of work carried on in conection with the experimental farms. Some hon. gentlemen have taken the ground that some one has been criticizing these expenditures because the farms have not been self-sustaining. Now, I do not think that anyone has attempted to criticize the farms on any such ground. No one expects an experimental farm to meet expenses or to pay profits, that is not what it is established for. The minister suggested a few moments ago that we had too many breeds of live stock in the country and it was necessary to standardize and reduce them. One would almost infer from his remarks that this was one idea which it was intended to put into practice in connection with the live stock depots that are to be established on these farms to supply stock to the farmers. I think he said that we have about three standard breeds of cattle. He mentioned dairy and beef cattle. He might tell us which one of the breeds he mentioned will be singled out by the department. I see a danger in connection with any undertaking of this kind. Individuals have invested a great deal of money in pure-bred animals of various breeds and their whole investments may be tied up in connection with the breeds which the experimental farms will not specialize in. In that way there might be material damage done to legitimate and useful business in the country, and this was one of the things I had in mind when I was trying to show the danger that might attend any attempt on the part of the government to enter upon the breeding of animals on a commercial basis to supply the wants of the people. I consider that this is something that should be left to those engaged in the business. I have always encouraged the purchase by the government of the very best animals that could be procured to be kept on the farms as examples to breeders. I was at the Canadian Live Stock Show in Toronto last winter and was particularly pleased to note that the province of Manitoba exhibited the grand champion Clydesdale stallion of that show in competition with other exhibitors. I thought it was a great compliment to the good judgment of the agricultural department of that province in making such a wise selection. But that is an entirely different matter. That exhibition serves a useful purpose as an object lesson to students visiting the place. But it seems that the government in this case intend to specialize in two or three breeds, and I infer from the minister's remarks that he thinks that even three are too many. So far as bacon breeds of hogs are concerned he says that two ought to be sufficient. Well, that may be true, but possibly competition may serve a useful purpose. Competition is the life of trade, and the competition which we have in our exhibitions is one of the most useful things in connection with our agricultural industry. Those who had the privilege of visiting this exhibition in Toronto last winter as well as the great winter show at Chicago must have been favourably impressed with the resources of this country, for we had a magnificent display from every part of the Dominion.

As far as western Canada is concerned, I must say to their credit that many of their exhibitors at the winter show in Toronto secured a large share of the prizes. I think many breeders there of pure-bred live stock will object very strongly to the government entering into competition with them, particularly if one or two breeds are given the preference. I should like the minister to pay a

little more attention to this question and give the committee further light on what he proposes to do, and what particular breeds are to be singled out, because I would judge from his remarks that, like every other farmer, he has a personal preference for certain breeds as being the most useful.

Apparently from his remarks on the feeding of live stock, the sunflower is a new development that our friends from western Canada knew nothing about until a few years ago, but I am inclined to be a little skeptical as to that.

The Seasonable Hints to which the minister referred, I have found them in banks and other public places throughout our province in stacks for distribution, with an invitation to the reader to apply to the nearest experimental station for information with regard to agriculture. Unfortunately as far as we are concerned in Ontario, from Ottawa west for five hundred miles the only practical demonstration we can have in agricultural methods is in relation to the growing of tobacco, for we have no other Dominion operated farms. We have fruit growing stations in several parts of the province, but they are maintained and operated by the provincial government. And as far as tobacco growing is concerned, I am afraid that the present labour situation will deter those who might wish to go into that industry.

10 p.m.

If the minister would briefly indicate the particular breeds that are to be developed and placed in competition by his department with other breeds raised by the breeders of this country, he will be rendering a service to them by way of warning as to what they are going to be up against in the near future.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought I had already dealt with the question by pointing out to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) what we are doing at Indian Head. In that heretofore wheat growing district we thought that the dual purpose shorthorn cow would be taken more kindly to because she lends herself both to beef production and dairying. The same may be said with regard to Brandon. At Swift Current and Scott, too, it is generally thought that dairying cattle will be the line of stock developed, especially now that the silo is a recognized institution in that territory. Quebec is a recognized dairy province, and on most of the farms the dairy breeds will be handled. The three standards I had in mind were the Holstein, the Ayrshire and the Jersey. There are other breeds, of course, but if we take up too many breeds we are going to dissipate your activities too much to accomplish anything substantial. In the Eastern Townships territory, in the vicinity of Lennoxville, where a considerable number of beef animals are grown, we have the beef breeds established, and the dairy as well in the Ayrshire and the Jersey, giving the farmers their choice. We are not arbitrarily imposing these particular breeds on the farmers in any district—they happen to be the predisposition of the local farmers. We cannot go into a district and say: Here, you have been doing so and so in the past, but if you are going to get any benefit from our methods you must change your breed and adopt ours. So far as is consistent with good practice and good business we are trying to meet the wishes of the respective districts with regard to the particular breed they desire to develop. For instance take what is known as the Canadian Jersey or the Canadian cow at Cap Rouge. The people there are wedded to that particular breed and do not want any other. It is an exceedingly good dairy cow, with a certain amount of sentiment attached to it, and it is to-day a registered breed. What would be the use of talking any other breed there? While we do not want to be arbitrary, at the same time we desire to be sufficiently advanced in our policy as to lead in the direction that we think will most effectively meet the reasonable requirements of the people directly concerned.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am not rising to criticise this vote involving a $200,000 increase, for if the money is well spent I think it will be a benefit to the Dominion as a whole. But I do think that when money is being spent to buy land for new farms the district I represent should get first consideration. The Cariboo district represents about a third of British Columbia. The Minister of Agriculture in the preceding government (Mr. Tolmie) I understand strongly recommended the establishment of an experimental farm along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Last summer I had the honour of accompanying the present Minister of Agriculture through there and we looked over several locations. Not only so, but his deputy, I understand, went through there last fall and definitely located where an experimental farm should be established. The money I might say was voted last year, and when other experimental farms are being purchased I think the least this committee could do would be to re-vote that item for the establishment of a farm in the Cariboo district. There are a great number of returned men in the vicinity of Prince George who

know very little about farming, and they want some one to give them a lead. Seeing that the last government recommended the establishment of a farm along the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and that this government approves of it, I think they are in honour bound to start operations this coming season.

Mr. TOLMIE: I listened with a great deal of interest, Mr. Chairman, to what the hon. minister had to say before adjournment this evening with regard to the establishment of breeding depots in connection with our experimental farm system, and I am rather anxious to have a little more information on the point. Judging from the term, one would form the idea that it is the intention of the government to breed cattle and to sell them in competition with the live stock breeders of the country. The department has been doing that to a certain extent up to the present time, but as I understand the hon. minister this evening, it is intended to extend that work to a much greater degree. If so, I may say that we have had a little experience as breeders of pure bred live stock in British Columbia in competition with the government in the same line of work. The government, you will readily understand, has a great many advantages over the ordinary breeder. When it comes to attending exhibitions it can put on a large string, and can also stand a much heavier cost than the ordinary breeder would be able to bear. Then again, being a government institution, its advertising is far more extensive than that of the ordinary breeder. It is true that the work carried along these lines will bring buyers from outside points, but these buyers almost invariably go to the government establishments to secure what they want. It would be very unfortunate indeed if the breeders who have done a great deal of pioneer work in this country and spent large sums of money in importing first-class animals should be compelled to meet heavy government competition along these lines, and I would like to have a little more information from the minister on that point.

With regard to inducing people to maintain certain breeds of live stock in certain sections of the country, while I agree that that would be very nice if once it can be accomplished, I can assure the minister that in my opinion he has assumed a very heavy job indeed. In the first place, we have to leave a great deal in a matter of this kind to the intelligence of the breeder himself. The greatest breeding country in the world will probably muster more breeds of horses, cattle, sheep and swine at their public exhibitions than any other country in the world, and that is Great Britain. I visited the Royal Show in 1921, and I may say that I saw all the breeds that I had ever seen at exhibitions on this side of the water, and in addition, many breeds I had read of but never seen, and some that I had never even read of—some brand-new breeds that had been created only within the last few years. So that when moving along these lines, a great deal must be left to the intelligence of the individual.

There is another point that must not be overlooked. In a country like Canada where we have about three and one-half million dairy cows, averaging about four thousand pounds of milk a year each, we have a common enemy to compete with, and that is the scrub cow. It does not matter whether the cow we bring in competition with that scrub is a brown Swiss, or a Guernsey, a Jersey, a Holstein, or any other breed, if she will increase the average output of the cows of this country to an appreciable extent she is rendering very valuable service to Canada.

I must congratulate the hon. minister and his officials and also the superintendent of the Agassiz farm on having produced there a cow with a world's record for the production of butter, a record in competition with all other countries in the world. That record is a very good one indeed, and I think that every tribute should be paid to Mr. Hicks, the superintendent of that farm, for the excellent work he has done in that connection. It only backs up what I have said in this House on previous occasions, that the Fraser river valley with its mild climate and ability to produce various kinds of fodder will be one of the greatest dairying sections of our Dominion.

I am pleased to note, too, that the minister still has in mind the placing of an experimental station in northern British Columbia. I looked over that territory when I was minister and I was astonished at its wonderful expanse and its adaptability for the development of the dairying and general live stock industry. These men are struggling along up there, and the advice which they could obtain through an establishment like a Dominion experimental farm would be exceedingly useful to them, and any money expended in that line would be bound to bring excellent results. I am not one of those who believe that we can develop Canada by adhering strictly to economy regardless of other considerations. In addition to strict economy we must have an intelligent expenditure of money from one end of the country to the other along such lines as give the best promise of immediate and sure returns.

With regard to the Swift Current farm, I heard one hon. gentleman of the group to my

left complaining because the minister had established a farm at that point. I have very much pleasure indeed in exonerating the minister from all blame for that and in taking it on my own shoulders, where the responsibility rests for selecting that site. It was chosen because it was a district just a little different from any other district where an experimental farm was situated, and I am very pleased indeed to learn that having gathered a crop or two from that land the minister has found it was a very good place to locate a farm.

In conclusion, no one has a greater appreciation of what has been done by the experimental farm system than I have. I think it is second to none in the world, as far as I have been able to gather the information, and I would be sorry indeed to see the minister do anything to radically change the most excellent work that has been carried on at these institutions. I would ask him to seriously consider before taking any such action.

Mr. LOVIE: I would like to say a word or two in favour of the experimental farm system. It is quite a number of years since one experiment was carried on at the Brandon farm which added much to the knowledge of what pasture grasses could do in the western country. Dr. Bedford, as he is now, when he was superintendent of the Brandon experimental farm, about the time that brome grass was being introduced, sowed one acre, fenced it with wire netting, and for the whole summer pastured two full grown steers there, showing that it only took one acre to pasture two head of cattle during the summer, whereas on the ranges in southern Alberta thirty acres is required to run one head. A lot of people visited Brandon to see that experiment, and brome grass got a start at that time that it has never lost.

I would like to back up what the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Steedsman) said in regard to the necessity for having a grass in the western country that is suitable for rotation. That is something that is absolutely needed, and if agriculture is going to be permanent in our western country, it ought to be by crop rotation. That will have to be worked out.

As regards the experiments conducted on the experimental farms, a good many people have not very much confidence in them because they figure that it is government money that is keeping up those farms. It is just a year ago last January since a resolution was passed by the convention of Agricultural Societies, sitting at the Agricultural College in Winnipeg, asking the government to commence demonstration farms, if you like to call them that. What they wanted was a farm in each locality where the average man on an average farm could show good returns at the end of the year, raise a crop and make the farm pay. That is what is wanted, and that is one of the reasons why farmers as a rule take more stock in experiments carried on by their neighbours than by the experimental farms. First and foremost, agriculture must be made to pay. That is what the farmer is interested in.

As regards community breeding, the minister has said that the government were absolutely behind it. Personally I think the Department of Agriculture under this government and the past government has not stood behind community breeding as I should like to see them do. Take, for instance, the federal assistance to horse breeders. There is something that I have always considered an injustice. Federal assistance is given to a horse breeder providing that one individual owns a stallion, but in a community where a number of farmers get together and purchase a high-class sire they get no assistance whatever. I consider that wrong, and it ought to be remedied. I would be very much in favour of the government doing all it can to improve all live stock, for goodness knows it needs to be improved, and if we are going to capture the British market we will certainly have to have our cattle up to a better standard than they are in the West at the present time. Every encouragement is needed from the government. I would ask the minister to remove the injustice that exists at the present time in that no federal assistance is given to farmers trying to carry on community breeding of high-class draught horses. This does not apply to any one particular breed; all high class draught horses suffer from the same handicap.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In reply to the hon. member who has just taken his seat I may say that the question he has raised with regard to horse breeding will come up more properly under the live stock vote when I will be very pleased to discuss it very fully. I recognize that he has brought up a question that will naturally arouse a certain amount of interest among the committee.

With respect to the development of grasses, it is to the credit of the experimental farms that brome grass was introduced into western Canada. Some people think it was an evil. It is hard, of course, to eradicate, but if you can get it free from quack grass there is no substantial difficulty that cannot be surmounted in the eradication of it when once

you know how. Like everything else it is easy when you know how. It is the best grass, in my estimation, that has yet been introduced into western Canada notwithstanding the difficulty of eradication. I have grown that grass for thirty years and at one time made lots of money out of it when many people were losing money growing wheat and hauling it the distance they had to. As a matter of fact that is one way I adopted to overcome the transportation difficulty. I could haul $300 worth of grass seed to Indian Head and market it with the same team and the same handling as I could seventeen or eighteen dollars worth of wheat. That was the result of observations I made as I passed the experimental farm at Indian Head. There is no doubt about it, these farms have been of inestimable value in the past.

With respect to the complaint—the very natural complaint—made by the hon. member sitting at the back—I think the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride)—I had the pleasure of travelling with that genial companion last summer. I did hope at that time that we would be able to start one, if not two, experimental farms in that vast territory which is capable of such tremendous development. The crops there, notwithstanding the drouth which prevailed at that time, were a marvel. But, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when, even in the matter of establishing experimental farms, we must cut our coat to suit the cloth; and I would advise my hon. friend to wait a year or two until we can start that institution properly, in the meantime taking care of the older farms in the way I have described. At present there is very good work being done at Fort George, Vanderhoof, and other points with respect to illustration stations —exceedingly good work. At the same time I recognize that that will not fill the bill indefinitely. I have intimated to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) who had tacitly, I think, with his officials concluded to establish a farm there while he was administering the affairs of the department that I feel we are committed to that place for the location of our next new farm.

With respect to some additions to the old farms to which I have referred, I may say that from time to time as we get the opportunity to buy five, ten, fifteen or twenty acres at a good bargain we think it is good business to do that, under the old farm system, particularly where we have to buy feed. There is scarcely a farm under the old system where we do not have to buy feed. My hon. friends opposite who have been life long farmers know that is not good business on their individual farms. Some times it occurs inadvertently or is unavoidable, but as a general practice it is bad. It is just as bad for the experimental farms as it is for the individual farms, and it should be avoided as far as possible in both cases.

Now with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), I may say that I hope I did not leave the impression that we were simply going to turn these farms upside down and convert them into exclusive breeding farms, or that we were going to revolutionize them, or that there was going to be much change in respect to many of them. But there are certain farms in the Maritime provinces and in the prairie provinces as well, where we believe we would be neglecting our duty if we did not pay considerably more attention to live stock at this time. The farmer that insists upon continuing in exclusive farming of any kind—whether it be fruit, grain, potatoes, or any other branch—has to take his chances; he is engaged in a very much more vulnerable business economically than the man who is devoting himself to diversified farming We believe in the good old practice of diversification or specialties if you like, whatever the district may be adapted to, so that when one particular branch falls down you will have something to keep the wolf from the door, or something to prevent you from raising money on a mortgage at the bank. This doctrine is as old as the hills and a great many people are practising it.

As regards the farms to which I have referred at which more attention will be paid to live stock, I may say that at the present time Mr. Archibald has gone to the United Kingdom in connection with that work. Although we have had exceedingly good directors of the experimental farms system since their inception by Professor William Saunders, I do not think we have had a man more active, more alive, or more energetic, than the present director, Mr. Archibald. He is about arriving in the United Kingdom on an errand in connection with certain shipments of horses. While he is there he is going to buy thirty breeding boars of the best bacon type he can find in the United Kingdom, consisting perhaps of Yorkshires, Tamworths, and a few bacon type of Berkshires. We hope to equip our experimental farms with these, distributing them to suit the requirements of the various districts. While at the Royal fair during the early winter I was discussing this matter with some of the breeders of Tamworths, and they told

me we could not perform a better service than by introducing some new strains of Tamworths. Because of the inbreeding that had been practised in this breed by the various breeders it was found that an infusion of new blood was desirable. They were delighted to find that the government contemplated bringing in shipments of this particular breed to which I have referred. With the demand for the bacon type of hog, and with our grading system so recently introduced, and with so few breeds grading up to standard, this is one of the activities we will undertake at the various experimental farms throughout Canada.

I may say to the hon. member for Victoria City that I went into that matter very fully and I think I satisfied the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), so that he does not look half so savage as he did last year. If I succeeded in satisfying him I think my hon. friend from Victoria City, had he been here at the time, would have been satisfied also that we do not mean to enter upon any serious revolutionary process, nor into any field in a way calculated to disturb private enterprise, but rather to proceed in such a manner that if we act judiciously we shall encourage private enterprise. That was the extent of my argument and I think my explanations were generally accepted by the committee.

Mr. COOTE: I think the minister very well stated the course that should be followed in regard to this particular item. He said we should make the suit to fit the cloth. Following up his own statement I think that he should cut off the increase of $200,000 asked for this year in connection with this vote. I want to protest very strongly against the way in which the estimates dealing with agriculture are presented to us, and I think that remark applies equally to the estimates of some of the departments. How can any man here vote intelligently to-night on the question of whether we shall spend the sum of $1,525,000 on experimental farms? I think we have spent something over three hours in discussion of the item, and I do not feel that we have had any reasonable explanation from the Minister of Agriculture as to what he is going to do with this money. I think the minister should have the items printed in detail in the estimates or at least state how much it is proposed to spend on each farm. There are a great many men in this House who do not know how many experimental farms there are in Canada, and I must admit that I am one of them. I think that we might very well put this information in the estimates. If the minister would not consider doing that, I think we should adopt some new procedure for dealing with the estimates, so that we could deal with them intelligently. I think they might very properly go to the Committee on Agriculture and there be discussed in detail by the members of that committee. Then I am sure when a recommendation came from that committee there would be very little opposition in this House to the passing of the estimates, and a lot of time might be saved. I for one am not prepared to vote for this large increase of expenditure in the Department of Agriculture with the explanation that we have had from the minister to-day. I do not say that he is to blame.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend indicate any particular information he desires? I read out nearly all the twenty-two farms and indicated the amount we proposed to spend on each of them. I think we can supply pretty nearly any reasonable information he desires to ask for, and I will be delighted to do so.

Mr. COOTE: We have spent three hours and I do not think we have yet been told the total amount it is proposed to expend, say on the experimental farm at Ottawa, or on the farm at Indian Head or on the farm at Agassiz, and just what they would do with the money at any one of these particular farms. He stated, if I understood him correctly, that the period of experimentation in regard to grain growing on the prairie was practically over for these farms, and yet he asks for an increased vote of $200,000. To my mind he certainly is not justified in asking for that increase without any explanation. He says that he proposes to expend $5,000 on one farm and $3,000 on another but gave no real substantial reason for what is being done. I think the experimental farm is a necessity in Canada. There is one necessary work that the farm should perform, and that is research work, with regard to plant diseases and insect pests and such things. Those are matters that the average farmer cannot handle. In western Canada a great deal of the best experimental work has been done by individual farmers and not by experimental farms. I am not for a minute running down the work done on our experimental farms. Good work has been done on these farms but much of it has not been made use of by the individual farmer. We are trying to bring the individual farmer to the experimental farm, instead of taking the experimental farm to the individual farmer and it is a very hard thing to do. I think a lot of our money might be far better spent in employing agricultural agents to

travel round and visit the farms. I think the Minister of Agriculture might close up the Rosthern farm. He says it is going to be moved, and yet he is going to spend this year several thousand dollars more than was spent last year.

I do not want to weary the House with any more remarks, but I really have not been convinced that we are wise in voting the extra $200,000 for the experimental farms this year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend has made two or three suggestions that look good on the face of them, and are good, except that they do not come properly under this vote. The question of insect pests comes under the very next vote, and when we reach it we will deal with the part the experimental farms throughout the Dominion play in regard to this important question. That is a question rapidly growing in importance, but I do not think it advisable to mix up with this matter.

With respect to the agricultural agents, I say; yes, employ them, if you can get the right kind of men, but that is an up-to-date provincial matter. While that is so, the grant the Dominion has been giving for the last ten years under the Agricultural Instruction Acts has been devoted largely in the direction of paying the district representatives in the various provinces. In Ontario I do not know what percentage of the district representatives are paid out of the Dominion grant, but it is a very substantial number. So that if you take the questions in the consecutive order in which they appear in the estimates, you will find all that work will be covered before we are through. Furthermore, with respect to the meagre information outlined in the estimates, I must confess myself, Mr. Chairman, that when I saw the amount that was published last year as compared with provincial estimates with which I had been familiar, it did not look excessive, but I am accepting these matters just as I find them. This is the second estimate that I have had the responsibility of explaining, and my hon. friend's suggestion that more details might be given in connection with this vote is, I think, deserving of some consideration. I think my hon. friend will at least admit that just to the extent that this is lacking, I have endeavoured not to be lacking in explaining the votes for the various activities that we have undertaken in this department, I have been trying to avoid the very thing my hon. friend complains of—spending too much time. I took about three-quarters of an hour at the outset trying to give a bird's eye view, a sort of skeleton, of the work, so that the committee might have a very intelligent grasp of the whole situation as to what was our objective and our plans with respect to the future in regard to new farms and all that sort of thing. I do not know whether that saved any time or not, but I do hope it gave members who are not intimately associated with, or who do not live in close proximity to the farms, some idea of the matter. The suggestion that we should give more particulars is a matter of general policy that might be taken up by the government, not only with regard to these estimates, but possibly all others.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago asked for particular information. The hon. minister (Mr. Motherwell) took five minutes in giving us a résumé, but that does not give us the information we wanted. The question asked by the hon. gentleman from Macleod (Mr. Coote) was how much money was spent on the Central Experimental farm last year and how much it is proposed to spend on that farm this year. These are questions I would like to see answered.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I went over that once already.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have not been able to get it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would like to ask my hon. friend from Macleod whether he means the total or the increase? The amounts I have been reading out have to do with the increase.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If the minister will give us the total appropriation for last year and the total appropriation for this year, we can see what the increase is.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: While we are having the figures for the Central farm looked up, I might point out that all the questions formerly were directed towards the explanation of the increase, and I read them out farm by farm. I undertsand my hon. friend (Mr. Chaplin desires to know the total, including the increase, that is a different class of information. We have not been trying to overlook it at all; but at the very outset, the ex-Minister of Finance, (Sir Henry Drayton) asked for an explanation regarding the purposes to which the increase of $200,000 was to be put, and the whole discussion the whole evening was with respect to that item. We can, however, start all over again. As regards the expenditure for the experimental farm at Indian Head, the total estimate for the year ending March 31, 1924, is $44,550.

The increase, I think, was $5,000. Therefore, by deducting $5,000 from $44,550, you will get what was spent last year, or, in round figures, $39,550.

Mr. COOTE: What is the figure for Rosthern?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The total estimate for Rosthern is $34,859 for next year. If we deduct $8,000 from that, the figure for last year was $26,000 in round numbers. The total estimate for the Central Experimental farm for next year is $502,145, and the increase is roughly $60,000. This item of $502,145 includes, I am informed, the 110 illustration stations and also the tobacco farms. In the earlier part of the evening, I read a whole page of details with respect to the activities of the experimental farm at Ottawa.

Mr. McTAGGART: What is the total estimate for the Swift Current Experimental farm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is $39,350 for next year. The increase amounts to $9,000, so that by deducting $9,000 from $39,350, you get $30,350 as the expenditure for last year.

Mr. LEWIS: Does that include the buildings?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, The building is done out of this appropriation for the first two or three years; after that, the building is done out of the Public Works appropriation.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister, in giving us the estimated expenditure for the Central farm for this year, said that it included some other experimental stations. Can he not tell us the expenditures in connection with those experimental stations, so that we can arrive at a positive idea of the cost of the central farm for this year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is pretty hard to state exactly the cost of the Central Experimental farm, because that is really the clearing house for the entire twenty-two branch farm system. Experiments in regard to grasses, grains, etc., are conducted there, and as soon as it is established that they are of sufficient importance to develop, they are sent to the various farms and planted there in what we call multiplier plots, where they are developed. Therefore, more or less of the work of the Central Experimental farm is really chargeable to the branch farms, because of this dovetailing. It is one entire layout, as it were. If my hon. friend wants any particular division of the Central Experimental farm system—

Mr. CHAPLIN: No, I want to know what the central farm is costing, and I think that is a fair question. If the minister says that those smaller farms throughout the country cost certain sums and those certain sums all added together constitute the total cost of them, the balance must be the expenditure for the central farm. Surely, we should be able to arrive at a figure showing the cost of the central farm. The matter is only one of bookkeeping.

Mr. COOTE: The minister, in his remarks a few moments ago, seemed to insinuate that we might have asked for this information earlier. It is true, we might have asked for it earlier, and if I had had an opportunity I would have asked for it myself. But a number of members were asking questions and I did not have an opportunity. There are only some twenty-two experimental farms, and the minister should give us a list of them and the expenditures in connection with each. If we had had that information earlier in the evening when this estimate was brought up, we might have disposed of the matter by this time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I appeal to the committee if this information was ever asked for until now. The whole discussion was on the increase and the whole information was on the increase. If my hon. friend wants the other information with regard to the totals, I am just as willing to give the one as the other. I have reams of information here if the committee is willing to listen to it. As regards the central farm here and the different divisions of it, I can give the totals. Because of the joint relationship between the parent farm and the branch farms, the total I have given of $502,145 does not give anything like the information that could be given with respect to the branches. The Central Experimental farm is the clearing house for the rest of the farms. It is the experimental centre, while the others serve the various districts in which they are situated. The following are the details in connection with the central farm. I shall give the round figures:

Animal husbandry	$44,000
Bacteriology	5,600
Bee division	6,000
Botany, economic	8,715
Plant pathology	22,000
Cereals	33,000
Chemistry	11,000
Director's office	3,100
Extension and publicity	34,000
Farm superintendent	29,000
Fibre division in connection with flax experimentation	43,000
Field husbandry	30,000
Forage plants	21,000
Horticultural	53,000
Illustration stations	65,00[illegible]

With regard to these, you cannot administer the illustration stations without some centre. We have 110 of them scattered all over the country, and with the exception of Ontario and Manitoba they cost on an average between $300 and $400 each. The government enters into a contract with the individual farmer, leasing 40 acres of land at $5 per acre. That amounts to $200. Then certain seeds are supplied him and certain activities are carried on in the way of demonstration. There is no clerical work at these stations, which are directed from the central farm at Ottawa. There is therefore nothing for it but to charge the cost up to the central farm. That is one reason why these activities help to swell the vote for that farm. The other items are:

Poultry division	$31,000
Tobacco division	44,000
General expenditures	11,000

We have the necessary information giving a minute analysis of each sub-division, but I do not think that that is wanted at this time of night. I will now give the totals at each point, quoting the round figures:

Charlottetown	$36,000
Kentville	46,000
Nappan	43,000
Fredericton	44,000
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière	43,000
Cap Rouge	46,000
St Joachim	16,000
Lennoxville	44,000
La Ferme	37,000
Kapuskasing	39,000
Morden	36,000
Brandon	46,000
Indian Head	44,000
Rosthern	34,000
Scott	34,000
Swift Current	39,000
Lethbridge	46,000
Lacombe	44,000
Summerland	44,000
Invermere	27,000
Agassiz	40,000
Sidney	32,000

There are nine sub-stations, one of which is in Grand Prairie. At these sub-stations they do a certain amount of experimental, demonstration and extension work, such as holding public meetings, etc. The sub-stations amount to $18,000 with a general expenditure of $4,000. I understand that the special details in regard to each one of these items can be found in another formidable looking book.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I hope the minister will not think that we are asking questions with a view to making it more difficult for him to get his estimates through. The more information we get the easier it will be to have the item passed, providing it is reasonable. I was pleased to hear the minister admit at last that the central farm at Ottawa is really the clearing house for the twenty-two farms throughout the country, and that much of the expenditure for that farm is entailed in connection with those various branch farms. An admission of that kind is something we have not had for some time. On the contrary, last year Ontario was credited with all the money that was spent on the Central farm. It is quite apparent to every one that that farm must be the clearing house, as the minister states it is, for all these others. There are 110 illustration stations the expenditures in connection with which were charged up against this farm, and as usual the province of Ontario has not even an illustration station.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, no one has yet applied for one.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am afraid that is hardly correct. Possibly no one has done so recently, but I am inclined to think that they probably got tired making applications. I notice that the expenditures in connection with this Central farm, which amounted to $383,000 during the past year, according to the Auditor General's report, include an item of $148,636 for ordinary farm labour, in addition to $33,780 for foremen. This does not take into account the highly qualified men who are employed to administer the farms throughout the Dominion. So that on this farm of 465 acres there is spent $182,366 for labour. I have expressed my views on this question in the past, and I repeat to-night that this is altogether too large an expenditure for the work that is done on this farm. In the face of that you are not able to demonstrate to the people on any farm adjacent to the Central Experimental farm what the cost of farming is. You cannot show that the people are or are not justified in their complaints with regard to the condition of agriculture. Notwithstanding the fact that for ordinary farm labour you are spending no less than $182,365 at the Central Experimental farm, you are unable to show what is the actual cost of farm operations. I think the figures I have given are correct, and I cannot conceive how such a large sum can be expended for farm labour alone, particularly when I remember that a large part of this farm is laid out as a beautiful public park. In addition to that expenditure about $160,000 is paid annually by the Dominion government for the beautification of the city of Ottawa; in fact I think I am understating the amount. So on the whole the Capital is receiving very generous

treatment at the hands of the government. I am mentioning this to show that the money expended on the Central Experimental farm has not always been for the benefit of the province of Ontario as we have been told on previous occasions; on the contrary, a good deal of the administrative work performed there relates to the management of the various experimental farms throughout the Dominion. I should like the minister to express his views as to whether he thinks it possible for the ordinary farmer engaged in the breeding of live stock to compete with the breeders who will be stationed at this farm to supply stock.

A little further down in the estimates there is another item which is really connected with this one, for I perceive the minister's main reform in connection with the experi-
11 p.m. mental farm system is the live stock business. In item 48 it will be seen that there is another increase of $170,000. So there is really a total increase of $370,000 in connection with the matter now under discussion. It will be readily understood that those who are now engaged in the breeding of live stock are going to be very badly handicapped when the minister enters into this scheme, in fact it will be impossible for them to compete against so generous an expenditure for labour. Is it the intention of the government to continue this lavish expenditure for ordinary farm labour on this small Central Experimental farm?

Mr. BRETHEN: The item under discussion has a bearing on an item further down, namely, the decrease in the Health of Animals branch. I think it can be readily shown that experimental farms are well worth all the money that is expended on them. To realize this we have only to remember the provincial experimental farm at Guelph and the introduction there of Mandecheuria barley by Dr. Zavitz, which it is estimated has already benefited our farmers to the extent of $30,000,000. The introduction of Marquis wheat has been referred to this evening, and I suppose that has meant hundreds of millions of dollars in the pockets of the farmers of Canada. Only recently we noticed in the newspapers an announcement of the discovery of another variety of wheat, Marquis III, which is expected to play a very important part in our agriculture. Now, hon. members will understand that in experimental farm work where the grain has to be set out in little plots, much of it has to be hand picked, and great care taken to keep it separate from other grains, that the work is costly, and that viewed from that restricted standpoint an experimental farm cannot be made to show a profit; but viewed generally by the results to the people of Canada, why, such a farm pays about as well as anything with which Canada has to do. For that reason I should like very much to support this increase of $200,000, but when I find that we have a decrease of $285,000 suggested in the Health of Animals branch, I find myself unable to endorse the former. What is the use of spending $200,000 to introduce better live stock if we neglect the health of animals? As the minister said to-night, they have been standing pat at these experimental farms for eight years, and they can stand pat for another year in regard to the introduction of live stock and get along all right with what they have already; but we cannot stand pat when it comes to a question of disease or health. If we neglect the health of a human being or an animal for a single year, we cannot mark time, we are bound to go back. Now, this country has established a system which has held in check to some extent the plague of tuberculosis, and last year more than ever before in our cities waged a very active campaign in the same direction. But notwithstanding the progress made we find that this important work is to all go by the board. As I say, I should like to see this increase go through. I believe it is a good investment for Canada, but if it is to be at the sacrifice of the other item I have referred to, I cannot support it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, this is going to entail a discussion of another vote altogether, but I think it should be permitted because the hon. gentleman's remarks are reasonable enough, unless I can show a valid explanation for the reduction. Our intention is to take care of that work for another year just as effectually as we did last year.

Mr. BRETHEN: If I may be permitted to interrupt the minister? When I was down at the office where this work is conducted I was informed that if this vote goes through as reduced there will be no new work carried on this year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the source from which to get information is here, not in the office. I should be glad to get the source of my hon. friend's information.

Mr. LEADER: Did the minister not give the information to the House a few hours ago that he intended to bring in a bill reducing compensation for the slaughter of diseased animals?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If you will permit this digression, Mr. Chairman, I shall be very pleased to enter into the question, for the hon. member for Portage la Prairie appears to be quite exercised over it.

Mr. LEADER: Not at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I suppose my hon. friends are aware of the fact that there is what is called follow-up work in regard to accredited herds, that you have to give a second examination, that that examination invariably finds very much fewer reactors than the first examination; but if we are to keep the accredited herds clean there must be a second examination given in a reasonable time. That is what we are engaged on now. That will keep our staff busy, at very much less expense, and enable us to get through this current year reasonably well. We are not taking on any new accredited herds. We had to do the same thing last year. What we are doing now is to take care of the herds already accredited, and unless you engage in that follow-up work your original work is of no value in a very few years. I may say for the benefit of my hon. friends that I lost an entire herd through tuberculosis before there was any compensation, so I know exactly what the loss means to the individual. But the compensation to-day is so high that it frustrates the very object it has in view. A compensation of $200 for many animals that I know of will buy the animals, and the man who gets that figure or two-thirds of it will be getting a much better figure than he would on the market to-day in a lot of cases. The original framers of this scheme of compensation never had the idea in mind of giving more compensation than the animal was worth.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Are not the animals valued by the officials of the department at their actual worth?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know they are, but the maximum valuation is $200, and two-thirds of that is $133, and I know plenty of animals that are not worth that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not the minister misinterpreting the act? I am no specialist on this, but as I understand the minister's own explanation, it is this: The animal is valued but no valuation is allowed beyond $200, and though the animal may be valued by his own officers at $200, there cannot be paid more than two-thirds of that. The owner is never paid more than two-thirds of the value fixed by the minister's own officers. How does he make that consistent with the assertion that more money is paid than the animal is worth?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: So it is; $133 is more than many of them are worth.

Mr. CALDWELL: That is the maximum value. There is nothing to prevent a man from valuing them down as low as he likes. If this subject is open for discussion—I do not want to be out of order—

The CHAIRMAN: It is not open for discussion. Item 39 is being left to discuss another item, but I shall not object at this stage.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am perfectly satisfied to bow to your ruling.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I say, Mr. Chairman, that in what is called a restricted area in Manitoba we are cleaning up tuberculosis in all animals regardless of whether they are grade or pure-bred. That is costing some $75,000, and we are doing it as a try-out for the purpose of finding out what it is going to cost. That will not be required in next year's vote, and accounts for $75,000. The second examination, which will take up the time of the staff but will not require nearly so much money, will account for a little more, and I hope that the reduction that will be provided with respect to compensation for certain animals will account for some more. So we shall be able to carry on the work just as effectively as last year.

The reason we are trying out this restricted area of three municipalities in Manitoba is this, and I am sure my predecessor understands the situation: If this work is going to run into a large sum of money we want to be able to go to the provinces and to the municipalities and ask for their co-operation in cleaning up the herds regardless of whether they are grade or pure bred. In the United States they have adopted a plan whereby the federal government, state legislatures and municipalities unite in this work. We hope to get some information from the work in this restricted area that we can place before the provinces and the municipalities, and possibly at some conference suggest to them, are you prepared to enter into co-operation with the federal authorities with a view to taking care of this very heavy and very necessary and important work? That is the method adopted in the United States, and it has been found to work out effectively. I do not know whether it will work out effectively here, but I must have the information as to the cost before I can hope to have the

co-operation of the provinces and municipalities. That sum will not be required next year and that accounts for a very large portion of that reduction.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it not a fact that the maximum valuation of an animal is $200, that only two-thirds of that is paid, and that it is strictly the duty of the official carrying out that work to fix the actual market value of the animal before entering up his compensation papers? That actual market value might be only twenty or thirty or fifty dollars, and you are only entitled by law to pay two-thirds of that amount. I am sure the minister would not want the statement to go abroad that his officials were fixing these papers or preparing false papers. I have known the men doing this work in the Health of Animals branch for many years, and they are gentlemen of repute and high standing in their profession, and I would hate to see the statement go out imputing wrong statements to these men in the preparation of their papers.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend knows perfectly well the difficulty. If you put the compensation high, you are going to have the valuation high; there is no question about that. This is one of the most difficult features of our whole compensation business, to get a proper valuation that will compensate the owner partially. It is similar to the indemnity that is paid to members; it is an indemnity, not a salary, and similarly the compensation is paid to the man to indemnify him for his loss, so that with the salvage of the animal and the compensation, he can start over again. It may be sound theoretically to say that if we put the compensation up to $1,000 the appraisers would value the animals at their actual value, but would not the tendency be to appraise the animal higher than if the maximum compensation was $200? There is no question in my mind that that would be the tendency. That has been my experience, and it is no reflection on the staff at all. If we are going to have a successful administration of this vote we shall have to give reasonable satisfaction and secure the active and sympathetic co-operation of the owners of the stock. The desire of the breeders to have their herds accredited goes to show that they are being well compensated for their stock now. I do not believe that the intention of the framers of the act is being carried out if no part of the loss falls on the owner of the animal. It is true that a lot of the loss falls on breeders of first-class stock, but with regard to inferior animals the present compensation means that you are buying the animal.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have had a number of years' experience in the actual administration of the act, first as inspector in the employ of the federal government, and also as chief inspector for the province of British Columbia, and I say that if you are paying more money than these cattle are worth to-day the act is not being carried out, and anybody that does that should be fired immediately.

In the first place an inspector makes his valuation in the field. That valuation certificate is submitted to the chief inspector of the province, who looks over it carefully, and if he requires more information secures it from the inspector in the field. Finally those documents are forwarded to the head office in Ottawa, where they are submitted to further scrutiny. There is no man who is doing his duty who will value the animal higher than its actual worth. It is his business to base the valuation on the regular market price, and if he wishes further information on this particular subject he can easily obtain it by applying to those who keep in close touch with the market reports. As I said before, anybody valuing these animals at a greater value than they are worth on the market is certainly not fulfilling his duties and should be looked after and reprimanded.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then, it does not make any difference what the maximum valuation is, whether it is $200 or $2,000. The appraiser will come along and give the real value.

Mr. MILLAR: A few days ago I had occasion to read in the House a paragraph from a journal making certain allegations. That excerpt is already on Hansard and it it not necessary to repeat it. I will, however, give the substance of the charges. They were to the effect that men were carrying on a considerable business through the west in buying old cows and animals that were likely to react when tested for tuberculosis; they were buying them, it was said, for the purpose of having them re-act, because they were getting them at about $8 apiece, the article stated, and when they re-acted the purchasers claimed $30 apiece from the government. It was stated that this practice was carried on on quite a large scale around the stockyards at Winnipeg.

Mr. TOLMIE: I absolutely do not believe that statement for one minute. I know these men in the Health of Animals branch. I know their reputation and I know they are

good square fellows as far as I have been able to discover. I certainly think it is the duty of the minister to take up the statement of the hon. member and investigate it to the bottom, and ascertain whether the allegation is true or not. If it is true the minister could remedy it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the admission the minister has made is one of the most severe reflections upon this branch of the department that has ever been made by a member of the government in this House. I think it goes to confirm certain charges that I brought against that very branch on several occasions last session. I may say further that the remark just made by the minister that you might as well not have a maximum compensation but let it run up to $2,000 might just as well apply.

Mr. GARDINER: I rise to a point of order. The question the hon. member is discussing is not relevant to the item under discussion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before giving your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the minister asked for discussion on this matter, and I think it would be most unfortunate for the officials of his department not to have the allegations cleared up now that we have so nearly approached the hour of adjournment. I cannot conceive it possible for men who understand their work to fix so excessive a valuation on these animals.

Mr. GARDINER: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. gentleman wish to debate the point?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the point of order, I would say that the matter has been under discussion and considerable latitude has been allowed. The minister himself asked for the discussion. That was my reason for wishing to make a few remarks. I think an injustice will be done if the discussion is terminated at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister, in answer to a comparison that was made by one hon. member, briefly entered into a discussion of the question of the health of animals. I must rule the point of order is well taken, and that this question cannot be discussed on the item relating to experimental farms which we are now considering. I rule that the discussion must be limited to the item under consideration.

Mr. LEADER: I must say we all appreciate the information that the minister has given us to-night. Hon. members will concede that he is actuated by the desire to do the best he can in his department. I feel that way myself, and recognize that the minister is perfectly competent for the position which he holds. But I maintain that in asking for $200,000 more than was voted for this purpose last year the minister is calling for too much under present conditions. I protest against a vote for such an amount, and would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Coote that the item be reduced by $200,000.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not taken any part in the debate and I do not profess to any special knowledge of farming, but if you are going to move for reductions I do not think it is wise to select the agricultural interest for the beginning. The Minister of Agriculture has been very profuse in his information, he has given all possible explanation, and if there is any more required, I have no doubt he will bring the information to-morrow. I would earnestly plead with the committee not to make any reduction in this item. I know the minister is most zealous and earnest to promote the agricultural interest of the country. I know he has most strenuously asked this increase, and possibly some have unwillingly granted it to him under his strong recommendations. Therefore I think it would be a mistake for the committee now to reduce this item.

Amendment (Mr. Leader) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Wednesday, February 21, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP

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

That the name of W. J. Lovie be taken from the list of members comprising the standing committee of the Library of Parliament and that that of A. L. Beaubien be inserted in lieu thereof, and that the name of A. L Beaubien be taken from the committee on Railways and Canals and that that of W. J. Lovie be inserted in lieu thereof.

That the name of P. Elliott (Dundas) be taken from the list of members comprising the select standing committee on Railways and Canals and that that of M. N. Campbell be inserted in lieu thereof, and that the name of M. N. Campbell be taken from the committee on Marine and Fisheries and that that of P. Elliott (Dundas) be inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

On the order:

Introduction of bills, Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Criminal Code,"—

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker I have been induced by a number of organizations in my own constituency, as well as by organizations throughout Canada, to introduce this bill. I appreciate the responsibility which devolves upon me as the sponsor of it, but feel somewhat encouraged when I realize that on several occasions the measure has been introduced in this House. Mr. Bickerdike, who was for some time the member for the St. Lawrence division, Montreal, first brought this bill before the Canadian parliament. He set forth the arguments in its favour very forcibly, and I suppose that to-day we may reap some of the fruits of his noble efforts. It shall be my aim in presenting the argument in favour --

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman but simply to remind him that at this stage of the proceedings the explanation of the bill should be general and brief. It is on the second reading of a bill that a more elaborate explanation of its purpose is given. I would therefore ask the hon. member to state simply and briefly the objects of this bill.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, having introduced this bill at a previous sitting of the House, I was under the impression that the duty now devolved upon me of moving its second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is only the first reading.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the hon. member has made the mistake of thinking we are taking up Item No. 3 under Orders of the Day where Bill No. 8, to amend the Criminal Code is set down for second reading. This appears to be a new bill which the hon. gentleman is introducing.

Mr. IRVINE: I have no other bill to introduce, having already introduced a measure for this purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see on the order paper, under the heading "Introduction of Bills" a bill to amend the criminal code standing in the name of the hon. gentleman. Does the hon. member wish to drop that bill?

Mr. IRVINE: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to drop my bill proposing to amend the criminal code.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to introduce the said bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. RINFRET: Will the hon. member please explain.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I can explain the bill in one sentence. It calls for the repeal of the provisions of the criminal code demanding capital punishment, and the substitution of life imprisonment for the death sentence.

Mr. GRAHAM: Look at page 19 of the order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must apologize to the hon. gentleman and to the House. Evidently an error has been made by one of the clerks, —not one of the Clerks of the House but one of the clerks who have charge of the drafting of the order paper. I shall deal accordingly with this clerk. I understand that this bill has already been introduced and that it has reached the stage of the second reading, although it appears on the order paper again under the heading of "Introduction of Bills." The House will therefore now proceed with the second order under "Introduction of Bills," the bill standing in the name of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 24 to amend the Copyright Act, 1921.

He said: In June 1921 a Copyright Act was passed by this parliament, but that act has never been proclaimed. I believe the Minister of Justice of that day found some objections raised by other countries. It is to enable Canada, first, to comply with the provisions of the British Copyright Act, and, secondly, to comply with the provisions of the International Copyright Act that we propose very slight amendments to the Copyright Act of 1921.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before we proceed to the question, I rise to what may be described as a point of order. The Redistribution bill was read a second time yesterday, but no motion was made to refer it to a special com-

mittee, but still the order seems to be dropped from the order paper. It should, I think, appear under Government Orders to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the right hon. gentleman states, the bill was read the second time yesterday, I think, and I understand the government intend to present a motion referring the bill to a select committee. It is in the hands of the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It should be on the order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be on the order paper in due time. Notice will be given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It cannot be dropped off the order paper merely by the second reading. It should appear on the order paper.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether an opportunity will be given to members of the House to discuss the principle of this bill before it goes to committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say it was my intention to move to-day for a reference of the bill to a special committee. The reason I did not do so was because I was anxious to make sure, before making the motion, that the number of members on the committee would meet with the general acceptance of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not finding fault with the fact that the motion has not been made. I am only pointing out the fact that it is off the order paper. I think it should be there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the bill was read the second time yesterday no motion was made for a reference to a select committee and for that reason no motion should appear on the order paper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not agree with that. If the motion had been made for reference to a special committee, and that motion carried, then it would be off the order paper till the special committee reported, but seeing there was no reference at all, it should appear on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Journals show that the bill received its second reading, and I presume it would have been in order to have made a motion to-day referring the bill to a special committee. That was the intention but the fact that no motion is made does not alter the privilege of the government to introduce it. With the permission of the House I would like to say to my hon. friend that the government is of the view that the work of this committee would be more expeditiously and efficiently carried on if it were a small committee rather than a large one. In 1903 the Redistribution committee consisted of seven members. In 1914 the number was enlarged to nine. The government had thought that if this year the Redistribution committee were made eleven in number, having regard to the diffcrent groups in the House, that would be a fair-sized committee, and perhaps the most efficient to deal with this particular measure. However, I have gathered that hon. gentlemen opposite feel they would like to have a somewhat larger committee and the government would be quite prepared to concede a committee of fifteen, but I think to go beyond fifteen would make the committee unduly large for the purpose. It does not mean limiting the number to fifteen, because any group may have sitting with their members in the committee just as many of their own party as they may wish to consider the measure. A reference to the rules of the House will show that where a committee is larger in number than fifteen—rule 11, I think, —some special procedure is necessary to have the larger number adopted, if exception is taken to a committee larger than fifteen. I hope under the circumstances that my right hon. friend and members also of the other group will find it possible to agree with the government that fifteen would be a sufficiently large number for the purpose of working out the details of the redistribution. Just as soon as we can get to an agreement on this matter I shall have pleasure in moving the reference of the bill to the special committee.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I did not receive an answer to the question I asked a minute ago as to whether an opportunity would be given to this House to discuss the principles of this measure before it goes to committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yesterday my hon. friend had that opportunity, as every member of the House had. The bill was read the second time yesterday, and if he missed that opportunity, he no doubt on the third reading will have a chance to say something.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it is out of order, but I would like to say a word in reference to the Prime Minister's remarks. A committee of more than fifteen does seem large, but the conditions are unique at this time. Of course it presents no difficulty to the Prime Minister on his side of the House, because they will insist upon having a major-

ity in the committee. That leaves us in a minority of the minority, but our duties are just as onerous as those of hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to redistribution. We had, and undoubtedly will have again, a candidate in every one of the 245 constituencies in the nine provinces, to be looked after. Hon. gentlemen to my left are in the same position. Consequently our work is just as irksome as that of hon. gentlemen opposite. A committee of fifteen leaves us only three. Three were found too few when it was tried. Four were found to be few enough. We have agreed to four, and I put it to hon. members opposite that four are none too many—in fact four are insufficient—to undertake the detailed, burdensome work of reviewing the redistribution of nine provinces and 245 seats.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN NATIONAL DIRECTORS' INSPECTION TRIP

Mr. HARRIS:

1. Was a special train provided for the inspection trip of the new Canadian National directors in January, 1923?
2. If so, how many private cars were attached to such special train, and how many cars in all composed such train?
3. How many directors took part in such trip and between what points, and at what times did such directors take part in the trip?
4. What was the cost of such trip to the National Railway Company?
5. What practical results were obtained by such trip?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. There were no private cars so-called attached to the train. There were, however, seven business cars, these being the cars which are used by officers in the performance of their work. In addition to these cars, there were: one baggage car for the train crew, and an observation car in which delegations were met and received.

3. Three.

4. It is not possible, without a great deal of accounting work, to develop the cost of the trip. There was no unnecessary cost since the trip was an essential part of the duties of the directors.

5. The president and directors saw the lines and terminals, and became acquainted with the character of the traffic, its volume, the needs of the property, and, what is more important, the qualifications of various officers; but the trip was primarily for the benefit of the president in order that he might collect sufficient information to intelligently develop an organization for the administration of the property, and decide the personnel of the railway system. It would be impossible to administer such a property without information of this character.

Mr. HARRIS:

1. Was a special train provided for the inspection trip of the new Canadian National directors in October, 1922?
2. If so, how many private cars were attached to such special train, and how many cars in all composed such train?
3. How many directors took part in such trip and between what points, and at what times did such directors take part in the trip?
4. What was the cost of such trip to the National Railway Company?
5. What practical results were obtained by such trip?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. There were no private cars so-called attached to the train. There were, however, seven business cars, these being the cars which are used by officers in the performance of their work. In addition to these there were: one baggage car for the train crew, and an observation car in which delegations could be met and received.

3. Six.

4. It is not possible, without a great deal of accounting work to develop the cost of the trip. There was no unnecessary cost, since the trip was an essential part of the duties of the directors.

5. Directors saw lines and terminals covered on trip and discussed various railway matters with the general and territorial officers who travelled on trains from time to time over their respective territories. The directors obtained a comprehensive view of the properties and the various important questions at issue.

PURCHASE OF LAND IN ALBERTA

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Were lots 31 and 32, block 8, in the town of Vermilion, Alberta, bought by the government? If so, when?
2. Who were they bought from?
3. What was the price paid?
4. Considering the vast amount of coal lands owned by the government and the tremendous quantity needed for the National Railways, has the government cosnidered the advisability of developing mines to supply fuel to the said railways.

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. (a) Yes; (b) 12th September, 1913.

2. Mr. W. J. Seed.

3. $10,000.

4. Up to the present, the advisability of developing mines to supply fuel for our rail-

ways has not been considered. However, it is the intention of the management to give consideration to the fuel question with other problems that are now confronting Canadian National Railways.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to two separate applications to the Federal Power Commission at Washington by the American Super Power Corporation at Buffalo to develop power on the St. Lawrence river in the towns of Waddington, New York, and Messina, New York, 920,000 h.p. for the United States and 680,000 h.p. for Canada, including plants along the lines of the proposed St. Lawrence waterways with locks proposed of 30 feet draught as part of the power scheme, plants of which to be located at Ogden island and Barnhart island?

2. What steps does the government propose to take to see that the interests of Canada are safeguarded from a navigation and power standpoint?

3. Does the government propose to renew and continue negotiations with the government of the United States for the development of the St. Lawrence river along the lines of the report of the International Deep Waterways Commission, 1922?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The government has received no official intimation of either of the applications referred to.

2. As no development can take place on the St. Lawrence river without consideration by the Dominion government, there will be ample opportunity for safeguarding Canadian interests.

3. The government does not deem the present an opportune time to negotiate with the government of the United States for the development of the St. Lawrence river in the manner referred to.

COAL IMPORTS AND PRODUCTION

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. How many tons of anthracite coal was imported into Canada from the United States during the twelve months just past?

2. What was the total cost of this coal in Canada and what was the total amount of duty paid on same?

3. How many tons of soft coal of all kinds were imported into Canada from the United States during the past twelve months?

4. What was the total cost of this coal in Canada and what was the total amount of duty paid on same?

5. What total amount of hard or soft coal of all kinds was mined in Canada during the past twelve months?

6. What amount of the said coal was mined in each province?

7. What quantity, if any, of the said coal mined in Canada was exported to the United States?

Hon. Mr. COPP: Twelve months February 1, 1922, to January 31, 1923.

1. Imports anthracite coal from United States entered for consumption in Canada. Tons. 2,676,036
2. Value of anthracite coal as entered for consumption.. .. .. $ 23,364,988
   Duty paid on same.. .. .. Free
3. Imports bituminous coal from United States entered for consumption in Canada.. .. .. Tons. 10,327,450
4. Value of bituminous coal as entered for consumption.. .. .. $ 37,578,581
   Duty paid on same.. 4,680,116

5 and 6.

Provinces	Anthracite Tons	Bituminous Tons	Lignite Tons
Nova Scotia..		5,456,000	.....
New Brunswick		272,000	.....
Saskatchewan..		.....	296,000
Alberta..	42,000	2,706,000	3,228,000
British Columbia.		2,927,000	.....
Yukon..		465	.....
Total For Dominion..	42,000	11,361,465	3,524,000

7. Quantity domestic coal exported to United States.. .. .. Tons. 1,526,105

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. SENN:

Referring to the Agricultural Instruction Act passed in 1919, which will lapse on the 31st of March next:

1. Is it the intention of the government to pass a similar act?

2. If so, what is the amount per annum proposed to be distributed?

3. When will this act be brought down?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. It is not the intention of the government to pass a similar act this session, but provision is being made for the payment to the provinces of a grant to assist in agricultural instruction.

2. This grant will amount to $900,000.

3. Answered by No. 1.

PORT OF BELLEVILLE OFFICIALS

Mr. PORTER:

1. Have the Harbour Commissioners of the Port of Belleville been dismissed from office?

2. What complaint, if any, was made against them and by whom?

3. Is it known to the government that the Harbour Commissioners of the Port of Belleville lately discharged, Lt. Col. A. P. Allen and Corporal B. L. Hyman, are returned soldiers with overseas service in the late Great War?

4. Are the persons appointed to succeed the above named commissioners or either of these returned soldiers or did either of them have any family representation in the late Great War?

5. Is the government aware that a number of G.W.V. of Belleville were capable and desirous of filling these positions in the event of their comrades being dismissed, and if so, why were they not appointed?

6. What qualifications superior to that of the late commissionners, has either of the present occupants for filling such position, and in what manner is it expected they will be able to discharge the duties of their office in a superior manner to their predecessors?

7. Has the light-house keeper at the Port of Belleville been discharged?

8. What complaint, if any, was made against him and by whom?

9. Who has been appointed to succeed to the position and what are his special qualifications that his predecessor did not possess, and in what respect is a successor expected to discharge the duties in a manner superior to his predecessor?

10. On what date was the said light-house keeper discharged, has any one been temporarily appointed to succeed him and is such temporary employee drawing salary since his appointment, and what duties (if any) has he performed since then and what duties are to be performed during the winter season at this office?

11. Why was not a returned soldier appointed either temporarily or permanently to this position?

12. What was the age of the present occupant of this position at time of his appointment?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Former Harbour Commissioners of the Port of Belleville have been dismissed from office on two occasions, first in 1911 and second in 1922.

2. In the case of the dismissals made in 1911, complaint was made by Mr. E. Guss Porter, M.P., that the then commissioners were guilty of political partisanship, on the strength of which complaint an order in council issued discontinuing their services. The dismissals in 1922 were made in accordance with the general policy adopted by the government in connection with other harbour commissions in Canada.

3. The government has no information. Inasmuch as there is no authority for the payment of salaries for these positions, the question of overseas service did not arise.

4. See answer to No. 3.

5. See answer to No. 3.

6. The government has no information as to the extent to which the qualifications of the present occupants are superior to those of the former commissioners. The government expects the present occupants will discharge their duties in a more satisfactory way by reason of the fact that generally speaking their views are in harmony with the government's policy.

7. Yes.

8. Charges of political partisanship during the election campaign of 1921 were preferred against him by Mr. Carr, Secretary of the Belleville Liberal Association, who wrote the department enclosing affidavits from B. A. Sanford, Chas. Barnhart and Edward Ethier, charging Mr. Smith with political partisanship.

9. No permanent appointment has been made. Applications for the position, to be received not later than 3rd February, 1923, were invited by the Civil Service Commission. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has not been advised whether any selection has yet been made by the Civil Service Commission.

10. His services were discontinued by order in council of 20th November, 1922. John C. Weir who was employed as keeper of this light prior to 1912 was selected as temporary keeper, pending a permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission, by reason of the satisfactory service performed by him while previously employed coupled with the consideration that three of his sons enlisted for war service, two of whom served overseas. He is performing the duties ordinarily attaching to such office and receiving the authorized remuneration therefor. The duties during the winter consist of the care of the government property.

11. See answers to Nos. 9 and 10.

12. His age as stated on application form is 53 years.

SALES TAX ACT

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Has any order in council been passed during the current fiscal year adding to the list of exemptions under the Sales Tax Act?

2. If so, what are the exemptions added and in what cases do they apply?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: No.

JUDGES' SALARIES

Mr. BINETTE:

1. What has been the cost to the Dominion government during the fiscal year 1921-22, for judges' salaries in all provincial courts?

2. Of this amount, how much was paid to the several provinces of the dominion for each court, either appellate or original jurisdiction, superior courts, country or district courts, etc.?

3. How much has been paid by the Dominion government during the fiscal year 1921-22, for travelling expenses of above mentioned judges, in each of the several provinces?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. $1,828,990.31.

2. Ontario: Court of Appeal, $46,000; High Court Division, $113,909.87; County Courts, $260,167.74; District Courts, $68,615.61; Total $488,693.22.

Quebec: Court of King's Bench, $108,612.90; Superior Court, $324,500; Circuit Court, Montreal, $22,500; Total, $455,612.90.

New Brunswick: Court of Appeal, $27,250; King's Bench, $37,000; County Courts, $29,000.02; Divorce Court, $500; Total $93,750.02.

Nova Scotia: Supreme Court, $62,887.09; County Courts, $34,999.92; Divorce Court, $500; Total $98,387.01.

Prince Edward Island: Supreme Court, $26,548.38; County Courts, $15,000; Total $41,548.38.

Manitoba: Court of Appeal, $41,451.61; King's Bench, $55,750; County Courts, $43,340; Total $140,541.61.

Saskatchewan: Court of Appeal, $29,209.67; King's Bench, $66,362.90; District Courts, $84,916.50; Total $180,489.07.

Alberta: Supreme Court, $92,344.42; District Court, $57,722.17; Total $150,066.59.

British Columbia, Court of Appeal, $45,-250; Supreme Court, $59,166.61; County Court, $68,404.90; Total $172,901.51.

Yukon—Territorial Court, $7,000.

3. Ontario, $38,136.25; Quebec, $20,409.10; New Brunswick, $7,310.05; Nova Scotia, $5,-818.36; P. E. I., $581.00; Manitoba, $7,645.-75; Saskatchewan, $15,248.00; Alberta, $26,-396.95; British Columbia, $20,199.65; Yukon, $80.00; Total $141,825.11.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES

Mr. SENN:

1. Has the operation of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act so far as it relates to the accredited herd system been temporarily suspended?

2. If so, why?

3. How many herds in each province have been accredited during the year 1922?

4. What amount of indemnity was paid for reactors during the year 1922?

5. What was the amount spent for inspectors' salaries, travelling expenses or otherwise, during the year 1922, under the provisions of the act for accredited herds?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. The testing of cattle under the accredited herd plan was discontinued on the 10th January as regards herds not previously tested; but the re-testing of herds already tested once was continued, as also the testing of additions to those herds.

2. It is considered advisable to clean up herds now under the test rather than start new herds, and limitations as to staff and money for compensation do not permit of doing both.

3. Herds that became accredited between 1st April, 1922, and 31st January, 1923: Prince Edward Island, 10; Nova Scotia, 7; Quebec, 68; Ontario, 152; Manitoba, 21; Saskatchewan, 5; Alberta, 6; British Columbia, 9; total, 278.

4. Amount of indemnity for the period from 1st April, 1922, to 31st January, 1923,—$775,-997.66. Of the above, $468,581.33 was in connection with accredited herds, and $307,416.33 in connection with municipal testing.

5. The inspectors of the Health of Animals Branch are in many cases not exclusively engaged in tuberculosis work; and even then their time is devoted to municipal testing as well as accredited herd work. In the period April 1st, 1922, to January 31st, 1923, 131,355 tests were made, 52 per cent of which were in connection with accredited herd work.

It is estimated that 49·7 per cent of the time of our staff was devoted to tuberculosis work, and on that basis, 52 per cent of 49·7 per cent of amounts paid in salaries and travelling expenses would represent the amount chargeable to accredited herd work. The amount of salaries chargeable is, $67,473.83; travelling expenses, $36,060.29; supplies, tags, thermometers, etc., $3,277.04; tuberculin used, $10,-267.66; total, $117,078.82.

JUDGES' PENSIONS

Mr. BENOIT:

Is it the intention of the government to abolish at this present session, pensions of judges appointed in the future?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

ONTARIO SOLDIER SETTLEMENTS

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many returned soldiers have been settled by Soldier Land Settlement Board in counties of Frontenac, Addington and Lennox respectively?

2. How many have been salvaged in each county?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

1. Frontenac, 18, Addington and Lennox, 22.

2. Frontenac, 2, Addington and Lennox, 4.

PETERBORO INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Mr. BRETHEN:

1. Who is the inspector of weights and measures for Peterboro district?

2. What salary in full did he receive in 1922?

3. What moneys did he collect for 1922 as: (a) inspector (b) cartage?

4. What percentage of said moneys was received by government?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. G. H. Howson.

2. Salary $1,785.00. Bonus $138.69.

3. (a) $3,255.05, (b) $892.35.

4. One hundred per cent.

STAMPS ON CHEQUES

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Have any rulings been made for the direction of the public or the banks as to affixing stamps on cheques under the legislation of last session? If so, what ruling or rulings?

2. What are the penalties for failure to affix stamps or sufficient stamps on the cheques?

3. Have any proceedings been taken in respect of such breaches?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. The following regulations have been approved by the Minister of Finance, under the provisions of Section 4 of the act of 1922 to amend the Special War Revenue Act of 1915, whereby cheques embossed with words indicating that the stamp tax has been paid, may be used by persons, firms or corporations to whom a license is issued:

July 7, 1922.

1. Application for a license (form L 20) shall be forwarded through the collector of the nearest customs and excise port to the Commissioner of Customs and Excise, Ottawa, hereinafter called the commissioner, in an envelope marked "embossed cheques."

The representations made in such application shall be verified by the statutory declaration of the applicant.

2. There shall be forwarded with the application for license a requisition (form E 159) for the number of embossed cheques required by the licensee, together with a certified cheque, by way of deposit, payable to the Receiver General for an amount equivalent to the estimated tax, as per assertions 1 (a) and 1 (c) on application for license plus twenty-five per cent. The commissioner may at any time require a larger deposit.

3. Cheques will be embossed and issued to a licensee in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter defined.

4. A licensee shall keep an account in which shall be entered, at the time each cheque is drawn, particulars of the cheque, showing the serial number, the date of issue, the amount and the sum due as excise tax thereon. A separate account shall be kept for each bank or branch of a bank on which the licensee draws cheques. On or before the fifth day of each month the licensee shall forward through the Collector of Customs and Excise at the port through which the license was obtained to the commissioner the account or accounts, as the case may be, for the preceding month, verified by the statutory declaration of the licensee and accompanied by a certified cheque payable to the Receiver General for the total sum of tax shown as accrued by said account or accounts; and all bank statements of cheques debited to the licensee's account, and all relevant books of account of the licensee shall be open to inspection and audit for the purpose of these regulations by officers of the Department of Customs and Excise, and such audit shall be made by officers of the department at such times as are deemed necessary.

5. When a further supply of embossed cheques is required, requisition for same will be made by the licensee on form E 159.

6. Each embossed cheque shall have printed or lithographed on it, in a prominent manner, the name of the licensee, the number of license and the name of the bank on which the cheque is to be drawn; and no person other than the licensee whose name is so printed or lithographed shall draw such cheque, and no bank shall pay an embossed cheque drawn by any person other than the licensee whose name is so printed or lithographed, or on which the license number does not appear.

7. In the event of a licensee abandoning his license there may be repaid to him the amount of his deposit in excess of the amount payable in respect of the stamp tax on all embossed cheques issued by him less the cost of embossing and transportation of that portion of unused cheques remaining on hand, and the unused cheques must be returned to the commissioner. If a license is cancelled for a violation of any of the provisions of the Special War Revenue Act, and amendments, or of these regulations, or for any other reason, no portion of the deposit will be repaid to the licensee and he shall be liable for any further amount payable by him in respect of stamp tax on embossed cheques which he has issued and he shall return to the commissioner all unissued embossed cheques.

8. The design to be embossed on cheques shall be in a form to be approved by the Commissioner and shall contain the words "tax paid" and the number of the license.

9. The commissioner may refuse any application for a license if in his judgment, which shall be final, the number of cheques issued by the applicant is not large enough to justify the granting of a license or for any other reason which appears to the commissioner to warrant refusal.

10. The blank cheques must be forwarded to the American Bank Note Company, Ottawa, who must be advised by the shipper as to the quantity and description of blank cheques in the consignment, the outer covering of the parcel being also marked to indicate the name and address of the shipper. Packages, the gross weight of which exceed 90 pounds, if shipped from Montreal, 60 pounds if shipped from Toronto, or 40 pounds if shipped from Winnipeg, must be forwarded by freight. Under these weights shipment must be made by express. From each of the three places mentioned the parcels are to be forwarded by Canadian government railways or Canadian National Express (as the case may be), charges collect.

Shipments made from points other than the foregoing are to be forwarded by the same lines where practicable, the method of transportation being determined by cost. If the lower rate is provided by freight, shipment must be made accordingliy, and vice versa.

11. When cheques are shipped for embossing, the top sheet of each lot must indicate the position where it is desired the stamp should be placed, as well as the gauges to which the sheet was fed. The impression will be made as near to the point indicated as the circumstances will permit.

12. The paper must be of such quality, thickness and colour as to be suitable for receiving the impression of the die, a red coloured ink being used for this purpose.

13. The paper must be flat and uncreased, and should not be gummed, folded, perforated or rouletted before it is sent to be stamped.

14. Each cheque for which a separate stamp is required must not be less than five inches in length, nor less than one and a half inches in depth.

15. All cheques must be presented for stamping in sheets of at least four on.

16. Where blank cheques do not meet the requirements of sections 13 and 15 the charge for embossing same in lots under 15,000 will be 70 cents per thousand cheques, and in lots of 15,000 or over, 20 cents per thousand cheques.

17. Bound forms will not be accepted.

18. In designing cheques, a space of one and a quarter inches in depth and one inch in width should be provided for the embossing of the stamp.

19. Requisitions for the embossing of less than one thousand forms will not be accepted.

20. In shipping blank forms a sufficient quantity should be provided to allow for spoilage in embossing, and all cheques, etc., should be carefully counted before being shipped.

21. Spoiled forms will not be returned.

22. Blank forms left over when the requisition has been filled will be returned upon request.

23. The department will not accept any responsibility for injury to material in the process of stamping, nor for loss of material, which may arise during transportation to and from Ottawa.

24. Refund of excise tax may be allowed on embossed cheques returned to the department, when it is established to the satisfaction of the commissioner, that the cheques although drawn were for some valid reason never negotiated, but on which the excise tax had been paid. Minimum amount of tax for which a refund will be allowed under this section shall be five dollars.

25. The regulations heretofore issued by the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue covering the embossing of a two cent stamp on cheques and money orders will continue in operation as per circular G. 26 or amendments thereto.

26. Application and requisition forms L 20 and E 150 may be obtained from collectors of customs and excise.

Section 10 of the regulations of 7th July, 1922, is cancelled and the following substituted therefor:

July 25, 1922.

10. The blank cheques are to be forwarded to The American Bank Note Company, Ottawa, by express or freight, whichever is the lower rate, charges in all cases "collect," with indication on the package of name and address of the shipper, and the shipper will by letter advise the company as to the quantity and description of cheques in the shipment.

2. As provided by Special War Revenue Act of 1915—part 3 and amendments thereto and sections 164 and 1035 of the Criminal Code.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

GRAIN, MARKETING AND SHIPMENT

Mr. MILLAR:

1. How much grain has been sold on the Winnipeg sample market in each of the last four years?
2. What amounts have been received by the government from the proceeds of terminal elevator overages for the last year, for which returns are available?
3. Did the government propose, towards the close of the 1922 shipping season to waive the regulations forbidding foreign boats carrying Canadian grain between Canadian ports?
4. If so, did any Canadian carrier or carriers make objections, and what are the names of such objectors?

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was any merchandise, material, or supplies of any kind purchased on emergency requisitions for use at the maritime penitentiary at Dorchester, New Brunswick, between January 1, 1922, and December 31, 1922?
2. If so, what goods were so purchased, what quantities of each kind and on what dates?
3. From what persons, firms or corporations were said purchases made and what is the business address of said persons, firms or corporations?

PRIVATE BETTING

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, it is expedient that subsection two of section two hundred and thirty-five of the Criminal Code be repealed, and that it be enacted that the provisions of subsection one of said section, and of sections two hundred and twenty-seven and two hundred and twenty-eight of the said code shall not extend to any person by reason of his becoming custodian or depository of any money, property, or valuable thing staked for the purpose of becoming the property of the winner of any lawful race, sport, game or exercise or to a private bet between not more than ten individuals who are not engaged in any way in a business of betting.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With reference to the proposed resolution of my hon. friend, would it not be possible for him to put what he has in mind in the form of a bill? I doubt if anyone reading this resolution, could tell what it means, and if my hon. friend would put his ideas in the form of a bill, we would have them clearly before us, and the House could discuss them much more intelligently.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. GOOD: I do not know that I have any particular objection to proceeding along that line, except that I am not in a position myself to draft a bill, and perhaps some delay might be involved in discussing the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can inform the hon. gentleman that the law officers of the House of Commons will be only too pleased to lend their services for drafting any such public bills. Shall I say: "dropped"?

Mr. GOOD: No, I would not like to give my consent to dropping the resolution without a little further consideration.

Motion stands.

GREAT LAKES DISARMAMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, writings, correspondence, documents, etc., of any kind, passing between the government of Canada and the government of the United States relative to the Great Lakes Disarmament question.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I explained to my right hon. friend, I think, when this motion was called before, that this matter is at the present time one of negotiation between the government of Canada and the government of the United States, and I think he expressed the view then that it would not be in the public interest to bring down documents that were the subject of negotiation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there are matters in negotiation, I stated that they might be rightfully considered confidential, and withheld; but surely that does not apply to all the correspondence that has taken place up to now. I know that when we left office—because I had special charge of this matter—what I described as a consensus ad idem was arrived at. That is to say, the minds of the two governments were in agreement, although that agreement was not reduced to writing or signed. I know of no reason at all why the correspondence up to that point should not be brought down. If the correspondence since conducted by this government is considered by them as confidential, why then, notwithstanding my recollection of their vigorous protests to us when we were in the same position, against withholding confidential documents, I thoroughly agree that they should not be brought down.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall have much pleasure in bringing down all the correspondence to which my right hon. friend has just referred.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR STRIKES IN 1922

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, and other writings relating to the strikes of workers in shipping, railway and other crafts in 1922 and also for copy of the opinion of the Department of Justice given in relation to the conduct of either employers or employees affected by such strikes.

He said: The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has pointed out that the adoption of the motion as drawn would entail a great deal of work. I am quite content to change the wording of the resolution with a view to making it somewhat shorter. I desire to hold the request for the opinion of the law officers, and in addition restrict the remainder to:

All communications of whatsoever sort exchanged between the departments of government or any member of any department of government with any persons or companies respecting the Sydney coal strike of last winter. All communications made to or received by any department of the government and by the railways in connection with the shop trades' controversy of last summer, and concerning the Alberta coal strike in the fall of 1922, especially the correspondence between the Department of Labour and Mr. John L. Lewis of Indianapolis, the president of the Labour Union.

I think that very materially reduces the list. Perhaps my hon. friend would like to give it consideration.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): It would simplify matters a great deal if my hon. friend would amend his motion. The correspondence between Mr. John L. Lewis and myself has already been asked for by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and, I understand, has been or is being given to him. That disposes of that order. The other day my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) struck from his motion the order respecting the other crafts and said he was willing to have the motion confined to the production of correspondence regarding shipping and railway strikes in 1922. There were no such strikes, and therefore there could be no correspondence in that respect. As I have stated in two letters to my hon. friend in regard to this matter, we shall be glad indeed to give any information we have if he will only indicate in his motion what he wants.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will see my request in Hansard and he can no doubt let me have an answer to-morrow or the day after.

Mr. MURDOCK: I respectfully insist that such request should be submitted in an amended motion for the production of papers.

Motion stands.

SIR HENRY THORNTON

Mr. MEIGHEN moved:

For a return showing all correspondence passed between the government of Canada and Sir Henry Thornton leading or in any way relating to the contract made with Sir Henry Thornton for the management of the National Railways, and as well a copy of said contract.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): I have no objection to the motion, but there was no correspondence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be that I am relying too much on the press, but I understood that an application was filed. Would that not come within the terms of this motion?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would if there were an application, but there is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The press is wrong again. It is frequently doing the government cruel injustice.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will not say until I see what the press says.

Motion agreed to.

COPYRIGHT ACT, 1921

Mr. RINFRET moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Copyright Act, 1921, should be amended by dropping out the clauses thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and twenty-seven, in regard to licenses; and that said Copyright Act, so amended, be enforced immediately.

He said: In view of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), has introduced a bill to amend the Copyright Act. 1921, which will afford a full discussion of the question covered by this motion, I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

CAPE BRETON COAL STRIKE

Mr. IRVINE moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents of all kinds which passed between the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Dominion Coal Company of Nova Scotia, in connection with the sending of troops to Cape Breton during the strike of the employees of said company last August.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the title of the minister is now Minister of National Defence.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SOLDIER SETTLER FIRE INSURANCE

Mr. McMURRAY:

For return showing the amount of fire insurance placed on property of soldier settlers in the province of Manitoba, under the Soldier Settlement Act; the names of the brokers who wrote the said insurance and the amount placed by each. The total amount of premiums paid to each of the several insurance companies placing said insurance, showing which of the said companies are Canadian, British and American, respectively.

WINNIPEG COAL PURCHASES

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a copy of all tenders, contracts and other documents pertaining to the coal purchased by the Dominion government during the year ending January 31, 1923, in the city of Winnipeg, used in connection with federal buildings, etc., including a list of the persons from whom said coal was purchased, the amount purchased in each case, and the amount paid to the Canadian Coal Sales Company, Limited, for coal supplied as above mentioned.

SUPPLIES FOR IMMIGRANTS

Mr. CHARTERS:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, papers, and other documents relating to the over-charging of immigrants for supplies at the port of Quebec.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS REGULATIONS

Mr. MACLAREN:

For return showing all regulations and conditions passed by the Governor in Council under section 11, chapter 13, of the statutes of 1919, being the Canadian National Railway Act.

BANFF SPRINGS AND CAVE

Mr. SHAW:

For a copy of all papers, memoranda, correspondence, reports and other documents of all kinds, relating to the discovery of the "Cave and Basin" and the "Hot Springs" at Banff, Alberta, and relating to the acquisition of said properties by the Dominion government and the payment therefor.

BANFF PARK—POWER RIGHTS

Mr. SHAW:

For a copy of all papers, letters, correspondence, memoranda, reports, and other documents, relating to an application made during 1922 by the Calgary Power Company for additional power rights and privileges in the Banff National park.

BELGIAN EXPOSITION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the government to a despatch in the issue of February 1st of Belgique Canada, to the effect that next summer a commercial exposition is to be held in Belgium in which practically every country has expressed its intention to participate, but that Canada has declined to be represented. As trade between the two countries is increasing, our participation in this exposition might be a good means of stimulating our commercial relations, and I should like to know if it is the intention of the government to have Canada represented at this exposition.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we realize the importance of an exhibition in Belgium, and I thank my hon. friend for bringing the matter to the attention of the government. We shall take his observations under consideration.

THE BANK ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the government if they are ready with their bill to amend the Bank Act; and, if not, when they expect to bring it down?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I am not able to fix a particular time, but the matter is engaging our earnest attention and the bill will be brought down at an early date.

ANTI-COMBINES BILL

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): May I put a similar question to the government in regard to the bill foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne to safeguard consumers and producers from trusts, monopolies and combines?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I promise my right hon. friend that the bill will probably be brought down next week.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have observed in the press lately accounts of delegations waiting on the government to induce Canada to join something that is described as a Pan-American Union. May I ask the government if they contemplate binding Canada to this or any similar union other than the union we are in?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): We have not received an invitation to join such a union. When it comes we will consider it. We will not refuse or accept the invitation before it is made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask what has been the character and purport of the representa-

tions made, and what is the attitude of the government towards them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not aware of any representations other than one or two personal interviews that have been had within the last day or two. There may be some communciations that I do not call to mind at the moment, but nothing of an authoritative or formal character has taken place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister will not say what is the purpose of the invitation or what the attitude of the government is?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I find difficulty to describe the purpose in the mind of any one else. A gentleman interviewed me yesterday in reference to a Pan-American Union. What his motive was I could not say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not ask for his motive, but for the purport of his request.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have just told my right hon. friend that no request has been made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the interview apparently was aimless?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not place any construction on the interview.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is another case of the press being wrong, I suppose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it is another case of my right hon. friend being wrong.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved the second reading of bill No. 6 to amend the Immigration Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I need not long detain the House in this matter; while it is an important one, it is not elaborate in its details. When it was read the first time I mentioned briefly the purport of it. The object of this bill is to confirm in this parliament a right that I think none will deny—its absolute right to control and regulate immigration into this country of whatever source or origin. It is not confined to some kind of immigration, it applies to all kinds. The bill provides that no immigrant shall enter Canada without permission of the Minister of Immigration. Who shall gainsay the reasonableness of that, or who shall claim that that is an unfair provision as regards immigrants or as affecting any other nation?

There is ample provision in the bill under the various sections further on to provide for the entrance of those who wish to come for short periods on account of business or health or pleasure. In fact there is more ample provision in this respect than is customary in such legislation. There is also provision made for the exemption from its operation of all British subjects—at least, all white British subjects.

Similar legislation was passed in New Zealand in September 1920 after a very full debate. The New Zealand parliament is much smaller than ours, but 30 per cent of the members took part in that debate, which would be equivalent to some seventy-five or eighty members discussing it in this House, and would mean a debate with us of some eight or ten days. So it shows the matter was very thoroughly debated in that parliament. And it is worthy of note that at the close the bill was passed without a division, although there were objections taken to it from both sides of the House.

I wish to quote from the speech of the hon. Premier of New Zealand when he was introducing the bill. It will give a good idea of the point of view from which he regarded the measure. He said, among other things:

> Now this bill is the result of a deep-seated sentiment on the part of a huge majority of the people of this country that this Dominion shall be what is often called a "white" New Zealand, and that the people who come here should, as far as it is possible for us to provide for it, be of the same way of thinking from the British Empire point of view—I might have said the Imperial point of view, but I say from the British Empire point of view—and that they shall be people who will be loyal to the empire, loyal to the crown, and loyal to this country when they become its citizens. There is no injustice intended to the people of any other country who come here; nothing of that sort. We intend to treat them fairly and well, whether they are here now or whether they come in the future. But the point I wish to make—and I want to emphasize it—is that we have a perfect right to safeguard our immigration policy and to be quite sure that the persons who will come and take up their residence here as permanent citizens shall be people of whom we shall be able to approve.

Further on he remarks:

> I have mentioned the question of alien immigrants, and honourable members know that at present what is provided to safeguard foreign immigration is the education test. Well, the education test—and members know it as well as I do—has been of very little value indeed, and we are dropping it. The provisions of this bill will take its place, and I feel certain if we can bring it into operation—and I have no doubt of that—that they will be found much more effective. We are doing away with the finger-print as being unnecessary. I know it is very much resented by people who are compelled to leave their finger-prints in this country, and under this bill it will no longer be necessary.

And again at a later stage, he said:

> Clearly we want to keep the race as pure in this Dominion as it is possible to keep it. I have not the slightest doubt but that that object will be effected by this bill.

The first objection made by the leader of the Opposition in the New Zealand House

consisted almost entirely of a protest that the bill had not been introduced sooner. That will give you an idea, Mr. Speaker, of how the opposition there regarded the proposed legislation. In the course of the debate another hon. member said:

> There is no question that in recent times we have had grave reason to fear that that policy is being menaced because of the large influx of Asiatics during the last twelve months. So far as the general policy of the bill is concerned, I think the House will agree with the Prime Minister that some effective steps must be taken to deal with the menace, which undoubtedly exists.

Further on he quoted Sir Edward Grey in connection with the Chinese in South Africa and added:

> The question is, what sort of civilization are you building up? Are you building up a civilization in which all the citizens are capable of the full rights of citizens, or a civilization the elements of which are bound to conflict in their customs, their habits and their policies? If you are doing so, you are building on an unstable foundation.

And so on from various other members of that parliament. Now, that was the general tone of the debate when the matter was introduced. The objections made were, in the main, three in number, with which I will deal briefly. The first was that the measure might prove to be ultra vires, or at least unfair to the Hindus, who were fellow British subjects and technically and biologically of the white race. The second was that the matter could more properly be dealt with by means of diplomacy, and the third was that it would be putting in the hands of the Minister of Immigration a dangerous power which might under certain conditions be used unfairly and unjustly.

With regard to the first objection that it might be ultra vires, the people of New Zealand did not appear to have much apprehension in that regard. As a matter of fact, the act was passed by the Dominion and approved by the Imperial government and no protest was made by any nation. It is not necessary, therefore, to waste time in a discussion of that point, because time has proved that it was intra vires.

So far as the objection regarding the Hindus is concerned, the Hindu question is a burning one in New Zealand. There are 60,000 Hindus in Fiji, which is a comparatively short distance from New Zealand; large numbers of them were at that time flocking to New Zealand, and the question was a very burning one in that country. It may be said that this is a question that does not primarily interest this parliament, because the immigration of Hindus into Canada is supposed to have been stopped. But I wish to warn the members, particularly those from British Columbia, that the conditions have recently changed. A number of years ago the government of the day passed an order in council which prohibited immigration of Hindus into Canada. This order in council provided that all immigration of persons who did not arrive in Canada by continuous journey from the country of origin should be stopped, and one of the main effects of that provision was to stop the very large immigration then coming to Canada from India, because we have no direct steamship service between India and Canada. The matter was the subject of much discussion at that time, some ten or fourteen years ago, as the British Columbia members well know; it had reached an acute stage when it was adequately dealt with by the order in council to which I have referred. But what do we find to-day? We find that recently there has been passed an order in council which to all intents and purposes does away with that earlier order in council. In other words, with some restrictions which can easily be evaded, the continuous journey has been done away with and people will be allowed to come by a non-continuous journey. I submit that, by the very simplest method of evasion, any number of Hindus—and, what is still more dangerous, their wives and minor children—can come into Canada. So it behoves us to study well this Hindu question in its full significance as regards this act.

We find, then, that New Zealand gave a good deal of attention to this phase of the subject, and we find that it was dealt with in this way: When the attention of the prime minister, Mr. Massey, was called to it, he said there was no danger of producing conflict or annoyance or friction; that on the occasion of the holding of the Imperial War conference in 1918 a conference at which India among other nations of the British Empire was fully represented, the following resolution was passed—I need quote only a few sentences which contain the gist of the thing:

4. p.m.

> It is agreed that it is an inherent function of the governments of the several communities of the British commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities.

It goes on to elaborate that further, but that is the gist of it. That principle was not only assented to by representatives of India at that conference, but the resolution was actually introduced by the Maharajah of Bikaneer—if you know the gentleman. He was India's representative at that time—and I may say that he is one of the ablest men

India has ever produced. He has since been made a peer of the realm on account of the services he has rendered to India. Any resolution, therefore, introduced by him must certainly have had the full consent of the country he represented. That, in large measure, disposes of the argument that the proposed change would lead to friction with the inhabitants of India. Further, Mr. Downie Stewart, dealing with the subject, made this remark:

> It is pretty clear from the past policy adopted by the British government towards the Dominion authorities that if it becomes a question between the Dominion and some foreign country, the British government would prefer to quarrel with them rather than with us.

This is expressed as regards a foreign nation as well as regarding India.

> The whole policy of the British government was well expressed as long ago as at the first colonial conference, in 1897, by Mr. Chamberlain. Nothing could be clearer than what he said: "We quite sympathize with the determination of the white inhabitants of these colonies, which are in comparatively close proximity to millions and hundreds of millions of Asiatics, that there shall not be an influx of people alien in civilization, alien in religion, alien in customs, whose influx, moreover, would most seriously interfere with the legitimate rights of the existing labour population. An immigration of that kind must, I quite understand, in the interest of the colonies, be prevented at all hazards, and we shall not offer any opposition to the proposals intended with that object."

Could the English language be much stronger in asserting that the Imperial government had no intention, has no intention and will have no intention of interfering with legislation of this character? Particularly do we realize that such is the case when we remember that this act has been in force two years and no objection has been registered against it, either by the Imperial authorities or by any foreign government who might think that they were affected under its provisions.

We come now to the second objection that was raised in the House of representatives in New Zealand, and that was that this object could be better obtained by means of diplomacy. Now, I shall not quote the remarks of the one member who took that line; to tell the truth, they are not worth quoting. He began by showing that he had not read the bill in question by taking objection to the non-presence in it of certain features which the premier subsequently showed him were there. He went on the familiar lines that we have all heard so often: he said that the legislation was crude; that it was not polished, that it was not finished; that the better course would be to proceed by way of diplomacy. He also stated that he had interviewed the Chinese consul, who had declared—and he believed it absolutely—that China did not want its nationals to go into New Zealand. Have we not heard that before? The Chinese consul also said, according to this gentleman, that the Chinese were a proud nation and did not want to be aimed at in any indirect way—the same old familiar thing that we have heard in British Columbia for the last twenty years, from a different source. He advocated the policy of turning the cheek to the smiter; of giving to him who has stolen your coat your cloak also—a doctrine which was never popular even in the days when it was uttered.

I wish just to mention how the hon. Mr. Ngata dealt with the situation from that point of view. He said:

> As to the method, the hon. member for Clutha suggested diplomacy as the remedy. Well, it is a very nice suggestion, but in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the British dominions to put their cards on the table with regard to this matter, because they have been far too nice, far too diplomatic, in the past.
>
> Mr. MALCOLM: But diplomacy does put its cards on the table.
>
> The Hon. Mr. NGATA: We have before us a very fine example now in the result of diplomacy as between Japan and America. Look at the position America has got into in regard to colonization of the Pacific slope by the Japanese. It may end in war at any time. I think it would be the height of diplomacy if the British dominions were to make it known through the Imperial government to the Republic of China that the view of the people of this country is that they do not desire any Chinese to come into it.
>
> Why not make this sentiment known in a statute? That would surely express the view of the representative people of New Zealand and it would be the authoritative voice of the people of this country. Now, what did the hon. gentleman mean by diplomacy? Our representations would have to be made through the Imperial government—that is, through the Secretary of State for the Colonies. If we adopted that roundabout method we would probably get some kind of reply in four or five years. We would have to make representations at the Imperial Conferences, and so on. It is surely far better for the people of New Zealand to say straight out what they want by statute.

I think that deals practically with all that need be said in that regard.

We now come to the third objection that was raised by the labour members in the House, and I may say that the labour party in New Zealand is a particularly strong and virile one and if they saw any opportunity of finding objections to this or any other legislation they will be far from backward in making it known, so that any approval of any act they passed would be sure to have the approval of labour generally. They raised the point that perhaps the Minister of Immigration might use this legislation not for the purpose for which it is intended—to restrict immigration—but, by a false and malicious use of these powers, to flood the country with cheap coloured labour. They also raised the point, although they were not strong on it, that it was not fair to have British subjects

handicapped. I would like to quote what the leader of the Labour party said in that regard. He said:

When it comes to the matter of considering the possible influx into a country like this of a people whose standards of living are necessarily lower than the standards of living of the people here, and when the people who are coming in do not always know the conditions to which they are coming, then it becomes necessary not only that the legislation of New Zealand shall be framed so as to protect the standards of life of the people of New Zealand, and especially the working people, but that it shall be framed also so as to protect the coloured immigrants who might be brought here. . . . Hence any vote that I give in this House—or that the Labour party gives—will be cast for the purpose of preserving our own standards and for the purpose of protecting the coloured workers who may be allowed or induced to come here from other countries.

With regard to the point raised that the law might be abused, that the minister might let in cheaper labour, I have just this to quote. The Prime Minister of New Zealand in replying alluded to it and said:

I understand the hon. member for Buller—

That was the leader of the Labour party—

—to say that if the government wished to introduce cheap coloured labour we could do it by this bill. One of the reasons which actuated the government in bringing down this bill was so that they might protect labour from competition with men whose standard of living is very much lower than that of the average British worker. We are not likely to do anything of the sort.

Mr. Holland:—

That was the Labour leader—

—I was wrong there.

—Rt. Hon. Mr. Massey: Then I do not need to go further with that point. When a man admits he was wrong there is nothing further to be said.

That disposes of that feature, but I must say that the bill was read without division a second time. After its second reading, when it came before the Committee of the Whole, the labour people moved an amendment which I shall briefly read because I wish to carry with me the sympathy of the labour element in this House—not only those who form the Labour party, but other members having sympathy with the labour movement. The labour people moved this amendment which I think, had it passed, would have amply protected them from any danger, as they suggested, of abuse of the power granted to the minister. I do not think it is necessary but still it would be a very ample protection. Mr. Holland in the Committee of the Whole moved:

But in no case shall any such exemptions be made for the purpose—

That was the power of the minister to grant exemptions from this act—

—but in no case shall any such exemptions be made for the purpose of an influx of cheap coloured labour, or to bring outside labour from any country whatever into New Zealand during periods of industrial conflict.

Now, as I said, the bill was read without division which shows it had the sympathy of the whole House.

I do not think there is a great deal more to be said. The House will recall the debate which took place here last year on another phase, or one phase—for I am dealing with the whole question of immigration—of our immigration, and that was oriental immigration. We will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the House was unanimous that restrictions would have to be put on. Some hon. members thought that the words "total exclusion" should be used but the majority of the House favoured the use of the words "effective restriction" which they assured us meant practically the same. But unless I have interpreted very poorly indeed the temper of the House at that time, that resolution expressed the desire of the House that we should crystallize into legislation any and all gentlemen's agreements.

To-day the country to the south of us is moving in the same direction as New Zealand, and I have in my hand a bill introduced on February 9, into the House of Representatives at Washington in which I find a provision which excludes from the United States—excludes absolutely without any compromising gestures—and prohibits the landing of any immigrant not eligible for citizenship. Now that in the United States means all those of the yellow races. Unfortunately here it would not have that effect because men of the yellow races are eligible in Canada for citizenship, and a very great and grave error it is. In the United States it is not so, but I merely mention this to show that the government there is going ahead of us in this regard. I see, also, that they are issuing certificates of arrival, which means that every immigrant will practically have to be registered. It is the same thing that we advocated here last year, that all aliens should be registered. The certificate of arrival will form such a system of registration in the States. I only wish to point that out to show that the States are fully alive to the importance of this matter and are really ahead of us in this line of legislation.

We had a pledge from the government last year that something in the way of restriction would be introduced, and it was to be made a matter of possible diplomatic arrangement. The Speech from the Throne has come and gone and there has been no suggestion of anything of the kind. However we know this—

that diplomatic negotiations take a long time and the fullest measure of consideration must be given to that fact. At the same time I do not know any method more calculated to prevent action being taken, or more calculated to stultify progress than to refer anything, no matter what it is, to diplomatic negotiations. It is practically consigning it to the limbo of the unknown. It may take five years, it may take ten years; we may get a decision in five years, we may get justice in ten. But in the meantime—let us pass this bill. The measure is general in character; it does not apply itself to oriental immigration specifically, but by general provisions which will affect each and every national of the world. I have not mentioned the word "Japanese"; that word does not appear in the bill. The whole tenor of the measure is one of general application, it is applicable to every nation under the sun, including our own white race in India.

I particularly want to emphasize that—to emphasize the fact that there is no possible chance of protest or friction or of diplomatic or any other kind of trouble. It was passed in New Zealand, approved of by the Imperial government, and no protest has been heard from any nation whatever regarding its conditions.

You remember during the war how we all read with interest Bairnsfather's sketches of soldiers at the front, and how one soldier said to his comrade "Bill, if you know a better hole, then lead me to it." If we know a better system of achieving this result by all means lead us to it; but if we do not, are we not logically driven to accepting this measure? If we have in the far distant future the hope of diplomatic negotiations which will achieve the same end by all means go on negotiating, but in the meantime—let us pass this bill.

I would like to make one more quotation from the proceedings of the New Zealand legislature. Two years after the act was passed a member asked the Minister of Internal Affairs how the act had worked and this is his reply:

> My own opinion is that the act would be copied all over the British Empire because it was the most ingenious method of regulating immigration yet devised.

The return laid on the Table showed that the working of the act was very satisfactory. After eighteen months of operation that was the considered opinion of the minister in charge of its working. It evidently worked well there and will work well here. But by all means, let the diplomatic duel go on in the meantime. It may not do any good, but in the meantime, let us assist the government by the passage of this bill. I am reminded here of a legend in connection with a Scotch nobleman. It is more than a legend because there is documentary evidence of it. It happened long ago. It was when the Scotch nobility were fighting in France, but not during the late war. I would like to remind my hon. friends from Quebec that long before there was any talk of friendship between the English and French, the Scotch and the French had the strongest rapprochement. Six or seven hundred years ago there was intense friendship between the Scotch and French and great intercourse. When the Scotch were fighting for freedom against the tyranny of the English kings, when the English kings were holding lands in France, and styling themselves as kings of England and France, the Scotch and French were in great sympathy. The Scotch cadets used to go to France for their culture and their education and marriages between the Scotch nobility and the French aristocracy were quite common. Finally Scotland achieved her liberty from the English domination by the simple and characteristically Scotch method of going on fighting long after everybody had admitted that she was beaten. When they were relieved of that form of activity, the young Scotch cadets, who had been trained to do nothing but fight, passed in many instances to France and joined up with the French army. A large contingent of Scotch continued to fight under the banner of the French, and often could be seen the Scottish banner of the Lion waving on the same battlefield as the golden Lilies of France. I explained that because this Scotch nobleman was the leader of the Scotch brigade at one time, and they had been engaged in fighting. There was some sort of war always going on on the Continent, and on this occasion, the French and Scotch suffered a severe defeat, and it was afterwards discovered that it was due to the treachery of a Count Somebody, whose name I have forgotten. He was a count, a man of influence and standing in the country in which the war was going on, supposedly neutral, and the French and Scotch leaders held a conference that night to discuss the situation and decide what should be done. The Scotch leader was there, but it was noticed that he sat apart from the rest. He wrapped his military cloak about him and seemed to be keeping aloof. It was known that he had lost his brother in the battle of the day and it was thought he was nursing his wrath or his grief, and the other members left him alone. This diplomatic conference went on all night discussing what should be done with this count. Some said, "Burn him in his castle and all that it contains." Others

said, "Court-martial him," and the diplomatic men said, "It is going to cause trouble and incite the ill-will of this nation in whose domains we are. Perhaps it would be better diplomatically to ignore the situation and merely ignore the man as a traitor, and go on the best way we can." The diplomatic battle waged backwards and forwards. They could not come to any agreement. The night was far gone and it was necessary at last to consult the Scotch leader, whose words were as wise in counsel as his arm was strong in battle. They roused him up and asked his opinion, and he came to the head of the table and made his statement. I will have to translate it into English for the benefit of those benighted Sassenachs who never learned the beautiful Scotch language, the language as used in the Garden of Eden. His words were to this effect: "Gentlemen, I have heard your arguments pro and con. Before I came to this conference I was somewhat suspicious, a little dubious in fact, as to the result of the diplomatic conference, and just in case of a miscarriage of that diplomatic justice which you are seeking and to make the thing certain,"—and he unfolded his cloak—"I have brought the head of the Count with me." He disclosed the bloody head of the count whose fate they had been discussing all night. That is the difference between action and diplomacy. A man of action can always put it over the man of diplomacy. Let us proceed along these lines.

I would not be quite as exacting as my Scotch forebear. Let us continue with the diplomatic discussion, with all its legal quibbles and diplomatic sophistries, but—let us pass the bill. I can imagine the leader of the government would go with more confidence into a diplomatic conference if he knew he had this bill passed beforehand. I suppose it does not make much difference whether you are sitting into a diplomatic game of poker with another nation, or playing with Mr. Jiggs in Dinty Moore's back parlour, if you have the knowledge that you have a fifth ace up your sleeve, it is calculated to give you a better feeling. Let us cut the Gordian knot of the diplomatic difficulty by passing this bill, but if need be, if it will please the nations of the earth, go on with these diplomatic negotiations, you will get a decision some day, but in the meantime—this bill will serve the purpose. We have nothing to lose by it, we have everything to gain, and the risk is practically nil. I would submit to the consideration of the House that nothing can be lost by the passage of this bill to-day.

[Mr. Neill.]

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I did not know the hon. gentleman was going to ask for the second reading of this bill to-day. There are two things in connection with this bill that I would like to draw to the attention of the House. As far as the bill itself is concerned, I have no particular objection to it. The bill briefly provides that the Minister of Immigration shall absolutely control every person entering Canada and every person must have a permit, unless he be a British subject. I would not take exception to the bill, except that it cancels the present Immigration Act. There are a great many duties which the Immigration department performs for the government, and there are a great many provisions in the present Immigration Act that it is absolutely necessary should be embodied in the bill. Whether or not you should put it absolutely within the power of the minister to say, outside of British subjects who shall and who shall not enter Canada, I am not prepared to say to-day.

I propose to bring down next week a bill that will deal with Chinese immigration, and I propose to embody in that bill a provision for registration. There is no registration here. I propose to embody in the bill a provision for taking the finger prints of those who are leaving the country who desire to return again, because the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) will, I think, agree with me that that is one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with, in connection with the oriental people particularly. I am not just sure, after having read the bill carefully, whether registration is provided for or not. But those are some of the objections to be taken to the bill. I have no objection to my hon. friend having a discussion of this subject when the government bill is introduced, and when our amendment to the present Immigration Act is brought down and we can then get the consensus of opinion of the House as to what we should have to enable us to carry out the Immigration Act successfully.

I may say that there is rightly or wrongly, prevalent in the Scandinavian countries from which we desire to get immigration, and on the Continent, a feeling based on our present Immigration Act, that we do not want people to come to Canada, owing to the restrictions that we have placed on them at the present time. I do not think that feeling should exist. I think people whom we are desirous of having come to Canada, whom we are going to spend money on to encourage them to come to Canada—and I speak of the desirable class—should have it in mind

that they will be welcomed to Canada, rather than that provisions are to be set up to prevent their entering this country freely. On the other hand, we need provisions to guard against settlers coming to Canada whom we do not want to assimilate into our national life.

Let me deal, for a moment, with the very question the status of which my hon. friend is desirous of improving, that of Asiatic immigration. It puts the Minister of Immigration in rather a difficult position if, as my hon. friend hopes, and I assume he hopes, the minister must refuse absolutely to allow an Asiatic to come into this country. I do not entirely agree with him,—indeed, I think, perhaps, that is a mild way of putting the matter—that we would not get into difficulties. Anyone who has been reading the press of recent date, will realize that we have some difficulty at the moment with India with respect to this matter, and it is a very trivial matter over which we are having the difficulty, namely, that of the right of Indians to be enfranchised throughout the whole of Canada. We are trying to handle that in a way to avoid friction, and my hon. friends will agree that there appears to be enough friction in the Near East without our adding to it at the moment. I am not any fonder of creating diplomatic difficulties than is my hon. friend; but we cannot at all times ignore them, and at the same time, I am trying, to keep in mind the peculiar situation that exists on the western coast of Canada. I hope the bill, at least as regards Chinese immigration, will meet the approval of my hon. friend, and we are putting some very drastic regulations in that bill. But to say that the whole responsibility devolves upon the minister; that he must assume responsibility absolutely, whether or not he shall allow an oriental or an Asiatic to enter Canada and, if he does, that he is to bear that responsibility without being backed with some legislation—that is a fairly heavy burden for a minister of any government to assume. At the same time, I think there are many admirable suggestions in my hon. friend's bill, and I am quite prepared to discuss it on its merits with my hon. friend; but I would ask, until such time as I bring down the amendments to the Immigration Act and the Chinese Immigration Act, that action on this particular bill be delayed.

Mr. NEILL: Which section of this bill does the minister find cancels the Immigration Act?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The last section.

Mr. NEILL: That does not cancel the Immigration Act.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As I understand it, it does.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have listened, with a good deal of interest, to the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) and I notice he does not care to assume responsibility in reference to immigration to this country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Might I be permitted to make just one more observation, that as regards this bill and the present act, with the single exception of the provision for countries with which we have treaties, the minister has power, under the existing act, to prohibit anybody from coming to Canada.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It seems to me that that ground is rather an unusual one for a minister of the Crown to take, particularly as regards matters coming under his jurisdiction. Apparently, in New Zealand, a minister is quite prepared to assume that responsibility. The people in British Columbia feel that this government has not assumed enough responsibility in reference to this subject. Since this matter was discussed in this House on a resolution which I had the honour to submit, pressure for the exclusion of oriental immigration has been unabated on the part of the public of British Columbia, and we have heard expressions from sources which previously had been silent as to exclusion.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when my resolution was before the House, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stated that the government of British Columbia had not asked for exclusion, but instead, had expressed satisfaction with effective restriction. Since that discussion took place in this House, there has been a session of the provincial legislature of British Columbia, and I may tell hon. gentlemen that the result of that discussion was that a resolution was passed unanimously in the British Columbia legislature calling for, not effective restriction, but absolute exclusion. I have no doubt that resolution has been forwarded to the Prime Minister of this government. The people of British Columbia want exclusion; they have reason to ask for exclusion, because conditions are becoming worse and worse all the time, and they are demanding that this government assume some responsibility.

I have been asked by different organizations, more particularly by some of the

women's institutes, to ascertain from the Minister of Immigration what his policy is going to be and what this effective restriction means, and I have forwarded to the Minister of Immigration some of those communications. A good deal of delay in his replying occurred that, I suppose, being due to the fact that he was necessarily absent from Ottawa a good deal, making his tours over Canada, for which tours I must commend him. When I received his reply, it was to the effect that the government was going to do something this session. He did not say what that would be; but he pointed out conditions as they prevailed at the present time, namely, conditions due to orders in council and legislation which had been passed by the previous government, and let the matter go at that.

What we are demanding is that the government assume some responsibility. In the city of Vancouver at the present time, there are some 2,000 oriental merchants; that is to say, oriental trades licenses have been issued and are outstanding at the present time to the number of over 2,000, an increase of 500 per cent in the last four years. That is a pretty serious situation.

I said that some new sources had been heard from, and I would say that the church has come into the discussion. The Lord Bishop of New Westminster, in a public statement which he made not long ago and which is recorded in the press, came out strongly in favour of a policy of exclusion. I have here a copy of the Vancouver Province of February 9, 1923. I read the following headlines:

Would keep the province white, Christian and British

Menace of Oriental immigration voiced by Bishop de Pencier

Tells Anglican Synod difficult to keep some parishes going

This article says in part:

Warning against admitting further oriental immigration and the declaration that in some sections of British Columbia control of districts has passed into the hands of Japanese and Chinese, were features of the address of Rt. Rev. A. U. de Pencier, bishop of the diocese, in addressing the thirty-eighth annual session of the synod of New Westminster, Thursday.

"The estimated number of Chinese in British Columbia is about 30,000, as against 16,867 Japanese," said his lordship. "There are comparatively few Chinese women in Canada, while on the other hand 5,654 of the Japanese are females. Seven hundred and forty Japanese children were born in Canada last year. The Japanese own 5,637 acres of land in British Columbia, and 3,614 acres of leased land is in their possession. While the fishing industry is practically controlled by the Japanese, the market gardening is almost wholly in the hands of the Chinese. Chinese merchants are admitted without a head tax into Canada, and in 1921, 1,145 came in under that classification.

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Situation at Ashcroft

"The way in which this problem affects us, from a church point of view, is serious. The town of Ashcroft, for example, is now more than half Chinese. The principal hotel is owned by a Chinaman, who, when I was there during my visit last year to the diocese of Cariboo, employed a returned soldier and his wife to do his work. The English-speaking population is so weak in number that it is difficult to keep some of these parishes in existence. The old-settled district of Maple Ridge, for example, has 5,000 Orientals resident in the municipality, and 4,000 acres of the best arable land is cultivated by them.

"Let us earnestly consider this question without the raising of racial feeling and endeavour to accomplish two things:

"1. To see that we do not admit into our homes or our homeland undesirable aliens.

"2. Secondly, which is perhaps a more difficult problem, to see to it that this feeling, which would properly cherish and conserve our own right and citizenship, does not hinder us from putting forth all that energy and zeal, which we ought to exercise, so that we may Christianize those who are strangers within our gates, and who, returning, as they do, to their own land, will carry the Gospel message to their fellow countrymen.

"This is one of the greatest problems with which we have to deal in this province and diocese. Let me once again reiterate what I have frequently expressed in public, that in my opinion it is not essential that we should have our vacant spaces and our material resources settled and developed in ten or twenty, or even fifty years.

"We do desire growth, and we welcome an increased population of the right kind, but it is essential that when these vacant spaces are settled and our natural resources developed, that we should have a province that will be white; that will be British, and that will be Christian.

It seems to me that this government should take some responsibility in this matter. I do not think they go far enough by merely making a treaty with the Chinese, particularly if that treaty is not to go any further than was suggested by a representative of the Chinese government in Vancouver the other day. I have here the report of a statement made in Vancouver recently by Dr. Chilien Tsur, Chinese Consul General at Ottawa, who arrived in Vancouver—this is dated January 31st, 1923—from Peking where he had been conferring with his government.

"The immigration treaty," explained Dr. Tsur, "will provide that China shall not allow labourers to come to Canada. The dominion, on the other hand, will remove the head tax of $500, which Chinese people consider to be a disgrace. Canada wishes to limit the importation of labour from China and both countries seek the protection of their subjects in the territories of the other. These things will be provided for in the new treaty which will shortly be entered upon.

What will be the result of that treaty in regard to Chinese immigration? And what shall we get out of it? As I understand, it is provided at the present time by order in council that Chinese labourers shall not be admitted to this country. So that this will not do us any good. Chinese labourers, like

others, are kept out by order in council, and all that we shall accomplish, so far as I can see, will be to lose the $500 head tax. The minister may think that we shall derive some benefit from the treaty, but I cannot see it that way. As regards the Japanese, I understand that the government is not going to bring down any legislation at all, so that we can expect the Japanese to keep on coming in the same old way. In default of the government bringing down some effective legislation I submit that it is quite proper for this House to support the bill which has been brought down by my old friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). With him, and with other members from British Columbia, I feel that exclusion is the real solution for this difficult problem. Nothing short of that will do. But if, carrying out the promise made to us by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) last year, the government will give us exclusion under some other name, then of course, as to this phase of the oriental question, we shall be perfectly satisfied. We are not bound by any name; all we want is to have the orientals kept out of this country. I am in favour of the bill and I am prepared to support it provided it is passed on some understanding, such as apparently existed in the case of New Zealand, that if it becomes law it will be so administered as effectually to keep out of the country all oriental immigration.

Now, personally, I do not see why we should not try to achieve our purpose in a straightforward manner, why we should not have exclusion and call it by that name. But if that is objectionable, and if the arguments which the Prime Minister presented last year are sound, all right, we are prepared to accept a bill like this, provided the government can satisfy us that the effect of placing this bill on the statute books will be the total exclusion of oriental immigrants, just as in New Zealand, for that is the way similar legislation has worked out there. Their law means exclusion, but they call it something else. If we can attain the same end by the proper administration of the provisions of this bill when enacted into law, we will be satisfied.

I do not see why the Minister of Immigration should look upon this as a very difficult matter, because he has behind him a resolution of this House stating in so many words that oriental immigration and the rapid multiplication of orientals in this country constitute a menace to the future of Canada. That simply means that orientals are not desirable people to be admitted. Furthermore, he is recommended by that resolution to see that effective measures of restriction are enforced to keep these people out. I have every respect for the minister, but I do not think he is alive to the seriousness of this question and to the necessity for taking immediate action, and, above all things, for his assuming responsibility.

We are asking in British Columbia that this government do things. I have letters in my file here from many prominent citizens of British Columbia, men of standing in the community, who say that if effective measures are not put into force to keep these orientals out, in other words, if we do not get the help of the law, then the people are going to take matters into their own hands. Well, we had trouble of that kind some years ago. The Prime Minister knows what happened in the city of Vancouver, because he had to go out there afterwards and settle claims for damages. He is very well acquainted with all the circumstances, which were shortly these: That the people then decided to take matters into their own hands in order to bring the government to a proper realization of the gravity of the situation.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the hon. member a question? Do I understand that there are threats of Bolshevism from the Tory ranks, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I did not say anything about Bolshevism nor about the Tory ranks. This is not a political question in British Columbia. Shortly before I left for Ottawa I had the privilege of attending a meeting called by the Retail Merchants' Association of New Westminster, which was addressed by no less a person than the Attorney General of British Columbia. He does not pretend to be a Tory, and in fact I think he is not supposed to be one. The Hon. Mr. Manson is held out in the Liberal press of the province as the champion of oriental exclusion. He did not mince matters at all in his address. He said: Something has to be done. We have to make those people down in Ottawa realize where they are at. The Liberal party in British Columbia is urging the Liberal party here in Ottawa to do something, to take immediate action. I am not saying anything about Grits or Tories nor about Bolshevism. I am simply quoting the purport of letters I have in my file from leading citizens of British Columbia.

The same spirit which manifested itself in 1907 is commencing to reappear now, and it is essential for the government to assume responsibility, and assume it quickly. We cannot be responsible for the consequences if they continue their policy of masterful inac-

tivity. I do not intend to engage in an extensive argument on this question, but I want to go on record as being in favour of the immediate passage of this bill, provided we have an undertaking from the government for the effective administration of its provisions so as to absolutely exclude any further oriental immigration.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, we have in this question a very clear-cut issue: Are we to have total exclusion or partial exclusion? The people of British Columbia, irrespective of party affiliations, are insisting upon total exclusion. Last session when the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) introduced a resolution on this question the government in their amendment made a most important change in its wording, substituting for "total exclusion" the phrase "effective restriction." The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) informed the House at that time that this was the diplomatic way of saying total exclusion. But the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) did not regard the change in that light and, strong Liberal supporter as he is, he doubted the assurances of the leader of the government and voted against the amendment. Hon. members will therefore understand why those of us on this side of the House should be perhaps a little skeptical about further assurances on the part of the government and should be doubtful if the government are now going to be any more solicitous to accomplish the purpose sought to be attained last session. Not only did the hon. member for Skeena vote against the government on that occasion, but we find the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Munro) was absent altogether, and consequently we were left in ignorance as to his stand on the question. I had expected to see the hon. member in his seat this afternoon, to seize the opportunity to explain his position last year, or state his determination to stand by the unanimous appeal of the people of British Columbia to have total exclusion of Asiatic immigration.

It is not my intention to prolong the discussion on this question. The merits of the matter were fully gone into last year; the injury to the country, economically and socially, was established beyond question, not only by hon. members of the House but by the statements of leading citizens of British Columbia. We know that there is no possibility of assimilating these people into our population; their standards of living are vastly lower than ours. We know that they have entered into and have become masters of many of the most important industries of the country. Retail and wholesale businesses in the large centres are being gradually controlled by orientals, simply because of the fact that they are able to exist upon a very small margin between what it costs to carry on their business and what they expend. White persons who wish to engage in the same business cannot, upon the standard of living, of education and so on that they naturally desire to maintain, compete with the orientals. The question is purely an economic one; it is not a question in which the pride or the dignity of a great nation is involved. It is not a question in connection with which Japan or China may say that an offence has been committed against their national sense of dignity—it is, I say, purely and solely an economic question. In dealing with our oriental diplomats the government will find it necessary to take a firm, perhaps a somewhat stubborn, hold on the question. But I am assured, in discussing the matter with men who are prominent in diplomatic circles, that if a strong and determined stand is taken by the government and they base their action on the economic aspect of the question, there will be no difficulty in arranging matters so that we shall in fact bring about total exclusion.

People in other portions of the Dominion may look on this matter from a different point of view, but I believe their attitude would be more in the nature of apathy or indifference, than an attitude of opposition to the claims of the people of British Columbia. You have heard the views expressed of practically every public organization of importance in the far western country. You have heard the views of men in public life, members of both the provincial and the Dominion legislatures. You are familiar with the views expressed in the British Columbia legislature. You have heard the representations of boards of trade, of retail merchants' associations, of practically every person in British Columbia who is actively connected with its economic or its social life. You have heard the appeal from all these sources, an appeal addressed to the only authority which has the power to regulate and control the matter in this country, for the taking of aggressive and decisive and definite steps to bring about total exclusion.

We are aware of the fact that the development of the West, in our grain export, in our timber business, perhaps in connection with our mines, and so on, will depend in some degree on the development and extension of our trade with China and Japan.

But I again assure the House that a line of demarcation can be drawn between, on the one hand, the broad aspects of commerce, the export business, our trade with the Orient, and, on the other hand, the question of allowing Mongolians, a lower class of labour, into British Columbia. I submit that the government may foster the best interests of the Dominion, may encourage trade and add to the prosperity of this country, and do so consistently with the policy of keeping out a class of people who are undermining the work of the people in certain sections of our country, especially in British Columbia, who are unable to compete with those who have come to the province with the influx of immigration as I have seen it in the last two years. I do hope, therefore—and I say this in no partisan spirit—that the government will look at this matter in a broad way and that the bill which they propose to bring down will embody those features which are necessary to bring about not effective restriction, but total exclusion; because just as sure as you provide one regulation calculated to bring about effective restriction, the wily oriental will devise two other methods of evading it, and we shall have them coming in just as fast as they ever did.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member representing Vancouver (Mr. Ladner) has made special reference to the economic side of this question. Now, I do not rise to advocate the unrestricted admission of orientals to this country. But I do wish to point out to hon. members that in considering this question we should keep in mind the last observations of my hon. friend, in which he made reference to the trade aspect of it. No later than last week in this House we had before us demands, particularly from our friends in British Columbia, for increased facilities for storage of grain and for development in the harbour at Vancouver. The immense development and the possibilities of greater development of trade between Canada, China and Japan, were emphasized. Recently it was brought to my attention that the government of India has had under consideration a revision of the trade policy of that country. At the last session of their parliament a committee was appointed to consider the matter of preferential trade within the Empire, and there were presented to parliament two reports, a majority report and a minority report. I wish to read just an extract from the minority report so that hon. members may draw their own conclusions as to how the solution of this problem affects Canada and how the government should be guided in considering the matter—because whether we wish it or not, these problems are interlocked with the trade possibilities of the country. Both reports agreed upon a policy of preferential trade with the Mother Country, and it was pointed out that that preferential trade might be extended to the other British dominions. But the minority report put in this saving clause:

> That the condition precedent to any agreement with the British dominions in trade matters on the basis of reciprocity should be the recognition of the right of the Indian people to a status of complete equality and the repeal of all anti-Asiatic laws so far as they apply to the people of India.

Now, Sir, if there is one province in Canada more than another that has much to gain in trade matters by friendly relations with Asia it is British Columbia and the provinces adjacent thereto.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask a question? Does the minister suggest that exclusion would necessarily involve us in hostile relations with the Orient?

Mr. ROBB: Well, I said at first that I was not discussing the question of exclusion or restriction. I was pointing out to the House the importance of giving very careful consideration to these questions. Let it not be forgotten that acts passed by the parliament of Canada, or debates that take place here, will be brought to the attention of the parliaments in the countries where we desire to do business. It is frequently pointed out to the government of Canada—it was pointed out to the preceding administration and it has been pointed out to the present government—that we should devote more attention to developing trade in Asia. There we find customers that are worth considering, customers to the number of 700 millions. Taking that trade in the aggregate it is considerable; our trade with India, with China and Japan is growing and growing steadily.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the minister not realize the fact that the oriental is a good business man and that he will buy our goods only if he gets them at the right price, not otherwise. It is not a matter of sentiment with him at all but a matter of business.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, the oriental is a good business man. The oriental desires to do business with Canada but he desires, as do other customers, to do business on a fair basis and to be treated fairly. All that he asks is to be treated fairly, and I think I can convince the hon. gentleman that his custom is worth considering.

Now dealing more particularly with India. Prior to the war India imported, roughly speaking, $600,000,000 worth of goods. Of that amount the Mother Country supplied 64 per cent. Canada furnished goods amounting in value to the magnificent sum of $30,000. That was the extent of our exports into India prior to the war. In 1922 India imported over $800,000,000 of goods, and the Mother Country contributed 57 per cent of that business. Whereas Canada prior to the war only exported to India goods to the amount of $30,000, it is interesting to note that last year we exported goods to the amount of $1,125,000, showing that our business has grown very considerably in the six years. Furthermore, it is estimated by our resident trade commissioner in India, with headquarters at Calcutta, that the statistics for the present year ending March 31, will show a business of between three and five million dollars worth of Canadian goods sold in India. The records may not show that, because a lot of exports going to India from Canada pass through United States ports and are credited sometimes in the statistics in India as imports from the United States. There is no reason why Canada, and particularly British Columbia, should not do an immense business in India as that country develops. There is no reason why we should not do a very large business, especially in railway ties, in lumber, and in fish. If they buy these products largely there is no reason why Canada should not get the business and we are gradually getting it. Last year we shipped 1,520 automobiles from Canada to India. Now, the men who are building automobiles in Canada are employing Canadian workmen and buying the products of Canadian farms, India is a good market for us. Is it not better that the men manufacturing these products for India, or for other markets, should be residents of Canada and that their exports should not have to face hostile tariffs? Is that not better than that they should be residents of other countries where hostile tariffs are in force against Canadian products? And so I submit to the House, that in considering this matter we should always keep in mind the fact that whatever we say here will be read in the parliaments of India, China and Japan, and will ultimately affect our trade with these countries. I think everybody in this House would be very glad indeed if India were to follow the policy initiated by Canada twenty-five years ago in the shape of the British preference. Would it not be a good thing for Canada if we could experience the benefit of a preferential tariff in India? Would it not be a good thing for this country if we had a tariff preference of 20 per cent in our favour over our United States competitors? Would that not also be a good thing for our fellow citizens of British Columbia?

I offer these few observations, Mr. Speaker, without in any way expressing an opinion upon the question of oriental immigration, which is certainly of import to British Columbia. I rise at this time more particularly to point out that the grievance referred to in the resolution presented to the Indian parliament, as I understood and gathered from conversation with a member of that legislature, was not so much our restricting their emigration as the fact that their nationals, British subjects, now resident in Canada—there are about 1,000 of them in British Columbia and 200 in the other provinces—do not enjoy the vote in this country. I think they feel that worse than the exclusion or restriction of their nationals. So I submit to my hon. friends that in considering this question they should weigh carefully the consequences to this country—

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would ask the minister whether or not he has seen a newspaper despatch reporting the statement by the Right Hon. S. Sastri, upon his return to Bombay, India, that he found that his ideas in regard to the enfranchisement of East Indians before he made his tour of Canada had not been correct. He states that there was no prejudice against East Indians at all, that it was an economic matter; and more than that, there was a desire on the part of the people of Canada not to discriminate against the Japanese and Chinese in favour of the East Indians.

Mr. ROBB: I had the pleasure, in Bombay, of lunching with a member of parliament who is a friend of Mr. Sastri, and I gathered from him that Mr. Sastri, on his part, was going to do everything possible to bring about friendly relations between India and Canada, and he expected us to do a little here to help him along.

Mr. JOHN A. MacKELVIE (Yale): I would rather imagine the later remarks of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) have the effect of interjecting into this discussion a subject which is not exactly germane to the resolution now before the House. The latter question can, and no doubt will, be considered at another time. I may say, however, that having lived for over thirty years in British Columbia, and having seen this problem, this menace, of oriental intrusion

grow from small beginnings until it has now assumed proportions that cause it to overshadow practically every other problem we have to face in that province, I have always, in the innumerable discussions in which I have taken part during that time regarding this subject, endeavoured to approach it with a mind charged with more than local issues, endeavoured to view it with a full sense of the responsibility entailed by those who advocate complete exclusion having regard to international and imperial associations. That aspect, dealing with the constitutional phase of the question, was very ably and fully discussed last year in this House by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). His arguments left nothing to be said on the subject, and I do not propose to rehash them now.

In reply to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if he apprehends that any difficulty regarding trade relations may arise from the enforcement of resolutions such as this, I wish to warn him that a much more serious difficulty, a much more inflamed state of feeling in the Orient, may very reasonably be expected to arise if this almost intolerable condition under which we are now suffering in British Columbia is allowed to continue, and that serious results are inevitably bound to follow. There will be disturbances which will have the effect of creating far more inflamed feeling in the Orient towards this country than anything that could possibly result on account of restrictive measures which we may adopt.

I gave my opinion to the House regarding this matter last year, and I suppose that those of us from my province will be compelled again to debate this question when the policy of the minister is brought up. I may say I will support this motion, not because I believe it is absolutely the best way of approaching the subject, but because I am always in favour of moving in any direction which will give us relief in British Columbia —and indeed, in other parts of Canada, for the menace is rapidly spreading—from this condition of affairs which strikes so vitally at the very fundamentals of our prosperity in that section of the country.

As far as the constitutional phase of the question is concerned, I am prepared to reiterate what I said last year. If there be treaties standing in the way, denounce them. If there be anything that can be done by this parliament to absolutely put up the bars against oriental immigration of all kinds, let it be done immediately. Before I came to Ottawa I attended a meeting of the provincial association of the British Columbia farmers. A multiplicity of subjects was discussed and various resolutions advanced. Some of them were the subject of controversy, and debated at great length, but one question arose upon which they were united, upon which they did not even take the trouble of forcing the question to a debate of any kind; that was that the United Farmers of British Columbia, along with all other classes in that country, are absolutely determined to continue their fight as long as they can, until we get absolute and complete restriction of oriental immigration into that province.

I notice the minister said something about a proposal which he would advance to this House, looking to more effective restriction of Chinese immigration. So far, so good. We refrain from saying anything upon what is, perhaps, a more serious phase of the question; that is immigration from Japan. But dealing with each and every phase of it, I am convinced that there is only one solution. I am convinced that nothing would satisfy British Columbia, and I am convinced that the time is very rapidly approaching when nothing will satisfy Alberta and other sections of this country than that the government shall stand four-square to the world and say that we exercise the rights which are undoubtedly ours and refuse to admit to Canada any more of this class of people.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The subject of immigration is one of the most important that could engage the attention of parliament. The task of the present administration, in regard to the future of this country, with its financial situation and other conditions, calls for the increasing of its population at as early a date as possible and by the wisest method by which it can be brought about. I am sure the country is looking with interest to see what steps parliament will take in regard to this problem. My hon. friend (Mr. Neill) who introduced this measure has suggested what purports to be a complete policy with reference to the whole subject of immigration and in the consideration of this problem we have gone away from what might be called the national view upon this question to discuss the purely local situation as it appeals to the province of British Columbia. I apprehend, looking at the legislation now proposed, if I followed my hon. friend correctly, that he has taken a measure which was introduced into the parliament of New Zealand and has attempted to adapt it to Canada and Canadian conditions. I am sure that while this discussion so far relating to this narrow part of the

subject is very interesting, it cannot be expected, and I am sure my hon. friend who introduced this measure will hardly expect, that this parliament will proceed to adopt this bill, as he has drawn it, as the full measure of what we propose to do in regard to this question at this time. We would rather look to the government and ministry to submit to parliament a broad scheme dealing with all these questions and showing the country how the government is prepared to solve this most important problem. I quite agree with the minister as to the inaptness of this measure in a very great many respects. Drawn as it has been entirely from the viewpoint of New Zealand, we are faced with this proposition. In the second clause of the bill I find:

> No person other than a person of British birth and character shall (except as by this act is specially provided) enter into Canada unless he is in possession of a permit to enter in the form and to the effect provided by regulation under this act.

In other words, we are enacting a prohibition against the man in northern Europe, no matter what country he might come from, or no matter what country we might look to for desirable settlers, and we are telling him that he is in the excluded class, and that by no possibility can anybody be allowed to enter the country, except he be a British subject under the terms of the act.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. gentleman has read section 2. Will he quote the general provision of section 3?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the provisions of section 3, but section 3 does not remove the injurious effect of what is contained in section 2. The complaint I make in regard to section 2 is that this parliament would, if this were adopted, give notice to every man in northern Europe, outside of the British Isles, that he was a prohibited person and could not come into this country unless he had a permit from the minister, and I think the minister was quite right in indicating to the House that the responsibility which was going to be placed upon him by virtue of that measure was one which no minister would care to assume.

It is quite evident, looking at subsection 2, of section 2, that our New Zealand friends, in dealing with this question, were dealing solely with the oriental problem, but there the immigration question is largely one which is entirely controlled by that problem. With the exception of those of British origin, the men from northern Europe, to which countries we may look to people our land on account of the similarity of climatic conditions, do not go to New Zealand when they want to emigrate. They have to deal largely with people of British origin, who come from the British Isles and the Asiatics, and this legislation shows on the face of it that that is what they are dealing with, and it is, therefore, very limited legislation, and not such a measure as we should enact and place upon the statute books of this country.

I make that remark because I think this debate should be adjourned and that the attention of parliament should not be focussed upon this question in a deliberate way until the minister has had an opportunity of bringing down the submissions which he proposes to lay before us in regard to this all-important question.

May I turn aside for the moment to say a word as to Asiatics. I had the opportunity of hearing Dr. Sastri, when he was on a visit to Canada last summer. We have been accustomed to hearing eloquent things about the great Empire to which we belong, and about the great achievements in India, and about the fact that a certificate of British citizenship was the same the world over. That is the boast of the British people. When Dr. Sastri came to Canada he said:

> There are one thousand of my fellow countrymen in this country, and we do not ask that you should permit any more to come. We are perfectly content with the provisions which now exist to prevent any more from coming into this country.

But they are British subjects and they claim the right to the franchise. When the Great War was on, their brethren in India volunteered to engage in the conflict just the same as the sons of Canada did. They were not conscripted; they were not dragooned into the conflict. They have the fullest right to claim consideration as British subjects, according to Dr. Sastri's appeal, as men who come from any other part of the world. That argument, I say, appeals to me, and it does not run counter to the theory of the restriction of Asiatic immigration. If there are in this country one thousand people who are British subjects, and if, for reasons, the class from which they come say: "We do not want to come in any greater numbers," any difficulty that might arise with reference to that branch of immigration is entirely removed. But the appeal which Dr. Sastri made in Canada last year is one which ought to come with great effect to any man who has any sense of reason and fair play and who is proud of the fact that he is a British subject. I make that statement entirely apart from the question of what

our attitude should be as regards the class known as Asiatics, either Chinese or Japanese.

Mr. McBRIDE: Does the hon. member think it is in the best interests of any country that the population of that country should consist of white races and Asiatics?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If my hon. friend had waited, I was proceeding to say that I was not at the moment discussing the question of the exclusion of Chinese and Japanese. That is an entirely different subject, one upon which I think our friends from British Columbia, having regard to conditions existing in that province, are very largely justified in the views which they have put forward. But I apprehend this, that when this parliament wants to lay down a policy which has to deal with the whole question of immigration that must be done by a measure which is complete in its nature and which will grapple with the subject in a systematic and deliberate way. With all due deference to my hon. friend who has introduced this measure, I submit that this bill is not one which this House should adopt, nor which it should proceed to dispose of, perhaps, I should say, before we have had the wider measure which will deal with the whole subject.

My stand in reference to the position of a man who is a British subject and who comes from India, is one which, I wish the House distinctly to understand, is prompted by a realization of the fact that his position is entirely different from that of a man who is either a Chinaman or a Japanese. I would, therefore, submit to the House that this measure should stand over until the policy of the government in regard to the whole question has been brought down.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has taken a stand which, perhaps, is one which will meet with more or less approval on the part of quite a number of hon. members of this House. He objects to this bill, in the first place, because it is a very general bill and, second, because the chief argument advanced up to the moment in support of the bill, has been based upon the peculiar and extraordinary conditions in one province of Canada. In justification for the stand taken by the introducer of the bill and those who have supported it, I have this to say for the government—and I say it with all courtesy and kindness, and yet with firmness—that in previous years, but particularly last year, we came before this House with a very serious grievance. We presented our views in a wholly non-political manner. We asked for bread and we received a stone. We asked for the exclusion of Asiatics from this country. We received an assurance that we would have effective restriction. So far there has been no evidence of any definite policy whatsoever to give effect to that promise, although, as my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) has stated, in the same resolution which was accepted by the government, and, indeed, amended by them and accepted in its amended form, there was a clear statement, an admission by this parliament that there was a definite menace in this type of immigration. I, therefore, do not think that we are called upon to apologize to the House for advancing as the chief arguments in support of the bill the problem facing the Pacific coast province of Canada, namely, the Asiatic immigration problem.

My hon. friend who introduced this bill and, I think, others who come from that province, do not come to this House and say that this is an ideal measure from our standpoint. But we are endeavouring to meet the uninformed view—and I use that word without any desire to give offence—of many members from the other provinces who, by their numerical strength in this House, reduce us to a position of impotency and absolute inability to secure our rights or what we contend to be our rights. Unless we can persuade hon. gentlemen that this is a problem that must be faced, we are subjecting our province to a possible inundation of immigrants from the Asiatic continent that will make British Columbia simply an adjunct of those Asiatic countries.

Let me bring to the attention of the House and particularly of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a statement made by a Japanese statesman the other day, to illustrate the grave nature of this problem. Before I read the statement, it will be recalled that at the Washington conference, the Imperial Japanese government agreed in the conference to certain provisions to which I shall not refer; but it was also reported at least in the press, that the Japanese allowed the question of immigration to stand aside. It was felt, during the early stages of the conference, that that would interfere with a settlement, and we were all surprised, and, I think, pleased that the Japanese government allowed that question to stand aside and joined with Great Britain, France and the United States in a disarmament agreement. This is a clipping from one of the leading American journals:

Viscount Uchida has told the Tokyo Diet that Massano Hanihara, now en route to Washington as Japan's ambassador, is soon to take up the immigration negotiations, interrupted when the arms conference met at the American capital some fourteen months ago. From the point of view of the Mikado's government, this is not only an advisable step, but even an imperative one, for it—

The Imperial Japanese government—

—cannot be satisfied with the present understanding—that Root—Takahira "gentlemen's agreement" under which Tokyo issues no passports to Japanese labourers planning to cross to "the States."

There is a good deal more, but that is all I desire to read to illustrate my point. In other words, the Japanese government, while it waived that problem under conditions obtaining at the Washington conference, now comes forward and is demanding the abrogation, or withdrawal, or cancellation, or whatever term you choose to use, of the "gentlemen's agreement." The Prime Minister will recall all the incidents surrounding the "gentlemen's agreement" between Canada and Japan. It has served as a partial bulwark, shall I say, for Canada against an inundation of Japanese, but only a partial bulwark—I was going to use the term "meagre," and I will give the figures in a moment to justify that view. But if the government of the Mikado is going to demand from the United States government at Washington the abrogation of the famous Root treaty itself, it is quite within the realm of possibility that they will next demand the cancellation of their agreement with Canada. We are not satisfied with the terms of that agreement. We in British Columbia are faced with a very serious condition in regard to that agreement. We have not particularly attacked it, but we have been very restive under it and I tell my hon. friends opposite that the possibility of the loss of even that meagre safeguard will be viewed with extreme alarm in the province of British Columbia.

Let me justify my remarks by giving a few statistics, and I shall try to be as brief as possible. I might observe that I am not basing my whole argument on the Japanese situation; I am taking it as distinct from the others, to which I shall refer in a moment. There are 17,690 Japanese in Canada, of whom, in the one province of British Columbia alone, there are 16,869. In other words, there are fewer than a thousand in all the other provinces combined. Surely in view of that fact the government, and hon. members of this House will appreciate the reason for our alarm. But that is not the main significance of these statistics. I would ask hon. members to follow the figures I am about to give. In 1910 there were 5,005 births in British Columbia, of which 20 were Japanese. That gives a ratio of one Japanese to 249 whites. In 1915, there were 10,516 births in British Columbia, of which 303 were Japanese, or one to 34. In 1920, the total births in the province were 11,523, of which 657 were Japanese ,or a ratio of one to 17. In 1921, the ratio was further reduced, standing now at one Japanese to every 13 whites. From 1910 to 1921, a period of only 11 years, the ratio had changed from one to 249 to one to 13.

Is not that appalling? Is it not a situation that is fraught with very serious possibilities and consequences unless we face the matter frankly? This House must get clear on this point. Whether or not the government face this question now, the day will come sooner or later, and I believe it is not far distant, when it will have to be faced. There is no escape from it. In addition to the Japanese there are over 30,000 Chinese in British Columbia. And knowing a great deal about the Chinese methods of living and the difficulty of making a census, I am of the opinion that you could easily add 5,000 or 10,000 more to that number. At any rate, there are at least 30,000 Chinese in the province; while there are about 1,000 Hindus. That gives you a total of some 50,000 orientals out of a population of about half a million. And, mark you, that in the face of the most bitter opposition on the part of the people of that province during the last twenty-five years.

In all that time there has not been a moment when the people of British Columbia have not stood up to a man against this immigration. A few years ago in this House I brought to the attention of the government the fact that we had passed 144 resolutions and bills which had been disallowed by the federal government in preceding years, and which showed that the people and the governmental authorities of British Columbia were very serious about the matter. Now I come to the House and inform hon. members that in 11 years the Japanese ratio of increase has changed from one to 249 to one to 13.

Let me deal with another phase of the question. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) sounded a note this afternoon which has always been resorted to by those who are opposed to our view on this subject. And when I say opposed, I believe the opposition is based on ignorance of the facts, because I find that in Ontario, where a few years ago one could scarcely get a hearing in regard to the anti-Asiatic views of British Columbia, to-day we have a very strong stand against the oriental invasion which they find gradually working into their cities. I read in a Toronto newspaper the

other day, the Mail and Empire, an editorial in which it was stated that this country must face this question sooner or later. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, for whom I have the highest regard, and who undoubtedly had the very best intentions, advanced to this House his reason why we should hush up this question and say nothing about it. That reason was one of trade. Let me tell this House that if some effective steps are not taken in the near future it will not be a question of considering the effect on trade; it will be a question whether British Columbia is going to be merely a colony of the Orient or a province of this Dominion. That is what you will have to consider, for we shall not have very much say in the province.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) —and I have his words—referred to the enfranchisement of Hindus, which really touches the whole question, to a greater or lesser extent, of the enfranchisement of all naturalized citizens of oriental origin, as a trivial question. It is not a trivial question. Enfranchise 50,000 orientals to-morrow and what chance in the world could we have with a solid phalanx of opinion of that kind, moulded, moved and directed by one line of thought and interest?

Mr. McQUARRIE: You would have another party in the House.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, but just imagine the effect of most of these people living in our cities or adjacent to them. In presenting this matter to the House, and particularly to the government, I am not expressing any partisan view. I am stating the view of the members from British Columbia and of every citizen of that province. I ask that the government face this question now, and face it frankly. We must state to the world, with frankness and firmness, that this country is going to stand for the exclusion of oriental immigration to Canada. We are not asking for the exclusion of business men or bona fide students who are registered in any of our universities, nor are we asking that this shall apply to travellers or tourists. We welcome any increase of that kind. But we do say that we must rigidly enforce an exclusion law against orientals. If I understand the oriental mind, and I think I know something about it—my hon. friend from one of the Montreal constituencies (Mr. Jacobs) who is quite a student of immigration, laughs—I happen to have taken two trips through Japan, I have also travelled through China and the Malay States, and I have studied the question from the knowledge gained by that contact with the oriental as well as during thirty years residence in British Columbia and the Pacific coast states. I call the House to witness this fact that in California, Oregon, Washington, British Columbia—wherever this problem confronts the people, can you show me any one from the governor downwards who holds divergent views as to the absolute necessity of total exclusion of this class of immigration? Not one. Why, in this very despatch by this distinguished Japanese statesman he refers to the fact that all three of these Pacific coast states as well as others are solidly against the immigration of Japanese. Now, I say to the government, I say to parliament—because after all I realize that the government can only be moved by the opinion of parliament—I say to parliament that the time has arrived when we must make a clear-cut statement.

I was proceeding to say when the laugh of my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) interrupted me, that if I understand the oriental mind—and I think I do—I am right in reaching this conclusion: If you talk in plain, simple language the oriental will understand and appreciate your meaning infinitely better than if you indulge in the intricacies and refinements of obscure diplomatic terms. If there is anything he is a master of it is the subtleties of diplomacy—and if there is anything that this government is deficient in it is that very quality.

Mr. JACOBS: Give us some instances wherein they are deficient.

Mr. STEVENS: I think we are all of us perhaps less adept at that than the oriental. However, I will let that pass. But you will get very much farther ahead in dealing with this problem with Japanese, Chinese or Hindus, if you tell them frankly but firmly that the determined policy of Canada is to exclude this type of immigrant. Once that stand is taken without reserve you will have no difficulty in my estimation in dealing with the problem from their standpoint.

My hon. friend the minister (Mr. Stewart) says he is going to bring down a bill dealing with the Chinese situation. I assure him that I do not wish to embarrass him, but such action will not solve this problem, and I very much fear that anything he may bring down of a qualifying character will only increase the discontent and resentment of all classes of public opinion in the West on this question.

Now let me say a word or two in regard to the matter brought forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald). He referred to the enfranchisement of the Hindus. I admit quite frankly that not only in regard to the Hindu, but in regard to any naturalized subject the franchise seems to come as a

proper, just and natural sequence. But here is what we are faced with in British Columbia. The oriental is numerically so strong as an individual group or class, and the possibilities of a further influx are so grave, that we have but one safeguard against it: that is to deny them the franchise so that they have no voice in framing the public policy of that province. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is not in his seat, but if he were I can imagine an immediate interjection from him that that is a violation of British fair play.

Mr. JACOBS: May I say that it is also a violation of the understanding reached at the last Imperial Conference which the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) attended?

Mr. STEVENS: In so far as the Hindus are concerned—and I think my hon. friend has somewhat overstated the case—I admit that it appears to be a violation of those British principles of which we are all so justly proud. But I want to tell this House again that if we were to enfranchise naturalized orientals, then in all probability the next step would be the opening of the doors for increased immigration from their native countries. And the pressure is there. Japan is complaining to-day that, including Korea and Formosa, she has not room for her 77,000,000 people. But the point is not, whether we are going to supply a country for the settlement of Japan's surplus population. That is not the question. The question is, to what degree we are justified in opening our doors to any given class of immigrant who is incapable of assimilation. That is the question we must decide. So far as Japan is concerned, there are many areas on the continent of Asia that are not settled yet, and if time permitted I could soon illustrate my statement. But we are not called upon to solve Japan's problem in that regard, and British Columbia absolutely refuses to be the dumping ground for the surplus population of the Orient. And I think we have a right to refuse. We have a right to resent any such suggestion. Moreover, we have a right to plead in this parliament with the eight other provinces of Canada for support in this matter. We base that appeal on the knowledge that wherever other communities have been brought into contact with this problem, even in a small measure compared with our experience, they express the same opinion. If my right hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) or the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) would in the next two weeks have a clerk seek that information in Kingston, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal—in fact in almost any of our eastern cities, he would find all of them urgent with strong arguments, just as strong as any I am putting forward to-day, against further oriental immigration into Canada.

I say to the government as the active and potent power in this House that it is on their responsibility that some course of action must be taken. The reason I am speaking perhaps so strongly to-day is that I apprehend this measure will stand over because my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has so requested to allow him to introduce a bill, and therefore I hope the government may be impressed with the seriousness of this problem, and that when that bill is introduced it will be with a full knowledge of all the facts in the case as far as we have been able to give them, not only to-day but on the very complete debate a year ago.

Mr STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend will permit me a question? Wherein does this bill to improve the Immigration Act except in the single clause that provides for the admission of nationals with whom we have treaties? I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I am in entire sympathy with his views, but I have not yet seen that point dealt with and as it is very nearly six o'clock I should like to have his views before we adjourn.

Mr. STEVENS: I think I can deal with that in the few minutes at my disposal. I am very glad the minister raised the point because I had made a note of it but overlooked it. It is quite true, as he says, that under the general act power has been conferred upon the minister to do virtually all that is proposed in this act by order in council. But no minister has up to the present time felt that it was incumbent upon him by regulation to take such very drastic steps regarding the restriction or exclusion of any class of immigration as are called for by this bill. But clothed with specific statutory power, the minister has no choice; he must do it.

Mr. JACOBS: Not necessarily.

Mr. STEVENS: Virtually he must.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not discovered in the bill anything that forces me to exclude any one.

Mr. STEVENS: Now, let us stop quibbling about this matter. Let us talk very plainly.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not quibbling. I am simply arguing—

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps I have been quibbling. I will be very blunt with my hon. friend: the bill is not designed for that purpose. The bill is designed to meet the squeamishness of my hon. friend and others in this House who do not wish to say, "We will stand for exclusion." That is what the bill is designed to do—it is an indirect method of reaching exclusion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I hardly think I can accept that explanation. There is no squeamishness about the minister in connection with this.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, let me limit it, then. There is squeamishness—well, the term is not a very dignified one—there is hesitancy—now, am I using too strong a term?—on the part of this House, and has been for years, to take this stand in regard to exclusion. We have pleaded for it for years; now we come forward and say to you in this bill: we are following a precedent established by another dominion in the form of a measure which has been in force for over two years. There is a precedent, and on it we ask you to act, to attain the end that we think you should attain by definite and frank exclusion. I say to the government very candidly, that I would rather see this bill not passed and a definite exclusion measure put through.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Exactly.

Mr. STEVENS: If the government think that this bill is too weak, I am sure that the mover and others will join with him in going to the extent of frankly excluding. But in order to meet the constantly reiterated argument that someone is going to be injured here or some offence given there, we have followed the pattern of New Zealand, and offer this bill. As I said a moment ago, last year we asked for a certain thing and we got a promise of effective restriction, but there has been none. My hon. friend, I believe, has been looking for a method of effective restriction, and he has not been able to find it; it is a difficult thing to do. But we urge the government frankly to come forward; we urge parliament frankly to come forward and stand for the principle of exclusion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I ask my hon. friend how this bill bolsters or assists the minister in any particular with respect to restriction? I cannot discover it, if it is there.

Mr. STEVENS: I have tried to explain to the minister that his present powers are derived from the general Immigration Act. If he exercises the powers set forth here, it must be by regulation. It was never conceived, never intended in the original act that the minister should be empowered wholly to exclude any given class of people. This bill, if it passes, will become a statute, and we know the reason for its present form; it is to enable the minister to exclude certain races from this country.

Mr. JACOBS: That is, if he wants to do so.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly; I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. JACOBS: I point out to my hon. friend the provisions of section 3:

> The Governor in Council may order that the provisions of this act shall not apply to nations or peoples specified in such order.

Mr. STEVENS: I happen to know the views of my hon. friend the minister, and I think I know the views of the right hon. Prime Minister, to this extent: that if this government—or any other government that is possible—accepts this bill, it will be on the distinct understanding of enforcing it to accomplish the end I have been outlining. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not wish unduly to interrupt my hon. friend, but would a small amendment to the act already in existence not do everything that this bill proposes to do?

Mr. STEVENS: Very good; we will accept that amendment from the hon. minister if he will propose it.

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

Thursday, February 22, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

MOOSE JAW ELECTION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

OTTAWA, February 21, 1923.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., M.P.,
Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Re Moose Jaw Election

Sir,—I beg to enclose herewith my certificate in the above election case as required by section 69 of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

E. R. CAMERON.
Registrar of Supreme Court of Canada.

REPORT

Report of the Board of Pension Commissioners for the year ending March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Béland.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House has substituted the name of Mr. Beaubien for that of Mr. Lovie on the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

P.C. 2053

Mr. DUNCAN:

1. Was P.C. 1053, June 29, 1922, published in the Canada Gazette? If not, why?

Mr. COPP:

1. No.

2. It has not been customary to Gazette orders in council of this character.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY TIES

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. What quantities of cross ties were purchased from the Canadian Tie and Lumber Company, Limited, during the calendar year 1922, for use on any of the lines now included in the National Railway System?
2. On what dates were such purchases made?
3. What quantity of hard wood ties were purchased on each occasion?
4. What quantity of soft wood ties were purchased in each case?
5. What prices were paid in respect of each purchase?
6. By whom were such purchases made?
7. What is the official position of the purchaser?
8. Were tenders invited in connection with any of such purchases?
9. If so, on what dates, in what manner and in connection with what purchases?
10. Were any of such purchases made without tender?
11. If so, on what dates, for what amount of ties, and why were tenders not invited?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 750,000.

2. October 23, 1922.

3 and 4. Approximately 50 per cent of each.

5. Hardwood, 35c. to 75c.; cedar, 40c. to 85c., and small quantities of the following: hemlock, 30c. to 70c.; red oak and chestnut, 50c. to $1.00; white oak, 70c. to $1.30.

6. General Purchasing Department, Grand Trunk Railway system.

7. General Purchasing Agent.

8. No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

9. No.

10. Yes.

11. Purchase made under contract entered into by the late Grand Trunk management in July, 1917.

COAL IMPORTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What were the bituminous coal imports of Canada from the United States for the latest year of record?
2. What is the cost value of that tonnage of bituminous coal at the port of entry?
3. What were the anthracite coal imports from the United States for the last year of record?
4. What was the value of that tonnage of anthracite at the port of entry?
5. What was the total value of the bituminous and anthracite tonnage imported for the last year of record?
6. What was the total amount of electrical energy generated from Canadian water-power and exported to the United States for the latest year on record?
7. What would the equivalent of this electrical energy amount to in hard coal, and what is the cost value of American coal required to replace this amount of electrical energy?
8. What amount of Canadian money is paid every year to American mine owners and American railways on an average for the hard coal imported as aforesaid?
9. What was the value and tonnage of Canadian exports of newsprint to the United States in the last year of record?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.

1 and 2. Imports bituminous coal from United States entered for consumption in Canada, 12,746,976 tons, value $39,227,495.

3 and 4. Imports anthracite coal from United States entered for consumption in Canada, 4,415,921 tons, value $38,997,455.

5. Total value bituminous and anthracite entered for consumption in Canada, value $78,258,725.

6. The total amount of electrical energy generated from Canadian water-power and exported to the United States for the calendar year 1922 was 976,442,339 kilowatt-hours, or 149,431 h.p. years.

7. The equivalent in anthracite coal would be approximately 114,876 tons, valued at $16.50 per ton. The price paid by Canadian consumers would be $1,895,454.

8. No information.

9. Exports Canadian newsprint to United States, 14,106,128 cwt.; value $59,891,120.

CONSUMPTION OF CIGARETTES

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What was the total amount of cigarettes entered for consumption during the present fiscal year down to the end of the last accounting period, and the amount of taxes collected thereon; and, what was the total amount of cigarettes entered for consumption dur-

ing the corresponding period of the last passed fiscal year, and the amount of taxes collected thereon?

2. What was the total amount of cigars entered for consumption during the present fiscal year down to the end of the last accounting period, and the amount of taxes collected thereon; and, what was the total amount of cigars entered for consumption during the corresponding period of the last passed fiscal year, and the amount of taxes collected thereon?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Cigarettes:

Domestic cigarettes taken for consumption and excise duty collected thereon during the periods specified:

	Number	Excise Duty
April 1st to December 31st, 1921	1,945,851,276	$11,683,987 90
April 1st to December 31st, 1922	1,539,486,238	11,244,671 83

Imports of cigarettes entered for consumption and customs duty collected thereon during the periods specified:

	Lbs.	Customs Duty
April 1st to December 31st, 1921	21,705	$110,721 75
April 1st to December 31st, 1922	26,717	146,168 35

2. Cigars:

Domestic cigars taken for consumption and excise duty collected thereon during the periods specified:

	Number	Excise Duty
April 1st to December 31st, 1921	150,923,165	$905,557 07
April 1st to December 31st, 1922	150,207,655	514,479 41

Imports of cigars entered for consumption and customs duty collected thereon during the periods specified:

	Lbs.	Customs Duty
April 1st to December 31st, 1921	12,956	$80,301 35
April 1st to December 31st, 1922	15,518	88,215 70

Excise taxes on cigars entered for consumption:

May 24th to December 31st, 1922—	Excise Tax
Imported Cigars	$ 8,633 09
Domestic Cigars	156,772 04

Sales Tax collections on cigars and cigarettes not available.

TORONTO VIADUCT

Mr. HARRIS:

1. Is it the intention of the government to demand that the viaduct order of 1909, as amended and consented to in 1913 by the city of Toronto, the Toronto Harbour Commission, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and validated by an order of the Railway Commission, be proceeded with, and when?

2. If not, why?

3. Has the government had any representations made to them by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with a view of releasing them from their obligations regarding this order?

4. If so, when and on what premises are these representations made?

5. Does the government consider this work is necessary?

6. If not, why?

7. Has the government under consideration any alternative scheme in this connection?

8. If so, what is it?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Terminal arrangements at Toronto are not dealt with by the government, but by the parties immediately concerned and the Board of Railway Commissioners.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. It is not a matter for the consideration of the government, but of Canadian National Railways, the management of which hopes shortly to deal with the questions at issue.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. No.

8. Answered by No. 7.

CANADA COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. SHAW:

1. Have any sums been advanced by the government to the Canada Colonization Association?

2. If so, what was the total amount advanced, when was same paid, and under what authority was payment made?

3. Were any stipulations made as to the objects and purposes upon which moneys were to be expended?

4. If so, what were such stipulations?

5. Have such stipulations been complied with?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Yes.

2. $40,000. By authority of the Immigration Act.

3 and 4. For advertising in Great Britain and the United States, and to provide information for proposed purchasers of lands in Canada.

5. It is still too early to determine the ultimate results of the work done by the Canada Colonization Association. A great deal of preliminary work has been done in the way of listing lands and in classifying these and also in interesting prospective land purchasers.

VANCOUVER TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Mr. SALES:

In view of the fact that a bill has been passed providing for the erection of an extension to the terminal elevator at Vancouver.

1. Have plans and specifications for said extension been received by the government?

2. Have any contracts yet been let in connection with construction? If so, to whom, and for what amounts?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No.

2. No.

WINE AND BEER EXCISE TAXES

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What amount was collected from excise taxes, during the fiscal year 1922, on (a) alcohol; (b) wines, (c) beer?

2. What proportion was paid by each province for each of the above items?

Hon. MR. BUREAU:

Statement of Excise Revenue collected by provinces, on alcohol, wines and beer the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922.

Excise Duty:

Province	Spirits	Malt Liquor
Nova Scotia	$ 62,633 67	$ 10,320 00
New Brunswick	119,821 35	15,926 07
Quebec	2,514,603 99	1,734,655 62
Ontario	3,009,546 45	382,862 64
Manitoba	189,980 50	95,856 78
Saskatchewan	.....	16,640 85
Alberta	100,878 69	115,115 79
British Columbia	224,095 87	167,124 90
Total Dominion	$6,221,560 52	$2,538,502 65

Excise Tax:

Province.	Spirits.	Wines.	Ale, Beer. Porter, etc.
Nova Scotia	$ 17,881 23	1,947 60	1,732 50
Pr. Edw. Island	2,463 50	129 53	.....
New Brunswick	40,731 47	727 75	3,894 09
Quebec	1,118,906 94	62,210 96	856,074 62
Ontario	464,204 33	120,068 47	192,880 07
Manitoba	23,443 62	1,896 46	15,336 20
Saskatchewan	63,189 33	3 00	186 84
Alberta	35,343 72	78 90	21,267 73
British Columbia	72,532 00	3,596 16	156,218 54
Total Dominion	$1,838,696 14	$190,658 83	$1,247,590 59

Sales Tax figures not available.

REGINA PHOTO SUPPLY CO.—SALES TAX

Mr. EVANS:

1. Was the Regina Photo Supply Company granted exemption from the sales tax to December 1, 1922?

2. If so, why?

Mr. BUREAU:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

MEMBERS' STENOGRAPHERS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many stenographers are there in the members stenographers' branch of the House of Commons?

2. How are they selected?

3. Has the Civil Service Commission anything to do with their appointment?

4. What are their salaries?

5. What are their names?

6 How many hours per day do they work?

7. Does the Clerk of the House exercise any supervision over their duties?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. 63 stenographers.

2. By the chief of the staff, subject to the approval of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

3. No.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

4. 62 at $4 per day and 1 supervisor at $5 per day.

5. Anderson, Miss Mabel; Bass, George; Bouchard, H. M.; Brankin, Miss H.; Brennan, Miss M.; Cameron, Miss A.; Cameron, Miss C. L.; Carrier, Miss A.; Charette, Miss D.; Charrow, Miss G.; Cook, Miss B.; Cross, I. E. (Capt.); Culross, Miss A.; Demont, Miss F.; Denison, Miss J. E.; Deschamps, Miss J.; Dickner, Miss M. R.; Duff, Miss J.; Fagan, J. E.; Forke, Miss M.; Gagnon, Miss M. J.; Garceau, Mrs. M. E.; Garneau, Mrs. S.; Garrow, Miss G.; Gougeon, Miss Y.; Graham, Miss N. J.; Gravelle, Miss M.; Halliday, Miss F.; Halliday, Miss J. M.; Jackson, Miss V. M.; Joubert, Miss L.; Kipp. Mrs. Y.; Laperriere, Miss M. R.; Locke, Miss B.; McEwen, Miss M. E.; McKinley Miss J.; Macdonald, Miss M. H.; MacRitchie, Miss A.; Mahoney, J. J.; Marcotte, Miss M.; Marriott, Miss I.; Megloughlin, Miss N. E.; Miller, Miss M.; Miller, Miss R. R.; Nicholl, Miss L.; O'Regan, O. G.; Ouimet, Miss A.; Parent, Miss O.; Parker, H D.; Patching, Miss H.; Read, Miss E.; Reynolds, Miss B.; Seguin, Miss M.; Sinclair, Miss A.; Soper, Miss K.; Sullivan, Miss M. H.; Theobald, Mrs. C.; Valiquette, Miss C.; Weilbrenner, Miss A. L.; White, Miss B.; Wilson, Miss M. E. D.; Wright, Miss A.; Wright, Mrs. J.

6. From 7½ to 10 hours per day.

7. No.

OIL SPRINGS POST OFFICE

Mr. FANSHER:

1. Has a postmaster been appointed to the Oil Springs Post Office, to fill the vacancy caused by the death, over a year ago, of the postmaster of said place?

2. If so, when was the appointment made and who is the appointee?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. No.

2. Certificate issued by Civil Service Commission in favour of Thomas C. Ward, who refused the appointment.

IMMIGRATION ADVERTISEMENTS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

During the present fiscal year and down to the 31st of December, 1922, how much money was paid by or for the Department of Interior and Immigration for advertisements designed to promote immigration (a) for such advertisements published in the United Kingdom (b) for such advertisements in any other country?

Hon. Mr. STEWART:

(a) Great Britain, $69,298.79; (b) other countries, $202,018.78.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

LEVIS COUNTY POSTMASTERS

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What are the names of the postmasters in the county of Levis that were dismissed between July 1, 1911, and January 1, 1922?
2. What are the names of those dismissed after inquiry?
3. What were the reasons for their dismissal?
4. What are the names of those dismissed without an inquiry?
5. What were the reasons for the dismissal of the latter?
6. What are the names of those who have been reinstated?

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

EXPLANATION OF THE INCIDENT REGARDING MR. IRVINE'S BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to read to the House the following letter which I have received from the chief of the Orders and Notices branch concerning the incident which occurred yesterday with respect to Mr. Irvine's bill to amend the Criminal Code:

February 22nd, 1923.

Honourable RODOLPHE LEMIEUX,
The Speaker,
House of Commons.

Honourable and Dear Sir,

The incident regarding Mr. Irvine's bill to amend the Criminal Code seems to be the outcome of some very natural misunderstanding on the part of some person. On the 31st January last I received from Mr. Irvine a written order to place a bill bearing that title upon the Order Paper. I did so; thus far there does not apear to be any difficulty. On the 8th February I received, from the Assistant Clerk, a written order to place upon the Order Paper a bill, also in Mr. Irvine's name, and bearing the same title; that is to say "An Act to amend the Criminal Code." I hold both of the above-mentioned orders. The latter one came out to me from the House, I had no discretion in the matter; all I had to do was to place it on the Order Paper as directed. It might have been a bill to amend some other provision of the Criminal Code, that Mr. Irvine desired to introduce. In any case I could do nothing other than follow my instructions. I did so, as I have always done, to the best of my ability, and I beg to express my regret that any misunderstanding should have arisen.

I have the honour to be, Honourable and Dear Sir,

Yours very respectfully,
H. CROSSLEY SHERWOOD,
Chief of Orders and Notices Branch.

FEDERAL GRANT FOR HIGHWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): Is it the intention of the government to extend the time during which the federal highways grant is to be available to the provinces?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): In reply to my hon. friend I may say that the matter has not yet been fully considered.

PORTFOLIO OF RAILWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Would the Prime Minister tell the House when he expects to have the vacant portfolio of Railways and Canals filled? I may remind him that it is not long since he was very impatient of "makeshift" arrangements about portfolios, and that the present Acting Minister of Railways is administering three departments.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The present acting minister is doing so well that I think I may as well take my time to consider the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it the intention to have the portfolio filled?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, at some time, but just when, I cannot say.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

MOTION BY MR. POWER FOR REPEAL OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The House resumed from Friday, February 16, the debate on the motion of Mr. Power (Quebec South).

That in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to repeal chapter 12, 8-9 George V., an Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Before resuming the discussion on the important resolution proposed by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), I would like to indicate my appreciation of his courage, and also of his frankness, in presenting this resolution for our consideration. There can be no question in the mind of the hon. member as to what he proposes to do with the Civil Service.

I would also like to say a word or two with regard to the attitude assumed by the seconder of that resolution (Mr. Chevrier). While, apparently, he had in his mind some slight reservation with regard to seconding the proposed resolution, yet upon further consideration, and certainly in view of his arguments, there can be no reason to my mind why he should make any mental reservation whatsoever. I do not wish for a moment to misrepresent the attitude of the seconder of the resolution in any way, but if I understand his position correctly it is simply this: He desires that technical officers in the Civil Service shall be removed entirely from the jurisdiction of the commission. He asks further that those engaged in what he calls "labour" shall be removed from the jurisdiction of that body. In the third place, he asks if I understand

him correctly, that the so-called clerical positions shall be removed from the jurisdiction of the commission so far as regards appointment and promotion, and of course, pay. In other words, if the seconder of the resolution had his wish, he would simply permit the Civil Service Commission to hold testing examinations with regard to the clerical staff of the Civil Service. I think, therefore, that upon mature consideration that hon. gentleman should have no difficulty whatever in seconding unreservedly the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec South.

The seconder also dwelt at some length—not only the other day but on the occasion of the debate last year—on what he was pleased to call the "joke book" consisting, I understand, of some two or three volumes. Now I do not know very much about this joke book, but I do know that the classifications made therein have meant considerable sums of money to those employed in the Civil Service, and quite properly I think, and if I judge the attitude of civil servants correctly I think perhaps they would appreciate another joke book rather than have the one already existing removed.

I would like to say that I have listened with considerable care to the arguments which have been advanced, and I notice that every single argument presented during this debate, and also last year, was made without avail, over fifty years ago at the time the merit system was introduced into the English Civil Service. At that time it was urged that the proposed commission was altogether too expensive, that it was a great patronage bureau, and it was urged at that time, just as it is to-day, that it would take away the responsibility of the ministry. So that even in those days in England, fifty years ago, when civil service reform was in its very swaddling clothes, it was suggested by politicians that the constitution of this commission simply meant the creation of a bureaucracy with a resultant loss of esprit de corps in the service. But the lapse of time and the development of a very sane and alert public opinion in England have freed that service from partisanship and from political control and has made it what it is to-day, a service which is at once the envy and the admiration of every civilized country in the world.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that for several years after the passage of the first civil service reform bill in England a large number of amendments thereto were introduced and carried in order to bring it to its present workable condition?

Mr. SHAW: I think that exactly the same situation developed there as has developed here. The appointment of that commission was opposed by political influences of various kinds from time to time, and efforts were made every now and then to put it on a somewhat different basis. It was attacked from every possible angle, as the same reform has been attacked in this country. Our Civil Service Commission is going through its testing time just as the Civil Service Commission in England went through its period of trial. Our commission has been established somewhat less than five years and one cannot reasonably expect that you can build a structure which is perfect in every part and develop it to its fullest extent within that time, especially when one realizes that in order to do that you must uproot convictions which have been deeply laid as a result of a spoils system in force for approximately fifty years in Canada. In our country patronage has ever been the mainspring of political parties; and it cannot be expected that party adherents so recently divorced from these accepted privileges should now stand idly by and allow themselves to be permanently deprived of its control and exercise. Until 1908 patronage flourished in this country. Following the advent of every new government there were hundreds of dismissals for which no reason whatsoever was given except mere political partisanship. Then followed in due course a long series of parliamentary debates, most acrimonious in their character, charges first by one party and then by another—debates which I humbly suggest did not in any way raise the dignity of parliament, but which on the contrary demoralized the Civil Service, because it was dragged through the mire of fierce partisan controversy.

I want to catalogue very shortly some of the admitted abuses which ensued as a result of that system. There was first of all the waste of public money. I believe that one of the auditors general of this country stated on one occasion that if he were given one-third of the money expended on the Civil Service he would be able to create a more efficient service than was then in operation. Not only has there been a waste of public money, however, but there has been a waste in human efficiency, because, owing to the fact that priority was given to political friends largely without consideration of merit, and owing to the insecurity of tenure which necessarily attended appointments, and the necessity, on the part of civil servants, of constantly having a friend at court in order to maintain positions secured, it followed that the Civil Service was bound to be demoralized and inefficient. Then unfortunately—and per-

haps this is one of the most important incidents of the system—was the fact that the public morals were corrupted. People were debauched largely with their own money, and the promise of the bestowal of public office resulted too frequently in influencing elections held in this country. Now, I suggest to hon. members that no one escaped the baneful influences of this patronage system, nor did any one in the long run profit by it. Under these circumstances one is not in the least surprised that there was a lowered morale in the public service, that there was a lack of economy, and consequently a lack of efficiency. I am not suggesting that the Liberal party was more to blame than the Conservative party; I think they were equally to blame. Not only that; if any other party had been in power at that time they would have followed in the wake of both old parties and adapted themselves to the then existing evils. But fortunately the public itself began to realize the necessity for reform. Governments, too, were not unmindful of the situation, because they appreciated the fact that this patronage system was the mightiest engine that made for the destruction of governments. Besides, members of parliament, I think, also began to realize that the dispensing of patronage was not the pleasant duty which it was sometimes considered to be. And, as a fact, many more people were disappointed than could possibly have their desires gratified by appointment to the Civil Service. As a result of this combination of forces directed towards reform, in 1908 a merit system was to some slight extent introduced into the Civil Service. That measure of civil service reform applied only to the inside service; it applied only to about 2,200 employees in Ottawa. However, despite the introduction of that partial reform, I do not think it can be urged with entire truth that even in that part of the service to which the reform applied patronage was dispensed with, because the peculiar method that was adopted resulted many times, I understand, in political friends receiving preferment. In 1911, we had another change of government. I glanced casually through the debates that took place in parliament, to see to what extent dismissals had occurred following the advent of the new government; and I found some fifty or sixty pages of Hansard indicating wholesale dismissals from the service. There can be no doubt that after that election, with the change of government it brought, the Civil Service had a distinctly Conservative hue. The war brought in its train many evils, but it also brought many things of very great value, one of which was the crystallization in the public mind of the necessity for a more complete measure of civil service reform. And so, as a result of a definite mandate from the people in 1917, civil service reform was introduced by the Union government. The Civil Service Act was passed in 1918 and stands to-day subject to the amendments that have been made in the interim. I would point this out particularly, that there has been no mandate from the public of this country asking for a return to the patronage system. Now, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who moved the resolution, suggested with some degree of fervour that the Civil Service Commission, as constituted under the Civil Service Act, in some way thwarted responsible government, and was to that extent at least unconstitutional. The hon. member is a very astute lawyer. He sat in the House during the time the Civil Service Act was constructed; and so far as the record shows he did not suggest at that time this question of unconstitutionality.

Mr. POWER: It was his second year as a member and he was very modest.

Mr. SHAW: I realize that the hon. gentleman, can, with some degree of honesty, plead modesty. But I notice he made no reference at that time to the important matter of unconstitutionality, and although he has sat in the House for a considerable period since I have failed to notice the slightest intimation from him of this problem of unconstitutionality. In fact, I must express the amazement I felt when I ascertained that in 1921 he actually refused to support a motion then before the House asking for the return of the patronage system. There was no suggestion of unconstitutionality at that time, and surely even my hon. friend would not plead modesty at that late date.

There can be no doubt that this question of unconstitutionality sometimes leads to a most profound argument, sometimes to even the shallowest. Whenever we desire to raise any question, I care not whether it be high freight rates in British Columbia or high freight rates in the Maritime provinces, we plead unconstitutionality—some divergence from our confederation pact. But I would suggest that in respect to our civil service legislation such an argument has little merit, and that the only effect—I will not say the designed effect—of my hon. friend will be to undermine the confidence of the public in the Civil Service Commission.

In the next place, I should like to ask the House who is asking for a change in the Civil Service Act? Who desires a return to

the patronage system, either unreservedly or qualifiedly? Do the civil servants ask for the abolition of this commission? I think not. In fact, if I judge the situation correctly, that is the very thing they do not want. I notice that at a convention of the civil servants in the Customs department held some months ago—and I do not know of any member of the government who displays more enthusiasm for the abolition of the Civil Service Commission than the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau)—they passed this resolution:—

Resolved that this convention of the Dominion Customs and Excise Officers' Association assembled, representing as it does members of the customs and excise service from coast to coast, very strongly resent any attempt to revert to the patronage system, which we feel would be detrimental both as regards the efficiency and the economical administration of the public service, and further that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Hon. Mackenzie King, and the press, urging upon the government in the strongest terms possible the wisdom of giving such matter very careful consideration before allowing the introduction of any legislation which would deprive efficient civil servants the benefits of the merit system as now provided for under the Civil Service Act.

I have no doubt that that expresses to a very large extent the attitude of the Civil Service generally.

Do the public desire a change? Well, I want to read one or two editorials which I think indicate the view of the public on this question, and I would particularly direct the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to an editorial appearing in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 16th last, in which it is stated:—

The defeated candidates have not had this privilege to a sufficient extent, however,—

That is, the privilege of patronage.

—and some of them recently met in Calgary under the chairmanship of Hon. Frank Oliver to frame a formal protest to Premier King according to a circumstantial report in the news columns of the Edmonton Journal. It states—

I take it that that means the Edmonton Journal states:—

It states that seven defeated Liberal candidates attended the meeting and passed a resolution reminding Mr. King that they had requested last January that party and patronage matters in Alberta should be dealt with through the defeated candidates acting on the advice of the Liberal executives or patronage committees, and that he had replied that this, the customary practice, would be adhered to and that "no outside channel will be recognized in dealing with party and patronage matters".

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Was not the protest due to the circumstance that something had been asked which apparently the government had not concurred in?

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. SHAW: I am afraid the right hon. Prime Minister has misunderstood the purport of the article. It suggests that the Prime Minister indicated to these defeated candidates that no outside channel would be recognized in dealing with party and patronage matters. Now, I should be very glad indeed to hear the Prime Minister deny that any such assurance was given to the defeated Liberal candidates or to anybody else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would certainly deny that any such statement was made by me.

Mr. SHAW: I am very gratified to hear that these gentlemen in their unseemly haste to reimpose the patronage system on this country met with short shrift at the hands of the Prime Minister. The editorial proceeds:

As for those Albertan interlopers who insist on putting their fingers in the pie which is supposed to be cut up and distributed by the duly authorized, they really should be reprimanded for their unmannerly haste.

I am glad to be assured that the Prime Minister has given them that reprimand. To indicate further the attitude of the public in connection with this matter I will now quote from an editorial—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I ask the hon. gentleman who the chairman of that meeting was?

Mr. SHAW: The newspaper report indicates that it was Hon. Frank Oliver, a former member of this House. I was about to quote, Mr. Speaker, portions of an editorial which appeared in the Calgary Albertan, a newspaper not unfriendly to this government. I have not the date of this editorial at the moment, but my recollection is that it was published about the middle of September last, and certainly a long time before Dr. Grant got into the newspapers. The editorial reads:

Under existing conditions there is only a shadow of patronage left. Despite that, already in this city there have developed certain petty scandals that reflect serious discredit upon the government and all who are acting in its name.

Leaving out the next paragraph, which does not appear to be material, the editorial continues:

If there is a plain, downright scandal in connection with the distribution of the crumb of patronage in this city now, what would be the result if the flood gates were opened again?

The party that loses by the patronage system is the party which has the distribution of the patronage. Premier King should be wised up, for surely he does not know of local conditions, and then he should act with some force.

Now, these are only two editorials garnered from a considerable mass of press opinion on this subject.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask the hon. member a question? I am unfamiliar with the language of the editorial. What does "wised up" mean?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SHAW: It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has never been initiated into the mysteries of our western language.

Mr. McMASTER: The argot.

Mr. SHAW: It simply means, to be made familiar with, to be given the information. I merely cite these illustrations as an indication, so far as the public press is concerned, that no desire is being manifested for the return of the patronage system.

Now, I have had the privilege of listening to one other debate in this House on supposed defects in the Civil Service Act and alleged shortcomings of the Civil Service Commission. Approximately one year ago we had a debate similar to that now in progress. I regret that I then heard not a single word of appreciation of the services which must have been rendered by that commission, I heard not a single word either on that occasion or the present indicating the slightest confidence in this commission. On the contrary, many of the statements made are such as can have only one effect, even if not so designed, namely, the effect of undermining public confidence in the commission. Now, what does the government propose in connection with this matter? The right hon. Prime Minister suggests that a committee of this House should be appointed for the purpose of investigating the workings of the Civil Service Commission; and I may suggest that his remarks divided themselves into three reasons. The first was that a gentleman called Principal Grant of Upper Canada College had made, as the Prime Minister stated, false representations in connection with the attitude of the government. May I be permitted to deal very shortly with that matter?

I was impressed at the time the Prime Minister was speaking that there seemed to be very little justification indeed for the attack he made upon that gentleman. Not only that, but a reading of the Prime Minister's remarks in Hansard satisfied me that the Prime Minister must have acted hastily in making that attack. What do we find? I should preface what I have to say by stating that I do not know this gentleman. I know nothing at all about his movement. I have heard the name Grant before, but not in connection with him. What did this gentleman say, and what were the circumstances? It appears that Dr. Roche, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was asked to deliver an address at Toronto. Mr. Grant, who apparently is interested in the proposed organization of a civil service reform league, gave a statement to the press on his own authority. The suggestion was—that the statement was for their information. The press, instead of taking it in the sense that it was intended without having representatives at the meeting addressed by Dr. Roche, certainly put words in his mouth that he never uttered; there can be no question about that. I have not the statement before me, but what does Principal Grant say? He does not mention the government in his statement from first to last—not a single word about the government. He says that the Civil Service Commission is being attacked by insidious political influences, and that already ten thousand men have been released from the operation of the act. Is there anything false about that? Is there the slightest lack of truth in that statement?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is not the whole purport of the article to which he refers to convey the impression that the ten thousand persons to whom reference was made were released from the operation of the act at the instance of the government or under some pressure from the government, and that as a consequence something was needed in the way of civil service reform?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were released by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: At the request of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SHAW: I respectfully submit to the Prime Minister that there is no suggestion whatever about the government in connection with this matter, unless the Prime Minister is prepared to state that his government is indirectly referred to in the direct statement with regard to the "insidious, unseen and silent manipulations of the adherents of patronage in political life." I cannot for the life of me—although I should be glad to do so, I must say—find justification for the Prime Minister's remarks. That is the statement which Dr. Grant made. Now, I can readily

understand that Dr. Grant has a very serious complaint against the newspapers, and I can understand that Dr. Roche has also a serious complaint against them and perhaps against Dr. Grant. But I fail to appreciate how the Prime Minister and his government have any serious complaint to make so far as these statements are concerned. The statements, I submit, are true; and the best evidence of their truth is to be found in the debates in this House of last year and the debates so far as they have proceeded this year, although the latter would not have been known to Dr. Grant at the time he made his statement. So I suggest that the Prime Minister is not on solid ground in asking for a committee of the House to investigate the matter from that angle. I would say further that in my opinion the formation of a Civil Service League is highly desirable and that Dr. Grant is to be commended for trying to institute an organization of that kind. No organization has done as much as the Civil Service Reform League in the United States to bring about that measure of freedom from patronage which now characterizes the United States Civil Service.

Then, in the second place, the Prime Minister suggests in his address not only a lack of economy but also a lack of efficiency in the operation of this board. He says that if the government were not manacled it could reduce the number of civil servants. Well, I may be mistaken, but my understanding is that the government controls not only the inlet to the service but the outlet to it also; that it is within the power of the government to decrease the number of persons in any department, to abolish positions and to accept or not to accept on the permanent rota the civil servants offered to them by the Civil Service Commission. How, under these circumstances, a government can complain that the increase in the number of civil servants is due to the Civil Service Commission, is more than I can understand. I may say that in England, if there is any excess in the number of civil servants that is taken as a direct reflection on the government, not on the Civil Service Commission.

The Prime Minister says that if the government wants to get rid of a clerk or a number of clerks, a great deal of correspondence must take place, and that that involves the necessity of employing a number of correspondence clerks. He took that ground when he had to shift from the first ground in regard to economy in the number of civil servants, and I doubt very much whether that argument either is worthy of consideration in this House.

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I made it clear that the statement I made in that connection was based upon the reports of deputy ministers to the ministers? My suggestion was that a committee of this kind could give the House an opportunity of hearing the deputy ministers and of hearing the commission itself on this very matter. That was the view that the deputy ministers presented to the government.

Mr. SHAW: It is only fair to say that I took it for granted that the Prime Minister had adopted the view that had been presented to him by the deputy ministers. I think they are wrong in the view they present. If the law is as I understand it; if the government through its executive departments controls both the inlet and the outlet to the service, then I see no justification for that argument. Let me revert for a moment to the matter of economy. I wish to refer—because it is a matter of some interest—to the estimates for the current year. I find that with the exception of the Labour department—and I hasten to give the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) credit for it—there is practically no department of government which shows a substantial reduction this year under the head of civil government. The Civil Service Commission, so far as salaries and contingencies are concerned, shows the greatest decrease of any department of government in the estimates for the current year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is my hon. friend not aware that even in the Labour department the reduction is due to the absence of a vote for the unemployed?

Mr. SHAW: I am simply taking the figures. I cannot go outside the figures.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will permit me a question, is it not a fact that the great majority of the increases provided are due to statutory increases over which the government has no control?

Mr. SHAW: I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will not, I am sure, mind my drawing his attention to the statement that the reduction in the estimates of the Labour department has something to do with the unemployment vote. It has not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The unemployment vote came out of my hon. friend's department; there is none now.

Mr. SHAW: I expected to draw some fire myself, but I hardly anticipated kindling it in other quarters.

Mr. MARTELL: Would my hon. friend tell us what new positions have been created and what increase there is in the civil government estimates over and above what is provided for by statute?

Mr. SHAW: I will answer my hon. friend in a moment. What I want to say is this: that so far as salaries and contingencies are concerned the Civil Service Commission shows the greatest decrease of any department of government for the current year,—a decrease of about $45,000. May I also say that that represents a decrease in the number of clerks employed by the commission, of some seven. The Labour department has a reduction of $34,340, and I was prepared to give the minister full credit for that reduction.

In answer to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) may I refer him to the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, who I understand from his remarks is not averse to the complete abolition of the Civil Service Commission. I find an increase in that department, so far as civil government is concerned, of $72,470. If the hon. gentleman can assure me that that is entirely due to statutory increases, I shall be very glad to accept his statement. But that is the situation, and what I do want to say is that the Civil Service Commission is costing this country apparently less and less, while many departments of government are increasing their expenditure all the time.

Mr. MARTELL: How many permanent civil servants in the employ of the Civil Service Commission have been dismissed? Is not this reduction simply a case of getting rid of the extra clerks that used to be falling over each other in the old days?

Mr. SHAW: I think my hon. friend's argument carries its own answer. May I just point out in connection with these figures that the amount paid through the Civil Service Commission is something like $60,000,000, and the cost of the commission itself for salaries is something like $188,000 for the current year? That means a percentage of .003 if I have figured it correctly, and I would ask any hon. gentleman to indicate what other Civil Service Commission in any part of the world operates on such a small percentage of the total amount of salaries paid.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. member accept the suggestion that these so-called insidious influences were responsible for bringing ten thousand civil servants outside the operation of the act? If so, does he not think it is possible that these same insidious influences may have caused the reduction in the Civil Service Commission vote?

Mr. SHAW: Of course, I cannot say to what degree these insidious influences were responsible for what took place. Perhaps my hon. friend can inform the House in that regard.

Mr. PUTNAM: No, I cannot, but my hon. friend made the suggestion that insidious influences were at work, and that they were possibly the explanation of ten thousand civil servants being removed from the operation of the act. If so, perhaps they also furnish the explanation for the reduction in the Civil Service Commission estimate, in which case give thanks to whom it is due.

Mr. SHAW: Now, Mr. Speaker, if what I have already said is not a sufficient indication of economy of the administration of the Civil Service Commission, I would direct the attention of hon. members to
4 p.m. the report of the commission for the year 1921. I do not know whether a report has been issued for the current year; I doubt it. On page 6 of this report I find, under the heading of reorganization, these remarks:

> At the request of the Deputy Minister of the Department of Militia and Defence, the Commission assigned one of the staff of the Organization branch as a member of a departmental committee on reorganization. This committee's functions were investigational and advisory, and its recommendations subject to the approval of the deputy minister and where necessary, the concurrence of the commission.
>
> The committee has reported on two branches of the department and its recommendations, which have since been put into effect, have resulted in a saving of approximately $20,000 per annum in salaries on the present permanent establishment, and of $18,000 by the release of temporary employees.

It goes on to show how the service in that particular department has been improved, and then says:

> A survey of procedure carried on in the commission's own offices had led to a reduction in the clerical staff of twenty-five positions and a consolidation in the methods of handling certain sections of the routine work. This survey is still in progress and it is believed that further reductions in staff and improvements in procedure can be made.

The Civil Service Commission wherever they have been invited to go into a department have saved the public money, and in addition to that they are apparently making a constant effort to save in their own department. That is borne out by the fact that the number of employees in this department,

according to the estimates, has been reduced I think by six in number.

May I just interject at this point that I do not know a single member of this commission; I do not know a single officer of the commission; I have never to my knowledge met a single individual in that department. I therefore speak without any question as to the personnel of the commission.

Mr. MARTELL: Who employed these six that were dropped? Does it not show that the commission were experimenting at the public expense in taking these men on?

Mr. SHAW: Not at all. My hon. friend is just arguing in a circle. I say that it indicates that the Civil Service Commission are consolidating their work, making it more efficient and effecting reductions even in the limited time they have had so far. I wish to direct particular attention to that part of the Civil Service Commission's report dealing with the Printing Bureau to show how the commission is economizing there.

The report says:

> The work of reorganization in the Department of Public Printing and Stationery has been continued by an officer of the commission specially detailed for the purpose.

It goes on to indicate the work of reorganization in the bureau and says:

> For the first time in the history of the Printing Bureau so far as can be learned, the Auditor General's Report consisting of three large volumes was this year ready to lay on the Table of the House on the day parliament opened.

Further on I find this:

> The commission records with pleasure that no difficulty has been experienced in its dealings with the bureau officials, and all appointments, transfers, and lay-offs have taken place without political or other interference, and it is confidently asserted that the Canadian Department of Public Printing and Stationery, at the present time, compares most favourably with any institution of its kind in America.

Then I would draw particular attention to this statement:

> The number presently employed is 732, as compared with 1,159 in 1919, a reduction of 428 in staff with an annual pay-roll saving of $746,000. It is believed a further reduction in staff can be effected after parliament prorogues.

That is the report of the commission, and I ask hon. gentlemen, can we not give to the members of the commission credit at least for having done some good work on behalf of the public service? And I suggest therefore, that if these facts be any evidence the Prime Minister cannot be entirely justified in stating that there is a lack of economy in connection with that particular bureau.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Was he a believer in the Board of Commerce, instituted by the late government, and if so, does he not know that the vice-chairman of the board stated that the autocratic acts of the Civil Service Commission prevented the board functioning, and thus rendered the purposes of the Board of Commerce futile?

Mr. SHAW: I recollect some squabble of that character, some time ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) has suggested that I said something about lack of economy in connection with the commission. I have brought no charge of that kind against the commission at all.

Mr. SHAW: Not the commission, but the administration of the Civil Service under the jurisdiction of the commission. That is the idea I had in my mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To make perfectly clear what I endeavoured to make clear, it is that according to the representations of the deputy ministers to the government—and I might say also according to some of the representations of the Civil Service Commission itself—there are particulars in which the act might be amended which would permit of economies that are not possible at the present time. With the act as it stands, the cost of government is being increased in a manner in which it would not be increased if certain amendments to the act were made, which I believe both the members of the commission and the deputy ministers would agree to.

Mr. SHAW: All I can say is that the address which the Prime Minister gave in the House the other day gives no indication of the details of the manner in which this economy may be effected. I am not suggesting for a moment that out of this system which has developed in the last five years some minor evils may not have developed, but I do deprecate this constant attack on the Civil Service Commission, without, in some way, indicating to the public the confidence which this parliament has or should have in that commission and in the principle involved in that commission. I want to tabulate, if I may be permitted, very shortly, some of the benefits which it seems to me have accrued as a result of the appointment of the Civil Service Commission since May, I think it was, of 1918. It has given a guarantee that character, physique and mental fitness shall be the means of getting employment in the departments of government, without regard to political belief. It has

opened opportunities for public employment to the whole public on an equal footing, where merit alone is the only question involved. It has classified the work and it has standardized the salary schedules by the work done and not by the mere question of political influence. It has promoted by efficiency reports the seniority and fitness for positions. It has, as I have suggested already—and I have given some evidence of it—gone a very considerable length indeed, in the matter of creating efficiency in the public service, and, not only that, but minister and members are no longer harassed by personal applications, by interviews and by letters from people who desire some position in the public service. It has largely eliminated the question of politics from the public service. I remember it was reported, in the early stages of the difficulties which subsequently resulted in the American Civil War, that President Lincoln stated that if he had had the opportunity to give his time and attention to the rising troubles in the United States, instead of having to devote all his time to the matter of filling the various offices in the States, he probably would have been able to do something to avert that tremendous civil war; and, therefore, I suggest that nobody should be more grateful than the members of the government themselves and the members of this House for the privilege of being released from the difficulties which arise from trying to exercise patronage.

Then, in addition to that, we have no more humiliating—or at least, we should not have any more humiliating—debates in parliament after elections, in regard to political removals. The dignity of this House, instead of being lowered, as it has been on occasions, has been very much enhanced. Not only that, but elections have, to a very large extent, been purified by the absence now of promises of the spoils of office. The views which I have advanced are in answer to the reasons which have been urged by the Prime Minister for the appointment of a parliamentary committee to go into this matter, and I say perfectly frankly—and I would say it to any government which was in power making a similar proposition—that I fear very much the result if this important matter is committed to a parliamentary committee. I am afraid that, instead of strengthening the hands of the Civil Service Commission, we will find that they are weakened and that patronage will make a further inroad upon our public life.

Now, on the other hand, what can the government do? Is there anything the government can do to make this service more efficient? If I am correct in my statement that the responsibility for the staff rests upon the government, I suggest that they can meet the needs of economy by cutting the staff to the barest necessities. I would suggest that they should ask the Civil Service Commission or its representatives to go into the various departments of government and assist them in putting those departments on an economical and efficient basis. I would suggest also that perhaps the introduction of joint councils, such as is the case, I believe, with England, arbitration courts might assist very materially in securing the confidence and goodwill of the Civil Service themselves. It has been found in England that practically all the suggestions for reform and for greater efficiency in the service come largely from the civil servants themselves. Why not take advantage of that opportunity, get their suggestions and views, and see if, on that basis, something of value cannot be developed. In the next place, I think we should have a permanent superannuation act, and finally I would say that we should secure a report from the Civil Service Commissioners themselves, not a report from two commissioners, not a report from one commissioner, but a report from three commissioners—if they cannot agree, let them give us separate reports,—indicating after a very careful survey of the situation how, in their opinion, these much desired ends of efficiency and economy can best be secured.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Service Commission themselves, after the experience which they have had, are probably in a better position than even this House to make suggestions of value. They can if necessary traverse this country from one end to the other and make inquiries, not only from the public, not only from the Civil Service, but from every possible source, as to the means by which the purposes of economy can be achieved, and I would suggest that such an investigation as that conducted by that body, should go over the whole question of the Civil Service, the question of subordination, the question of discipline, of organization, of hours, of pay, of appliances, of holidays, pride in the service, esprit de corps, efficiency, retiring allowance, social welfare, and every other factor which will promote in any way economy and efficiency.

In conclusion, I want to say that to my mind, there can be no turning back in this matter. I do not believe the people of Canada for a single moment will tolerate any turning back. What parliament must do is to strengthen, to fortify and to consolidate the progress that has already been made in

order to eliminate from the public service the evils of patronage, and in order to make it a service which will not only appeal to young men and young women as an opportunity to give lives of useful service to the public, but will also combine with that the greatest economy and the greatest possible efficiency.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec South reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to repeal chapter 12, 8-9 George V, an Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

When that hon. member introduced his resolution he intended to move an amendment to the following effect:

and to restore, in so far as circumstances will permit, the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Quebec South was not allowed to add his amendment, because I am entirely in favour of his proposition with the amendment added.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In that case why does not the hon. gentleman himself move that amendment?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I may do so. I suppose my hon. friend can wait a few moments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is good.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am entirely in favour of the return to the act of 1908, and of removing the outside service from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. In advocating that I do not wish you to understand that I am in favour of returning to patronage, because it is physically impossible to return to a thing that has never ceased to exist, but I am anxious that patronage should be taken from the hands of those who are not responsible to the people and restored to the hands of those who are responsible.

I listened to the speech made by the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) with great interest. He delivered a very serious and instructive speech, and I was amazed when the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) referred to him as a joker. I must remind the hon. member for New Westminster that besides a joker there is also a blank card in every pack.

One of the reasons why I am in favour of returning to the act of 1908 is because there has been too much of a tendency, to administer affairs in this country by commissions. We have the Railway Commission, the Purchasing Commission, the Civil Service Commission, and even the Canadian National Railway Company is a commission. I believe that the administration of public affairs by commission is detrimental to responsible government. The surest way to get rid of responsibility is to appoint commissions that are not responsible to the people. Under the prevailing system the Civil Service Commissioners in Ottawa can appoint men to different positions all over the country, from the Atlantic coast to British Columbia. How are three gentlemen, living in Ottawa, in a position to know the qualifications of men who make applications for positions in rural constituencies, that are, for example, four hundred miles away from this city? Even the ministers themselves, who are responsible to the people, cannot exercise control over their deputy ministers or their principal clerks. It is a fact that under the Civil Service Commission we have seen principal clerks in departmental offices, and even deputy ministers, criticising the work of the ministers, and there is no possible way of getting rid of them except through the Civil Service Commission. I know what my hon. friends opposite will say in regard to that; they will say that they can be dismissed by an order in council. But who will name the gentlemen to replace them? It will be the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not in the case—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Not in the case of deputy ministers, but it is true in the case of very important clerks. In cases like this—and there are many instances of the same character—how can the minister at the head of a department have efficiency in that department if he has practically no control over his clerks, if even his orders are disobeyed, and his hands virtually tied by the Civil Service Commission?

The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), in advancing reasons for the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission, stated that the act was a guarantee of character, of merit, without political influence, in the civil service. Surely my hon. friend was not serious when he made that statement. It would be very easy for me to cite a great number of instances where the appointments were made not according to character, not because of merit, but by reason of political influence—not of the present government but political influence in the Civil Service Commission itself. I make this statement with a due sense of the responsibility attaching to it. I can give the House the inside history of a few nominations. We have been told, for example, that when a rural postmaster is to be appointed, the Civil Service Commission despatches an inspector to the constituency where the vacancy has occurred.

This inspector is supposed to interview the principal residents of the locality, generally the clergyman, the doctor—

Mr. McMASTER: The lawyer.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The lawyer sometimes, the mayor, in short the most eminent people of the locality; and, after having interviewed these persons he makes a report to the Civil Service Commission declaring who is the best man to be appointed. Well, Sir, there was a case in my own constituency where such an inspector was sent. It is true he interviewed the mayor; that was on a Tuesday morning. He interviewed the priest in the afternoon. There was no lawyer in the place. He interviewed the principal merchants there, and then returned to Montreal. Everybody thought he was going to report to the Civil Service Commission in order that they might make the appointment. But the same night a certain person in the locality took charge of the post office. The inspector did not visit the district to take pointers from the people there who knew the conditions so as to be enabled to make a good appointment, he went there to appoint a postmaster, and the postmaster was on the job the same night. And it happened that he was one of the three electors, amongst 355, who voted against me at the election.

Mr. HOCKEN: That was a qualification.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It might have been a qualification, but it showed that patronage still existed, but distributed by irresponsible officials.

Mr. BANCROFT: The hon. member would have just two more to provide for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member should state that the appointment in such a case as that, made in that way, could only be temporary.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It was made permanent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might have been, later on.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It was later on—as many others—just before the government went out of office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the man a returned soldier?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, he was not a returned soldier. Now, I believe the House will agree with me that in regard to certain positions, such, for instance, as that of elevator attendant, the member and the people resident in the locality where the appointment is to be filled are in a better position to know of the efficiency and character of the applicant than any one could be, living at a distance from the place. Let me read part of a letter regarding the appointment of an elevator man. I suggested a certain person to the commission and the deputy minister wrote to me as follows:

> As for Mr. X and the position of elevator attendant at the customs building, I shall be glad to send his name to the Civil Service Commission with a recommendation for his employment; but, as you will understand, these appointments are made by the commission, and whether my suggesting his name will do any good or not, I am unable to say.

Mr. STEVENS: I think in fairness to the House the hon. member ought to state where these appointments were made. He might, for instance, name the post office to which he refers, because apparently he makes a very strong case in support of his argument that the act is not being properly administered, and the House is entitled to the name of the postmaster thus appointed.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: All these names could be brought before a committee if it were appointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like very much to look into that case but I cannot do so unless I have the name of the office.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I have no objection to giving the name; it was at Boucherville. But that is not all. I may say, Mr. Speaker, adverting again to the case of the man whom I recommended for the position of elevator attendant, that he was also recommended by the local superintendent of the public buildings in Montreal, who was in an ideal position to know of the efficiency of the applicant. He was recommended by the deputy minister, who probably based his recommendation on that of the superintendent in Montreal. And the deputy minister himself admits that his recommendation would have practically no influence with the commission. Well, I submit that it is absolutely ridiculous to think that three commissioners living at Ottawa, far away from the place where the vacancy is to be filled, could possibly be acquainted with the efficiency or the qualifications of the applicant. I might refer to another case in a town in my constituency where a position was open of a man whose duties were to signal the transatlantic steamers on the St. Lawrence. After investigation, and consultation with the best informed people in the neighbourhood, I recommended a certain man, who passed his examination successfully. But he was ignored and the commission selected instead the chief organizer

of the Conservative party in that town. Now, you can see what chance I had of surviving in that town. Why, I have as much chance of surviving there as a snowball in the place where the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) would like to see the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. HOCKEN: And where my hon. friend would like to see the member for West Toronto.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Oh, no.

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend might tell the House what was the political persuasion of the gentleman whom he recommended to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He was a Liberal, I admit, but he took no active part in politics. Now, it amuses me to hear Conservatives raise their voices against patronage and to see them lift up their hands in pious horror, when we know that in 1911 practically every Liberal employee was removed from the service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Practically every one.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Even in my own constituency, at the Chambly canal, where there are over two hundred employees, nearly every Liberal was removed, from the superintendent down to the charwoman. There was a certain position which entitled its holder to the occupancy of a house. The person having the position was confined to his bed dangerously ill, but he was dismissed and had to be removed on a stretcher, in order to make place for the new appointee. This is why I am surprised to see my hon. friends on the other side of the House raise their voices against the so-called evils of patronage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member permit me to give an instance which I have just received in a letter from his own province, of a returned soldier—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If my hon. friend wishes to ask me a question, I am perfectly willing to answer him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am asking if my hon. friend will let me give that instance.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My right hon. friend will have occasion to speak.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Oh, yes, you can There will be an amendment.

[Mr. Archambault.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: One of the best arguments brought forward by my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) was that of economy, but I believe I can show to the House that it would be economy to abolish the Civil Service Commission. In 1909, when the act of 1908 was in operation, the cost of the Civil Service Commission was $12,531, and its employees numbered nine; in 1910 the cost was $11,000, and there were eight employees. In 1919-20, the year after the amendment of 1918 came into force, the cost rose to $149,399, and the employees had increased to thirty-six permanent and forty-eight temporary; in 1920-21 the figures were $297,999 and two hundred and fifty-five employees; in 1921-22—and my hon. friend will recollect the figures that he himself cited—the cost was $312,395. I have not the number of employees.

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend will find the number of employees on page 57, of the Estimates for this year. There is a decrease from a hundred and thirty-four in the last fiscal year to a hundred and twenty-seven.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That may be true, but we are under a Liberal government. We are not getting all we want, but we are proceeding in the right direction. However, there is still a long distance to go—a hundred and thirty-four employees now against only nine in 1909. My hon. friend will admit that, and he will also admit that there is still a big difference between $12,000 in 1909 and $312,000 last year.

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but he will surely admit that the Civil Service Act of 1908 only applied to something like 2,000 employees, whereas according to the figures now presented that number has increased to something like 55,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do admit that, and that is why I want to revert to the act of 1908.

My hon. friend has also said that public opinion is in favour of the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission. I have in my hand an editorial from a paper which cannot be called a Liberal paper—the Montreal Gazette, which in its issue of February 19, has this to say on the subject:—

The act of 1916 was passed with the avowed purpose of eliminating party patronage as exercised in the making of appointments to the Civil Service, the initial mistake being the assumption that patronage is, per se, an evil, The principle was condemned, in reality, be-

cause it had been, or was alleged to have been, abused in the making of appointments that were unnecessary and, in the matter of individual fitness, improper. Parliament thereupon did what is so often done in the name of reform; it went to an extreme, and the result is just what always comes of an action of that kind. The law of 1916 set up a system in which the authority of the government was delegated to a commission, and appointments and promotions have since been made in accordance with a scheme of ironclad regulations devised and controlled by the commission, and the so-called merit system has been exemplified in a series of very extraordinary examinations, often upon subjects ridiculously remote from the requirements of the service. The results have not been satisfactory. The efficiency of the service has not been increased nor has its spirit improved, and there is no evidence that economies have been effected as regards the number of the personnel. There is still patronage, but is is exercised, as pointed out by the Prime Minister, by an irresponsible body, instead of by the government and parliament upon whom rests the responsibility for the conduct of the country's affairs. The thing is wrong, is known to be wrong and yet there exists a timorous reluctance to alter it. . . . . Since then, some sporadic efforts have been made to render the system less objectionable, but what is necessary is a thorough overhauling of the whole machine and the establishment of another order of things, one in which the responsibility of the government will be recognized and restored.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have given sufficiently to the House the reasons why I am in favour of the amendment that the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) intended to move. I am informed, however, that one hon. gentleman on this side of the House will take care of that amendment. I am in favour of a return to the law of 1908, taking away the exterior service from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. To sum up I may say that my first reason is that of economy; my second reason is that patronage still exists under this law, but instead of being in responsible hands it is exercised by those who are not accountable to the people; and my third reason is that although neither the government nor hon. members have anything whatsoever to say about appointments to the Civil Service, they are held responsible by the people for all the appointments made and for the fitness of the appointees, a state of things which is absolutely unjust, unfair, and unconstitutional.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one subject upon which we might expect hon. members would come to practical unanimity it is the one now under consideration. Yet we find a very great divergence of opinion, because the subject involves the efficient and economical working of our parliamentary institutions. But because of that very fact we should as business men be able to arrive at a conclusion without, in my judgment bringing any prejudice or partisan feeling into play.

Now, I shall endeavour to present some of the historical aspects of this question. Previous to 1918 there had grown up a body of opinion in the country which felt that the evils of government patronage had assumed very large proportions. I think that opinion was exaggerated. There were, no doubt, some evils, but my impression is that in trying to cure them we brought in fully as many and perhaps more. In 1918 the matter had been receiving very careful consideration in the press and in parliament, and an effort was then made to remedy the alleged evils by an act of parliament. Acts of parliament do not always remedy the evils they are intended to alleviate. It is to be assumed, however, that the late government, who put the act into operation, were in sympathy with its provisions. The commission was appointed by that government and proceeded to work under that act. But the measure was found to be impracticable and unworkable; and I have the best possible proof for that, because the late government brought in a body of experts from Chicago, known as the Arthur Young Company, to assist the Civil Service Commission, and the government and the Civil Service in bringing order out of the chaos which even then existed under the operation of this act. Well, that body of experts failed to bring about workable conditions, and another bunch of experts were brought in from the United States—I refer to the Griffenhagen concern. At very great expense to the country they worked for a considerable length of time, but they also failed; apparently they made confusion worse confounded, and the conditions became very bad. I will not depend upon newspaper reports with regard to those conditions; I will take the statements made by members of the late government or gentlemen supporting them, to show how impracticable the whole thing was. It was stated by a member of the then government on May 2, 1921—the statement will be found on page 2875 of Hansard of that year—that a certain position had been advertised for; that four hundred applications were received for the position, and that the Civil Service Commission were appalled at the number of applications which came in. They could not examine all these applications, and they did not try. They appointed three men in Ottawa, one of them the editor of the Journal, to go over them. When these gentlemen saw the number of applications that had been received they too were appalled at the magnitude of the task. Well, according to a statement of a minister of the Crown in the government of that day, they threw three hundred of these applications into the waste paper basket without looking at them at all; then they made

a cursory examination of the remainder and recommended a name to the Civil Service Commission for appointment. I assume that their recommendation was acted upon. Now, I ask hon. members of the House, was that an appointment by the Civil Service Commission? Was that an appointment on a business basis? Was that fair to the three hundred persons whose applications were thrown to one side without any consideration at all? Was that an appointment according to merit? It was a minister of the Crown who made that statement.

Mr. McMASTER: What minister?

Mr. HUGHES: The member representing Frontenac at that time. I do not know what position he held in the government, but he was a minister of the Crown.

Mr. HOCKEN: He was not a minister at that time.

Mr. HUGHES: That was in 1921.

Mr. HOCKEN: He was not a minister when he made that statement.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, he became a minister shortly after.

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: On the same day, page 2859 of Hansard, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) said:

> Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to see any merit in the Civil Service Act, because I believe it strikes at the very foundation of responsible government.

I think so, too.

> As it has worked out I think it might very well have been described as "An Act to Destroy the Discipline of the Civil Service and to Promote Inefficiency."

I will give a statement of another member supporting the late administration, the then member for North Perth. I will not quote his words, but they may be found on page 2280 of Hansard, May 2, 1921. He went on to show that the work the Civil Service Commission had to do was so extensive that they were not attending to it at all, or not attending to it in any proper way. He gave this illustration: A certain position was advertised for, and a certain man sent in his application. Some months passed, and having received no notice in regard to the matter he made inquiry of the commission concerning the paper he had sent in. He received a reply stating that he would have to know the French language before he could be appointed to the position in question. He said, "My application showed that I am familiar with the French language." Apparently the paper had not even been read. He followed the matter up, and later the commission told him that the position would have to go to a returned soldier. "Why," he said, "my application showed that I was a returned soldier; I went over early in the war and did not come back until after the armistice was signed." Another position became vacant in the post office in Toronto, and a returned soldier who had undergone a double amputation, having had both his legs taken off, applied for the position; it was that of attending the switchboard in the post office. He did not get it; another man was appointed. The position of stamp vendor became vacant, and he applied for that. He was told that that position had been given to another person, and that he had better apply for the position of letter carrier—and that man had both legs off. It may just be possible that the Civil Service Commission has so much work to do that they cannot attend to these things; but in their efforts to control everything they have certainly gone far beyond what I believe was the intention of parliament at the time of the passing of the act of 1918. I have some other cases here, but I do not think I need refer to them.

Some amendments were made to the act in 1921, and the fact that the late government found it advisable to bring in the Spinney Bill to amend the Civil Service Act is the best possible proof that it had come to the decision that the act ought to be amended. I should think that is the best possible proof to convince hon. gentlemen opposite. Then we have the present government stating—and I submit that men in the responsible position of a minister of the Crown when they make a statement in parliament should receive consideration—that they find the system unworkable, impracticable to a very large degree, and expensive. I remember the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) giving a concrete instance last year. He wanted two men for seasonal work and applied to the Civil Service Commission, but before he could get them appointed, the time for doing the work had passed, and it had to remain undone. Is it fair, is it reasonable, is it common sense, that the members of this House and the people of this country should expect efficiency from the government under such conditions? People do not expect it in any other kind of business. If the heads of departments of a large corporation, for instance, told the directors that they simply could not get along properly under their present system of appointments and promotions, what would the directors do? They would certainly allow their managers a very large voice in appointing their clerks and assistants and in making promotions and allotting the work. I do not

think it is a far-fetched comparison to compare parliament to a business corporation. We, the members of the House, are the directors for the time being, and the members of the government are the managers of the country's business, and we should not in justice look to the managers for proper results unless we give them control in a large measure over their assistants. If their selection and promotion is left to an outside body entirely, we cannot expect good results. I think anybody with an open mind who listened to the speech made by the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) the other night must have come to the conclusion that the Civil Service Act requires overhauling and amending, or we shall have greater inefficiency and more chaos than we have now.

What should we do under these circumstances? The Prime Minister has made the suggestion that the whole matter be referred to a special committee of the House. Can anybody suggest a better proposition? That proposition was not accepted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) withheld his assent; I do not know whether he was entirely opposed to it or not.

But can either of these members or
5 p.m. any other man suggest a better proposition? The hon. leader of the Progressives did suggest an alternative. He stated that if the present government would study this question in the light of the experience they have had since taking office, and would bring down their proposals to the House, so far as he was concerned he was ready to give them every reasonable consideration. I would say to the hon. member that that is impossible of fulfilment during this session. I think the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) would be the first to agree with me, if he were in his seat at the moment, that during a session of the House members of the government are so busy with the thousand and one things that come before them daily for adjustment that they have not time to give to a question of this kind the consideration it should receive. Furthermore, if the government brought down such proposals to the House, I fear very much whether it would not be considered that there was partisanship and patronage behind the move. Judging by this debate alone, I believe that the government would be charged with having ulterior and sinister motives in bringing down such proposals. That charge could not very well be made against a report by a committee of this House representing all parties. More than that, such a committee could bring before it the members of the Civil Service Commission, and if these men have been maligned or in any way misrepresented as the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) intimated, if the work they have done is not fully appreciated by this House and the country, what better place and what better opportunity could be given them than to present their case before a special committee of this House? The deputy ministers could also appear before the committee, the chief clerks in departments, and anybody who had useful information to give, and if a committee under those circumstances could not bring in a report that would be useful to the House, I can see no other way of dealing with this question. We must approach it in some way. It is too important to make of it a political party question. Parliament should have even more interest in this question than the government, because as the years pass, governments will come and governments will go, but parliamentary institutions, let us hope, will endure forever, and we, the members of this House,who have far more time on our hands than the ministers have should be quite willing to do our part in trying to solve this difficulty, and solve it fairly.

I do not think any man in this House or out of it wants to bring back any of the evils that existed under the patronage system. I think that is admitted on all sides. But what in the world can the objection be to have a special committee representing all parties in this House taking this matter up, considering it carefully, hearing all the evidence they can get upon it, and bringing in a report and letting the House consider it? I think, upon second consideration, that the member from Brandon (Mr. Forke) will see how reasonable that is and a number of the members on that side of the House would probably take the same view. There is another reason that I want to present to this House and to my Progressive friends particularly. They take pretty advanced views, more advanced views than the rest of us, I think, in regard to the amount of control, management and supervision that governments should give to several matters. For instance, I think they are in favour of government ownership, control and management of the merchant marine. If I am wrong in that I want to be corrected. It must be because they think that these things could be governed more efficiently and capably by governments than by men who have had years of experience in that line of business. I am quite sure my Progressive friends are in favour of government buying and selling and marketing wheat, and for the

reason that they must consider that governments are more capable and more efficient than men who have been engaged in that work for many years. Furthermore, I believe that my Progressive friends have strong views that the government should take greater oversight, control and management of the banking institutions of the country than they have hitherto taken, because they have greater faith in the honesty, the integrity and the ability of governments than they have in the men who have managed and are managing the banking institutions of the country, and at the same time some of these men think that the government is not honest enough and not capable enough to appoint its own servants, or its own officials, to look after the business that pertains properly to itself—that the government is able to mind everybody else's business and not able to mind its own. I do not think I am overstating the case. I hold a different opinion. I hold the view that the government should be allowed large control over their own work, and they should be very wary and careful in taking the management or control of a business that is operated by people who have given years of experience to it.

Mr. Speaker, I see no other way of solving this difficulty than by carrying out the suggestion of the Prime Minister, and doing it this session. I agree with the hon. member for West Toronto that the Civil Service Commission strikes at the very foundation of responsible government, and responsible government has been purchased at too high a price in this country to be lightly regarded or lightly discarded.

I have presented the matter to the House as strongly as I could in favour of the appointment of a committee to inquire into this whole question, and I therefore move:

—that the word "repeal" in the motion now before the House be struck out, and the following substituted therefor—appoint a special committee for the purpose of inquiring into the operation of—

In order that hon. members may appreciate the effect of the amendment, the motion would read in this way, if my amendment were adopted:

That in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to appoint a special committee for the purpose of inquiring into the operation of chapter 12, 8-9 George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

My motion is seconded by the hon. gentleman for St. James (Mr. Rinfret).

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

[Mr. Hughes.]

Mr. R. K. ANDERSON (Halton): I note the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to repeal chap. 12, 8-9 George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

I presume from the wording of this resolution that the intention was to repeal the whole act and do away with the Civil Service Commission. The amendment proposes to refer to a parliamentary committee, for investigation, the question of the abolition of the Civil Service Commission. In 1918, when we first passed the Civil Service Act, it was thought by members on the government side of the House that we had for all time settled the question of political patronage. It was a question that was mentioned during the election of 1919 and was a part of the platform of the Union government at that time. Then the Union government passed that act for the purpose of carrying out and fulfilling its pledge to the people of Canada. We passed the act with the full assurance that the people of this country were demanding it, and that they wished that political patronage, which had been used by various political parties throughout the history of the country should be abolished. I think it was admitted by all parties on both sides of the House that that system was capable of a great deal of abuse and that it probably had been abused by both political parties. I cannot say that I have had any experience in regard to that myself. So far as I was aware, there was not much abuse in connection with that system. However, in the larger centres of the Dominion it is realized that there was a good deal of abuse, and that it would be in the best interests of all concerned, and the Civil Service in particular, that political patronage should be done away with. The act passed at that time placed in the hands of the Civil Service Commission the appointment, under a system of merit, of all members of the Civil Service throughout Canada. In 1908 an act had been passed taking the control of civil servants, particularly in the inside service, from the various departments. The act of 1918 went further and brought in the outside service, placing under the control of the Civil Service Commission something like 50,000 civil servants throughout the Dominion.

I believe that since that time the Civil Service Commission have endeavoured, with all their might, to give the best service possible to the people of this country. They have instituted examinations by which applicants for positions under the government were given

the opportunity of showing, to properly constituted persons who were capable of deciding the matter in the public interest, whether or not they possessed the qualifications necessary to entitle them to admission to the public service and discharge their duties in a manner satisfactory to the public. The Civil Service Commission did, I think, in some instances, institute examinations which possibly at certain times did not result in giving the best results to the people. I think that in some instances, particularly in the outside service where a simple academic examination takes place, a person may pass that examination and obtain 100 per cent of the marks required, and yet be not possessed of the qualifications that go to make up a good public servant. There are certain qualifications needed in a civil servant that cannot be disclosed by an academic examination, for example the qualities of the man himself—qualities of head and of heart—which enable him to deal with the public in a way which is pleasing to them; and after all it is the personal element in the outside service which exercises a very important influence. But taking it all in all, I certainly think that since that time the Civil Service Commission have given very good returns to the country, and I certainly would not like to see that body abolished now, or any time in the future.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would not my hon. friend admit that an academic examination may be misleading in all cases?

Mr. ANDERSON: That may be true in certain cases, but I would not feel disposed to admit that it would be a failure in all, or even the majority, of cases. I think there undoubtedly are certain positions in both the inside and the outside service where an academic examination is absolutely necessary. Without such an examination it would be possible that a person might enter the service who was wholly unfitted for office; I do not think there is any doubt upon that point.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. gentleman asserts that my suggestion would be possible, would he not admit that it would be probable?

Mr. ANDERSON: It might be probable, in fact I think it has occurred in the past, that persons have been admitted to the public service who lacked the education and the other qualities necessary to render them good public servants.

Mr. LOVETT: Do you think it fair that the Civil Service Commission should delegate the power to an officer—for instance a collector of customs, or some other person—at a distance to practically make an appointment to an office that was vacant?

Mr. ANDERSON: I do not know that the Civil Service Commission delegate authority to such persons to make appointments. I believe, however, that it is quite within their jurisdiction to ask someone to give them information with regard to the qualifications of certain candidates, and doubtless it is quite proper for them to do so. Such person probably makes a report and the Civil Service Commission might consider his recommendations; I do not think he makes the appointment. I think that under all the circumstances it could not be expected that the Civil Service Commission, sitting in Ottawa, could decide, without some recommendation from the outside, who was the best man to appoint, for example, in the case of a vacancy in the city of Vancouver. I think they must take recommendations from others. Under the act of 1918 they were not permitted to accept recommendations from members of parliament, and I do not know but that might have been a mistake. The resolution before the House simply asks us to abolish the whole Civil Service Act and do away with the Civil Service Commission. The amendment asks that the subject be referred to a parliamentary committee. My impression was that the subject was referred to a parliamentary committee in 1921, when the Spinney Bill was up for consideration, and the committee at that time reported against taking the outside service from the control of the Civil Service Commission. The investigation made at that time was fairly exhaustive. All the deputy ministers in the public service were called before the committee and gave evidence and, if I mistake not, with only two exceptions they declared that the Civil Service Commission was in the best interests of the country and that it would be a deplorable thing if the appointment of civil servants, whether in the outside or the inside service, wer taken away from the Civil Service Commission. I believe that two deputy ministers on that occasion did not agree with that view. I think the Prime Minister, in the speech he made here only a few days ago, stated that at the present time the deputy ministers of the various departments are in accord with the present resolution to do away with the Civil Service Commission, and I was very much surprised to hear that statement. I was wondering whether the present government have changed their views since 1921. Is it possible that the change of government has had something to do with the change of view on the part of the present Prime Minister?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think the Prime Minister made that statement.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am not permitted to read from his address.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, you are permitted.

Mr. ANDERSON: I had supposed that I was not permitted to quote at this time from his address on that occasion, and therefore I did not bring a copy of it with me. I do not know that I could turn it up just at the moment. I might read an extract from the Ottawa Citizen, which states:

> On page 363 of this Hansard the premier is quoted to the following effect: "The deputy ministers themselves have, in joint conference, gone very carefully into the whole matter, and they are unanimously of the view that the act as it stands at the present time is in some of its aspects embarrassing public service, that it is increasing the cost of the service, and that if it were amended all the good that is in the act might be obtained and very much of the evil eliminated."

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is different from the statement my hon. friend made.

Mr. ANDERSON: Now, the Prime Minister was not in the House in 1918 when the act was passed, and I am not sure that he was a member of parliament in 1919 when it was amended. But the mover of the present resolution (Mr. Power) has somewhat changed his attitude on this question. In his speech in opposition to the Spinney amendment, which will be found on page 2780 of Hansard of the year 1921, he said:

> Mr. Speaker, before we take up the second reading of this bill I would like to register my opposition to any measure of this nature. . . This bill, if it means anything, means that in certain services we are to introduce the old abuses of patronage, and this is all the more irregular and all the more to be condemned since we have before us an election which we all hope will be held soon. ....It is our duty to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are not guilty of any back-sliding, that once having entered on the path of reform and of uplift they shall continue to the end of their days, which we all believe will be soon.

It is rather strange that in the short space between the time the hon. member for Quebec South was in opposition and the time his party came into power he should so completely have revised his opinions on this subject. It is remarkable that what he regarded as good while he was in opposition he should declaim against as something bad now that his party has come into power. He must evidently see that the operation of the Civil Service Act does not afford the government any scope for the bestowal of patronage in order to help them to retain their supporters in the various districts throughout the country during an election. The members of both parties that constituted the Union government realised that aspect of the matter. I realised it myself. But in the interests of the country and of an efficient civil service and in the interests of economy, we were willing to subordinate our own views on the question and to support the Civil Service Act, in the hope and the belief that future governments would see to it that it was duly observed. I venture to say that the present government, even if they were disposed to repeal that act, would not have the courage to do so; they would realise that a strong public sentiment would find expression against such a move when they went to the country, because the great majority of the people feel strongly on the civil service question and believe that it would be a very reactionary step to abolish the Civil Service Commission and re-institute the political patronage system that has held sway in this country for so many years. Listening to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), said in his speech on this subject, I should judge that he is in favour of reverting to the Civil Service Act of 1908. The right hon. gentleman is in his seat and he will correct me if I have misconstrued his remarks.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not quite catch what my hon. friend said.

Mr. ANDERSON: I gathered from the remarks of the Prime Minister in this House on the 16th instant, that he was in favour of going back to the Civil Service Act of 1908.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the hon. member understood that he is entirely mistaken, because I am not in favour of any such thing. I cannot make that too plain.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am pleased to hear the Prime Minister make the correction.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am correcting my hon. friend's impression.

Mr. ANDERSON: Of course the mistake is mine, I am willing to admit that. But I do not think I am alone in the construction I have put on the Prime Minister's remarks. And to show that others understood the right hon. gentleman as I did I will quote from the Ottawa Citizen, which corroborates the view I have taken of the Prime Minister's remarks.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend would be more to the point if he would read my remarks instead of inferences drawn from them by the Ottawa Citizen.

Mr. ANDERSON: I accept my hon. friend's correction, but I merely want to show, by the quotation, that I am not alone in my construction of his remarks. Of course, if he says

that my understanding of what he said is wrong, then the Ottawa Citizen is wrong as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It certainly is.

Mr. ANDERSON: That is the point I was making. The Ottawa Citizen of February 22nd, 1923, makes a certain statement, which perhaps the Prime Minister has read.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, and I should like to know who wrote it. The writer did not append his name, and perhaps my hon. friend can tell me who wrote that article.

Mr. ANDERSON: I should be pleased to tell the Prime Minister if I knew, but I do not. The Citizen says:

> In the first place, on page 362 of the Hansard, February 16, the Premier supports an addition to the Power motion, that the Civil Service Act of 1908 take the place of the act of 1919.

It is apparent from this that the Citizen—which I do not think is antagonistic to the Prime Minister or his party—also erroneously interpreted my right hon. friend's remarks. Now, with regard to the assertion that the continuance of the Civil Service Commission is not in the interests of economy, I might observe that the various departments of government absolutely control the number of civil servants employed. The Civil Service Commission makes the appointments, but the ministers in the departments can disallow any appointment. They have absolutely in their control the number of civil servants and can reduce that number at any time. It is a mistaken idea that the Civil Service Commission makes the cost of civil government more expensive. The commission has nothing to do with the estimates submitted to the House by the various departments, nor have they anything whatever to do with the number of civil servants that are employed in any department. They make appointments simply at the request of the deputy minister or the minister, and if any appointment is not satisfactory the department can within the space of six months discontinue the service of such appointee and they can reject any one appointed by the Civil Service Commission until they get an appointee who is satisfactory to them. If any department is over-manned, it is entirely within the control of the minister or his deputy to reduce the staff. Consequently if the Civil Service Commission has nothing whatever to do with the cost of administering the various departments or the preparation of their estimates as regards salaries or anything else, it cannot be charged, as is asserted by some hon. members on the government side, with being in any way responsible for the excessive cost of the Civil Service.

Hon. members will remember that in 1921 there was a re-organization of the Printing Bureau. In that year the government of the day, finding there were too many employees in the bureau, requested the Civil Service Commission to make a reorganization. The commission did so, with the result that the number of employees was reduced from 1,159 to 732, and the more efficient work done by this smaller staff has effected a saving to the country of some $746,400 annually. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he might consider the desirability of requesting the Civil Service Commission to reorganize some of the other departments. I do not pretend that it would be possible to effect a similar economy in every other department, if the minister or his deputy is properly looking after each department and keeping the expense down as low as possible consistent with efficiency; but in view of the excellent results obtained from the reorganization of the Printing Bureau, it is not unreasonable to suppose that equally good results might be obtained in other departments of the Civil Service.

As I stated before, the investigation instituted by the late government in 1921 under the Spinney Bill revealed the fact that the deputy ministers in every department were strongly in favour of the retention of the Civil Service Commission. Probably the right hon. Prime Minister will be able to tell us why it is that there has been such a change of opinion on their part and that they are now in favour of restricting the jurisdiction of the commission to the inside service. It may even be that they claim the commission should be abolished entirely, I do not know.

It has been stated, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Service Commission is an irresponsible body, accountable neither to the government nor to parliament. I submit that under the Civil Service Act of 1908 the commissioners are responsible to the government and to parliament, because although they are appointed for ten years, they can be removed for misconduct by the Governor in Council on an address from the Senate or the House of Commons. If the Civil Service Commission is not giving proper service to the country, if it is not making good appointments to the Civil Service, then it is the duty of the government to take the necessary steps to replace the commissioners by others who may be expected to have a better conception of the obligations of their office. That is one of

the duties which the government owes to the people. For my part, I am making no charge whatever against the Civil Service Commission. Both the commission and its staff have always treated me with the greatest consideration and courtesy. I have not interfered to any extent with appointments in my constituency, because being in a rural district very few appointments come under the commission, and this legislation has not in any way injuriously affected either me or my constituentss.

Last year on the 29th June a reommendation was brought into the House that certain offices under the Crown should be removed from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. The recommendation was acted on, and I believe that quite a number of appointments have since been made by the government itself or by its members individually without taking into consideration any recommendation whatever from the commission. That is one step back, so far as the outside service is concerned, to the conditions which prevailed under the act of 1908. I think the present government has made quite a stride in that direction, and it seems to me that the hon. member for Quebec South might have been well satisfied with the promise already made without introducing this drastic resolution.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) referring the resolution back to a committee of the House is only another instance of history repeating itself. Under changed conditions it is possible that such a committee might bring in a different recommendation from that presented by its predecessor. As I look across the floor and find so many hon. members in opposition to the Civil Service Act, I have not any doubt that pressure has been brought to bear upon the Civil Service Commission to get appointments made in accordance with their wishes, and that that pressure is also being brought to bear upon the government, and I have no doubt that pressure will be exerted upon the deputy ministers who may give evidence before such a committee. Consequently it is quite likely that the finding of such a committee might be rather more favourable to withdrawing the outside service from the Civil Service Commission than was the case in 1921. Indeed, it is quite possible that with a large majority of the supporters of the government in opposition to the commission a change will be brought about to suit their wishes. I almost expect to see that happen, although I was pleased to hear the right hon. Prime Minister standing solidly behind the Civil Service Act of 1918 as amended in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You must have misunderstood the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON: I understood that the right hon. Prime Minister was not adverse to the act of 1918 as amended in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will not correct you on that point.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No private conversations. Let us hear what is passing between the hon. members over there.

Mr. ANDERSON: Perhaps I have misunderstood the right hon. Prime Minister. I understood him to say he was in favour of the act of 1918, that he was not in favour of going back to the act of 1908.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend is quite right.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am glad to hear the right hon. Prime Minister is in favour of the act of 1918.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why a committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To amend it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To amend what is all right!

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question that is really of importance is whether hon. members are in favour of a Civil Service Act operated by a Civil Service Commission. I am entirely in favour of a Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission. But I think the act as it stands is not as workable as it should be, I think it ought to be amended, and I think the right way to amend it would be to have a committee of this House make recommendations as to what form those amendments should take.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I was calling attention to. If the Prime Minister is not in favour of the act as it stands, he would not want a committee to amend it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is getting pretty fine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It must be pretty fine, yes.

Mr. ANDERSON: As the resolution is brought in by a private member, I would suppose that the Prime Minister had nothing to do with the suggested amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was my suggestion. He moved my suggestion in the form of an amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am pleased to hear that it was the suggestion of the Prime Minister that the amendment should be brought in.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was made in my speech.

Mr. ANDERSON: I did not notice that in the speech. I have not read the speech. I was simply quoting from memory what the right hon. Prime Minister had said.

The hon. member for King's P. E. I. (Mr. Hughes) has brought forward the amendment to the resolution, then, in the expectation that the government and its following will be behind it and that there will be quite a change in the act of 1919. It is evidently the intention of the government to take away from that act the control of the outside service by the Civil Service Commission. I am sorry to hear that, Mr. Speaker. I think it will not be in the best interests of the country; it will not be in the best interests of the government itself. I should think that an act passed by a coalition government in which both parties, Liberal and Conservative, were represented—

Mr. TRAHAN: No.

Mr. ANDERSON: An hon. gentleman says, "No," but we had a large number of Liberals. It may not have been called a coalition government, but it was a union government in which both parties were represented. That government came to the conclusion that it was in the best interests of this country that the Civil Service Commission should have charge of all appointments both to the inside and to the outside service. The fact that the act was passed in that way ought to be a good indication that it is a proper measure and in the best interests of the country, and I should be sorry indeed to see it changed.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a long speech on this motion, but I would like to say a few words by way of qualifying the vote that I intend to give on this matter.

Different opinions are entertained as regards Civil Service appointments. Some claim that they would be better looked after by men independent of immediate political influence; others want to establish a distinction between certain positions and to have different classes established in the Civil Service so far as control by the commission is concerned. Still others support the claim that such appointments should remain with the ministers. In all this array of opinions there is one principle which has always appealed to me stronger than any of the euphemisms with which so-called reformers try to clothe their idealistic proposals. It is a principle of plain, simple good sense, namely, that control should rest where responsibility rests. Call it what you wish, patronage or any other name, what we must first ask of ourselves is merely this: "Who has been entrusted by the people to administer the affairs of this country?" Is it not clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are endowed not only with legislative but also with executive power, that is, the government has executive power and is responsible to the House, which, through its majority, approves or disapproves of the government's actions. It goes without saying that, believing in this principle, I am against government by commission. At best a commission is only an expediency; it may serve a temporary purpose, but I claim it should not be resorted to as a permanent institution. I do not believe in a commission—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he deny the right of parliament, or does he regard it as unconstitutional, to assign to a commission the administration of some of the public affairs of the country.

Mr. BELAND: He did not say that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): He practically says that.

Mr. BELAND: Oh, no.

Mr. RINFRET: Does my hon. friend intend to reply to his own question? I do not deny that right, I say we should not exercise it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Oh; that is another thing.

Mr. RINFRET: I do not believe in a commission to make purchases for the state, and I do not believe in a commission as a permanent body to appoint functionaries or employees for a responsible government. Not that I revel in patronage, Mr. Speaker; not that I wish to feed on it politically or reap the benefits of it; far from it. Of all the functions that a member of parliament has to exercise, none appeals to me less than the dispensation of patronage. I am a man of study There is nothing I would like more than to lock myself in a library and study the respective merits of proportional representation, or the single tax, or indulge in any other speculation of the mind. But if a poor man, one of the many thousands who have placed their trust in me, knocks at my door, I do not feel that I am right in pursuing the phantasy of my study; I consider I must close my book and open the door.

Others look at patronage as an evil; I look upon it as a duty—a sad and trying one, yet a duty that our constituents expect us to fulfil. It is all very well to uplift our minds to the serene regions of idealism, but it has appeared to me that often the revulsion against patronage verges on an unconscious desire for idleness or freedom from a very trying and unsavoury obligation.

When a man requires my help—and may I say that in city ridings at least an elector is a man known to us only by his residence, his political colour we have no means to ascertain—I do not find that I can say to him: "You have appointed me to look after your welfare, but my hands are tied. What you have to do is to write to a group of commissioners appointed by a government long since gone out of office—it is to them that you must apply." If I am to be held responsible, Mr. Speaker, I claim my share of control.

I do not consider, either, that the present system has shown more efficiency than the old one. The system of examinations is an arbitrary one; it never covers the field that is to be later explored by the appointee, and when it is extended to the more modest functions of the service it becomes a mere farce. Imagine holding an examination for the appointment of a sweeper—a competition of sweepers, with delicate instruments to record the quantity of dust removed, should prove of great interest. And I do not believe that a postman needs to know more about geography than that of his immediate vicinity. I submit that at their best, examinations are a very arbitrary way of making appointments.

I am not ready to admit that this method has done away with patronage, as has been said; not at all. It is merely taking patronage from the hands of responsible ministers and placing it in the hands of life-long appointed, irresponsible commissioners. I believe in going to a minister to discuss a matter of this kind. When a member is made a minister he still remains a human being, but when he becomes a commissioner he is involved in a new state of mind that may carry him anywhere, and without pointing to any one in particular I may say that if you wish to develop autocracy in this country you are doing it right along by multiplying the number of commissions composed of irresponsible persons carrying out work that should belong to responsible people.

I need not add that I am not a strong believer in the Civil Service Commission. The only argument advanced in favour of it is that it is able to perform a work that we were elected to accomplish, but that we are unable to do ourselves. I cannot admit that. If we keep going in that direction we may in the early future appoint another commission to adopt legislation and sit in parliament in our stead, and then the claim of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader), that our indemnity is too high, will have been vindicated.

I am willing to vote for an amendment to submit the whole question to a committee, because I understand that it may be imprudent to put a stop abruptly to a system, however disputable, that has obtained for a number of years. It has been suggested that such a committee has sat in previous years. I submit Mr. Speaker, that this is altogether a new parliament, a parliament that has had no occasion to submit its opinions on this matter, and I believe that this is an argument that should appeal especially to the Progressive group. I strongly hope that parliament will see its way clear to appoint such a committee, and I hope that whatever the results may be, they will be in accordance with this principle, which I consider is of high importance, that control and responsibility should go together. I shall vote for the amendment.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to crave the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes to make a few remarks on this subject. In the first place, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) for his calm discussion of the subject, for his reasonable, instructive criticism, and for the valuable suggestions he has made with a view to remedying the defects of the service. He, along with other members of this House, traced the history of the Civil Service Commission, noting its growth for the four short years of its existence, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to the character of these four years. They were years ripe with unrest, full of effort to establish returned men, years of return to a normal condition and years of reduction of abnormal staffs which had been increased by war burdens. In the face of these difficulties, Sir, one would naturally expect that we would be asked to be patient with the work of the commission, that we would give it time to reach the years of normal condition before the House could be asked to behead an innocent victim, an innocent offender, and, in common with the hon. member for Calgary West, I should like

to ask now where comes the demand for this decapitation.

The last speaker gave as his reason the objection to government by commission, and yet a very few months ago this government placed under the administration of a commission the affairs of our National Railway. We heard no objection at that time nor have we since to government by commission. I do not criticize the government for this commission, I rather approve of it, because no government, or no cabinet, either in the past or yet to come, can undertake, with any measure of success the work or the administration of these railways. Neither do I believe that any cabinet or government could carry on with any measure of success the Civil Service of this country.

What then is the cause of this effort to decapitate the commission? I think you will rather find it in the words of the last speaker who expressed a desire to retire to his office where he would study the subjects of proportional representation, the single transferable vote, or rep. by pop. But in the midst of his study, in the midst of his dreams, there came a rapping at the door.

Now, Sir, we are all familiar with the work of the elements of nature. Repeated rappings can get upon the nerves of any man or any body of men. Let me state again that repeated rappings can get upon the nerves of any man or organization of men, and I have no fear but that these rappings have got upon the nerves of the government. If they continue long enough the air, the atmosphere, the attic, the cellar, the empty rooms, and the walls will all be inhabited by spirits and this rapping will continue. On more than one occasion we have heard of the work of the elements of nature. Two years ago our friends, the farmers of Ontario, had experienced the force of the elements of nature. Winds were constantly taking their words from their mouths and translating them into language they were not acquainted with, words they had never spoken. The wind was given as the cause for all this trouble, and so I think this move has been caused by the rappings. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself, no doubt has heard these rappings. There came a rapping from Alberta, and when he went to the door the Hon. Frank Oliver was there. Defeated candidates have been affected by these rappings. The members of the government, the elected members, have become affected by these rappings, and I have no doubt the minister in charge of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) has heard many rappings from my own constituency. Some of them have taken the form of a rifle or a pistol held at his head, and demands have been made upon him. These are the causes of this move, I am afraid, and the rappings upon the door represent the demands of all the members and their supporters, and now comes this unexpected move to decapitate the innocent commission.

I would like to pass from these rappings and writings and ask the government to pay attention to the voice of independent people, such as the voice of the hon. member for Calgary West, and in addition I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister, although he is not in his seat to-night, to his words on page 368 of Hansard, where an independent voice spoke in this country and gave warnings of what was going on, and to draw the attention of the House to the occasion on which this voice was heard. The Prime Minister, in speaking, referred to the letter of Dr. Grant, and said:

> This civil service reform movement is supposed to be a reform movement, a moral reform. This is a strange kind of morality, to stir up antagonisms by false representations concerning the government, then claim that such a movement is helping along the cause of morality in this country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a principal of a college of young men will lend himself to that kind of false representation with respect to any branch of the public service in this country, the time has come—

And so forth.

These words were spoken with regard to a statement issued by Dr. Grant and I would like to draw the attention of the House this evening to the character of the man who made the statement referred to. There were two very celebrated men produced in this country, who were known by their breadth of vision and by their efforts to upbuild the country as a whole. One was Sir John A. Macdonald, the other was Principal Grant. The latter was a son of Nova Scotia, a province which is noted for the numerous talented men it has given to the public life of Canada, men who have become famous from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I know of none of them more celebrated than Principal Grant. Dr. Grant is the son of the celebrated Prinicipal Grant. Now, one would judge from the remarks of the Prime Minister when he spoke the other day that he was referring to a person unfriendly to his government. Those of us who have been college mates of Dr. Grant well know that he is not unfriendly to this government, that he is imbued with the principles of the Liberal party, and therefore the Prime Minister was not speaking of an opponent but of one of his own strong supporters. I do not think such words should have been spoken of any person who holds

a position such as that of Dr. Grant. What is the effect of such utterances? It is to deter citizens of this country from expressing any opinion in regard to the public administration. Those of us who have, perhaps, taken some interest in public affairs, municipally and otherwise, know how often we have gone to the place of nomination on the day fixed and found that there were not sufficient electors present to nominate candidates for the different positions. We have had occasion to regret that so few take an interest in the public affairs of Canada, and yet as soon as one man shows his interest in the administration of the government, he is immediately spoken of by the Prime Minister of Canada in the language which I have read from Hansard. I think it is only fair to the gentleman in question that the Prime Minister should withdraw any words derogatory to his character.

An hon. MEMBER: I hope not.

Mr. ROSS: An hon. member says he hopes not, but I appeal to the intelligent people of this country and ask them if they do not want criticism of our political parties. If honest and efficient administration is to be expected on the part of the government we must look for intelligent criticism from independent citizens, and if the object of the utterances referred to is to deter criticism of the government or a party, then I think it is a false position for the Prime Minister, or for the leader of any party, to take.

I have nothing further to say than that I wish to protest with all my might against any remarks that would reflect upon the character of this gentleman. He is a son of Nova Scotia, he has been trained by his father, he takes the same interest in public affairs that his father did, and he supports and is friendly to the Liberal party. Therefore, I think that the words which I have indicated, and the advantage which has been taken of this gentleman, are unfair.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I had the advantage of being a member of this House in 1908 when the Civil Service Amendment Act was introduced by the late Hon. Sydney Fisher, and as a member of the Liberal party I supported the measure and helped to pass it through the House. It was not supposed at that time that the law was perfect, but we were all sincere in our efforts to introduce civil service reform into the country, and the operation succeeded as most of the reform measures undertaken by the statesmen of that time did. But this statute is not to be compared with the law of the Medes and Persians; it is subject to change; it must be changed to meet the changing conditions that arise. Before casting my vote I wish to say that I will support the amendment, because I could not vote for the main motion, having always been a consistent supporter of the Civil Service Commission. But that body itself discovered that a load was placed upon its shoulders which it could not very well carry. The opening paragraph of the report of the special committee appointed to consider the Spinney Bill declares that civil service reform in Canada was carried much further than in the United States and in England; and to-day we see the Civil Service Commission of this country of its own volition, coming to the government and saying "We wish to be relieved of a certain work which has been placed upon us because we cannot carry out that work satisfactorily." For that reason I think the House should not refuse the occasion which is now presented to us of obtaining further light on this question.

There is a grievance here, and, whether it is well founded or not, it should be investigated, It is an axiom of our government that every grievance should be investigated and remedied. The House will have an opportunity, when the report of this committee is brought in, of discussing the merits of any suggestions that may be made; but in the meantime I think it would cause a very bad feeling throughout the country if we were to refuse an investigation into this matter. I have been brought up in the principles of the Liberal party; I have had the honour of a seat in this House now for pretty nearly twenty-four years; and I have always tried to discharge, to the best of my ability, my duty toward my constituents who have been very kind to me in re-electing me at six general elections. You cannot change the mentality of the people by a statute of parliament. The people look to their representatives to do this, that and the other thing for them. If the location of a post office is to be changed, if an office is to be opened, if a breakwater or a wharf is to be erected in some locality, if some change is necessary in connection with the service of the government railway running through a constituency, the people naturally look to their representatives to guard their interests. It would be useless for me—and the conditions, I suppose, are somewhat similar in other parts of Canada—to declare that I am sent here merely to support my party and to vote and that I have nothing more to do with the administration of these affairs.

I will be held responsible at election time, if I live until then, for everything that happens here, and every member of this House is in the same position that I am in. We are held

responsible for all the good and all the wrong that the Civil Service Commission or any other commission, may do. We are the peoples' representatives, and, whether we like it or not, have to assume responsibility for what happens here. I do not want to shirk my duty. I want to see civil service reform carried out. I want to see a man occupying a position in the public service who fulfils his duty properly, maintained in his position; I want him to get promotion, advancement, all the advantages which were contemplated by the original Civil Service Act. But on the other hand, if a committee of this House can ascertain from the permanent heads of departments, and from the Civil Service Commission itself, that certain modifications in the act are necessary in the public interest, that certain appointments should be made differently from the manner in which they are made now, I think it would be unfair and unworthy on our part to refuse such an investigation.

There is no doubt that the intention of the Civil Service Act originally was to require the competitive examinations for certain positions which needed such examinations. These were mainly located at Ottawa. There was a clause in the act which enabled the government after an experience of conditions had been acquired, to bring the outside service under the act if that were deemed necessary, but at the time the statute was applied only to the inside service. There are a large number of appointments made by the government which cannot be made properly except by competitive examination to ascertain the qualifications and competency of the aspirants to office. But any member of the Civil Service Commission will tell you that there are hundreds of apointments which can properly be made only by the departments interested. For example, how can you hold a competition for the appointment of a lighthouse keeper when every man in the community is competent for the work, which consists practically in keeping the lighthouse in order and lighting the lamp in the evening and putting it out in the morning? Or how will you hold a competitive examination to appoint a wharfinger or the postmaster of a small office? The man who would pass the examination with the highest percentage of marks might not reside in the locality where the post office is situated. These facts have been recognized by the commission themselves, when they suggested to the Post Office department that as a beginning all offices carrying a salary under $200 should be filled by the department itself. What happens now? A vacancy occurs in a small country post office. The department is notified; it notifies the commission, who ask for applications. These applications are passed over to the post office inspector and he holds an investigation and submits to the commission a report which naturally they must accept, because they have no other proper means of acquainting themselves with the facts. Now, here is an official of the Post Office Department called upon to act in behalf of the Civil Service Commission and to make a recommendation which under the circumstances they are bound to accept; for, to do otherwise, the commission would have to be charged with the duty of going from ocean to ocean to investigate these hundreds and thousands of vacancies that have to be filled every year.

I am sincerely in favour of the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission, as I was fifteen years ago when I supported the system and I will take the same stand to-day. But I think we are in duty bound to the public to adapt ourselves to its views as they change. There are two bodies of opinion in the country, one for and one against every question that arises. A new parliament has been elected since 1921; conditions have altered; public opinion has changed and continues to change. What may have been good immediately after the war, what may have been intended as a good measure and might have worked satisfactorily to a certain extent, may perhaps be susceptible of improvement now; and in giving my vote in favour of the amendment I am merely giving an opportunity to a committee, to be composed of the three parties in this House, to study the question and report upon it after a thorough investigation of all the facts. Such a committee would undoubtedly be in a position to pronounce the best judgment in the matter. I think therefore that under all the circumstances the amendment of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes) is a fair and moderate one which can be supported by the friends of Civil Service reform, and which I see no reason why the representatives of the people should not support, with a view to the proper conduct of the business of the country at as little cost as possible, and to the remedying of a grievance which undoubtedly exists in this matter.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): I have listened with a great deal of attention to this debate on civil service reform. I have paid considerable attention to what members have said on the government side to see if they could show any reason or advance any sound argument why a committee should be appointed to look into the question. I have no serious objection to the appointment of the committee itself, if it is not a camouflage to try to place the onus of the blame upon this

parliament as a whole. I cannot myself see why ministers who have been in power now for more than one session, and who have become familiar with the working of the Civil Service and with its evils, if there are any, cannot come forward in a manly way, assuming full responsibility, and say to us, as members representing the people of Canada, that the Civil Service Commission, with its intrigue and other evils, which they believe to exist, is not a workable one and that therefore they would ask for power to remedy those evils. But they have not done that. Not the government, but ordinary members on the government side, simply come to the House and make certain statements that seem to suggest that evil is rampant in the Civil Service, and ask us as a body in this House to vote for the appointment of a committee to investigate those evils; and then in some mysterious way this parliament will endeavour to remedy the same.

Now, the only member I have heard on that side who has brought forward any argument at all to show why the committee should be appointed is the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Marcil). All the other members who have spoken on the other side, far from saying that they want the committee, express the feeling that lies deep down in their hearts that they wish to have the Civil Service Commission removed altogether. They were not afraid to say so; they were quite frank in the matter. For that reason I am glad to know that there are hon. members on the government side of the House who when they were not in power believed sincerely in the Civil Service Commission. Because I believe that I think the Civil Service is safe.

My hon. friend suggested that public opinion is changing. I want to say to the government that it is on the strength of this theory of things changing that they are able to bring forward these various changes, such as they are doing to-day. The reason why they are not lowering the tariff to a greater extent than they are at the present time is evidently because public opinion, according to them, has changed since they got into power. Someone has said that one of the great blessings of humanity is the fact that we are able to forget promises and disagreeable things. But I am glad to say that there are some hon. members in the House. and some people out of the House, who read and remember, and who now recall that when certain ministers who sit on the government side to-day were in opposition they came out strongly for the Civil Service. And in order to remind the government of certain things that may induce them to be consistent, and in the hope that their voice may still be heard and that they may know how to vote, I will read some things that were said some time ago. Speaking in regard to the Spinney Bill which to a large extent was the same as the amendment that is proposed to-day, the Prime Minister on May 2, 1921, is thus reported:

> The whole purpose of Civil Service reform was to remove altogether the possibility of ministers acting in a partisan way. If a measure of this kind (the Spinney Bill) is permitted to pass it is setting back in a very real and substantial way the efforts of the past few years in the direction of civil service reform.

That is what the present Prime Minister said on May 2nd, 1921. Now, conditions have not changed materially in regard to the Civil Service; they are changed in regard to the government of the day. As far as the Civil Service is concerned, conditions are much the same as existed when that statement was made. Why then, does the Prime Minister to-day say that it is absolutely necessary for the sake of economy and service that the civil service legislation shall be changed?

But I would also like to quote, if it is permissible, the hon. gentleman who was elected to the first place in this House. The Speaker with all his parliamentary experience and ability expressed himself in these words in answer to a question respecting the Civil Service:

> My hon. friend knows that my hair turned grey during that regime. I was between the devil and the deep sea all the time.

He is speaking in reference to political patronage. He proceeds:

> It is a new departure in Canada. Let us live up to the promises, aye the sacred pledges made by gentlemen on both sides of the House when through the legislation in this respect adopted two years ago, we declared this country virtuous. I believe in the merit system. This bill is opposed, by the commission, by the independent press of Canada, and generally by public opinion. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) stated, when he introduced the bill the other day, that the commission had had an enormous task to perform. That is true, and it is because of the very extent of the task that there may have been some disappointments in the administration of the act. The reclassification in itself was a tremendous task, and although some mistakes were made, we must give the commission credit for having accomplished it. Is there any hon. member on this side or on that side who wishes to revert to that devilish system of political patronage, especially during election time? Let us get free from that system and give the commission an opportunity to exercise its full authority under the protection of parliament. Let that commission administer the act free from all influences. I was not a political friend of Dr. Roche or of M. Jameson when they sat in this House. They were, however, both personal friends, but as a Liberal, dyed-in-the-wool, I have the utmost confidence in the honour of Dr. Roche and Mr. Jameson; I fully trust their integrity, and parliament should support them and Mr. LaRochelle as well.

Here then is the statement of the Speaker of the House when as a private member he was revealing unto us the devilish system of patronage, knowing that all the time he was between the devil and the deep sea, and when he looked upon the Civil Service Commission as something that freed him from the octopus that was throwing its tentacles around members of the government. Is it in order to revive this devilish system that we had this exhibition of camouflage this afternoon whereby certain members on the government side while not supporting the amendment stated quite frankly their belief that they should have the responsibility of making certain appointments to the Civil Service, and indeed that the Civil Service Commission should be abolished altogether.

Now, I want to ask this question: Why does the government wish to get rid of the Civil Service Commission? What earthly object is there in doing that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend how he justifies himself in saying that the government wishes to get rid of the commission?

Mr. LEWIS: As far as the government is concerned, I mentioned a moment ago that I had not heard any member of the government speak either for or against the Civil Service Commission outside the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil).

Mr. MARTELL: You are drawing on a vivid imagination.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not drawing on a vivid imagination. I heard various members of the government say this afternoon that they wished to get rid of the commission. They said so quite frankly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What member of the government?

Mr. LEWIS: The members on the government side, if that is what you wish.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is altogether different.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Might I ask my hon. friend a question? What member on this side said he wanted to get rid of the Civil Service Commission? Did not my hon. friend understand me to say that I wanted to get rid of the Civil Service Commission in respect to the outside service?

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did I ask for the abolition of the Civil Service Commission in my speech?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Can the hon. member name one speaker on this side who urged the abolition of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. LEWIS: Well, if I were a spiritual medium and could read into your hearts, I would say that I think the whole bunch of you were in favour of the abolition of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My hon. friend is a mind reader.

Mr. LEWIS: That is all right, but some of the members who have spoken have failed to realize that very often the wish in the heart is given expression to, even though it be by subterfuge. Now, so far as the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) is concerned, he wanted to know whether he said he wanted to get rid of the Civil Service Commission. I have not his speech before me, but I remember quite well that he divided it into about three parts, A, B, and C, or something in that style. Under one proposal he would get rid of the commission; that is to say, he would put into the hands of some other people the lower class appointments—he dwelt a great while upon the lower class positions—although apparently by order in council, passed at the suggestion of the Civil Service Commission, those very classes have been withdrawn from its control. But at any rate he would place one class outside the jurisdiction of the commission, and he referred to the responsibility of making such appointments. Quite a few hon. members have stressed the point of responsibility in the matter, and one hon. gentleman asked the hon. Minister of Finance whether he would continue the present system if he were in a great business.

Well, there is this to be considered when you are dealing with a great business. As a usual thing the proprietor has been born into the business, he knows all about it from A to Z; but even then in some instances he is not qualified to judge who are the best men to be appointed to certain positions, and so he delegates this duty to one of his managers who is peculiarly qualified to undertake it. I can readily understand that where a new government comes into power every few years it is almost impossible for a minister to acquire such an intimate knowledge of every position in his department as would enable him to select the right man for any vacancy that might occur. For that very reason it would seem to me to be far better to place such appointments in the hands of an independent commission. Why, one hon. member answered the question not very long ago. When we asked him why the government

did not bring down its recommendations so that we might vote upon their merits, he replied: Why, the ministers of the government are so fully occupied with a hundred and one things concerning the business of the country that they have not time even to think about amendments to the Civil Service Act. Well, Sir, if members of the government are so completely occupied with national affairs, then I say they are certainly not justified in spending any of their precious time on political patronage. Let us take one example, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). If there is any man in this House who knows all about agriculture from A to Z I believe it is the hon. minister himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: All right. Yet I can readily conceive that the hon. minister would not be qualified to decide on the ability of an applicant for a technical or a scientific position in his department. Undoubtedly he is an exceptionally qualified gentleman in his own department, but lacking the requisite technical or scientific knowledge, he would not know whether he was appointing an efficient person or not. So for that reason it is readily understood that the commission must depend to a large extent upon somebody who is qualified to speak in respect to the man who is to be chosen. That seems to me to be the only sense in which it can be done.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is the hon. member in favour of having these technical officers appointed by the Civil Service Commission itself, or through some persons whom the Civil Service Commission asks to act as a board of advisers?

Mr. LEWIS: I would prefer the latter.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then you have it to-day. That is the way the Civil Service Commission is doing it.

Mr. LEWIS: And I think they are perfectly justified.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is where we disagree.

Mr. LEWIS: Most decidedly, if I am placed in a position as Civil Service Commissioner—

Mr. FOURNIER: What is the use of the Civil Service Commission then?

Mr. LEWIS: Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: Not at all. I thought I understood my hon. friend to say, "What is the use of the Civil Service Commission"?

An hon. MEMBER: That is what it is.

Mr. CALDWELL: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: It is order.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not understand what the hon. member said. I was pointing out that if the Civil Service Commission were dealing with technical or scientific appointments, I would not assume they would be qualified to judge in every particular; no government, no minister would be so qualified. Only men qualified to speak under such circumstances—when we consider the business of the country that is at stake and what it means to the country at large—should have a voice in that affair. For that reason I think the Civil Service Commisisoners are pursuing a wise, sane and intelligent policy in going to qualified sources for their information in regard to the application that is before them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Would the hon. member not be in favour of having these same qualified officers paid by the government to act as a board and be responsible to the government as members of the Civil Service Commission, rather than leaving it to independent people outside the Civil Service Commission and responsible to nobody? That is what I myself have advocated: that these men should be paid; that they should be under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. gentleman has a most peculiar way, as some other hon. members have, of asking a question; they almost try to put the answer into one's mouth before giving him time to speak. Now, so far as responsibility is concerned—

Mr. MICHAUD: We have not got it yet.

Mr. LEWIS: I believe in a commission that would be altogether free from political influences.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. member applauds that statement. Probably, then, we shall be able to defeat this amendment and allow the commission to have the source of power which it has at the present time.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Under the present law the Governor in Council appoints judges, men who occupy the highest positions in the land.

These are the most important appointments that can be made; the judges have more to do with the rights of the people than any other class of citizens in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. MARTELL: Let me preface my remarks, please. Would my hon. friend give to the Civil Service Commission, which consists of a doctor, an ex-town clerk and an ex-lawyer, the right to select judges?

Mr. LEWIS: I should think they would be just as well qualified to select judges as the present administration. If there is one thing I regard as detestable in any country, it is for a government to be able to appoint the highest officials in the land, officials who act in a judicial capacity, and especially when —well, perhaps I had better not say it; but I feel it in my heart. I feel that appointments to positions of the highest judicial capacity should not be made by any government so far as that is concerned.

Mr. JACOBS: Who should appoint them?

Mr. LEWIS: Never mind; you know who appoints them at the present time, and if you look at the history of some of the appointments and see what the leanings have been in the years gone by, you will understand why they have been appointed. I am not freeing any party from that. I read a statement only the other day in one of the newspapers in regard to judgeships and other appointments, which showed that in a great many instances these men had been defeated candidates in times past.

Mr. MARTELL: That is nothing against them.

Mr. LEWIS: Nothing against them? It is nothing for them. When a man fails to get the support of the people in his own community and then the party that attains power turns around and appoints him to the highest position in the land, there is something seriously wrong in our democracy.

Mr. McMASTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. LEWIS: I want just to let the government know where they stand on some of these matters. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) on March 11, 1921, said this:

> I do not believe in political patronage. It has been tried in many countries of the world, and it has been found wanting everywhere.

A man who is enlightened; one of the men who has recently seen light on the Liberal side, who has made an exhaustive study of the democracies of the world, says that if you revert to any condition of patronage, you are making a retrograde movement. That is where we stand to-day. No country in the world than can claim the name of democracy would go back to the patronage system that we have heard so much about this afternoon. What seems to be the matter with the Civil Service in the minds of some hon. members is that those hon. members have failed to get the people appointed whom they wanted to get appointed.

Now, one hon. member asked certain questions, and I would like to answer them. It was the hon. member who attempted to pour oil on the troubled waters; I think it was the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEWIS: It makes no difference; he has been so near the sea that he knows that when you pour oil on the troubled waters, things will be all right. He spoke to the Progressives in this way: The Progressives, he said, are in favour of a wheat board; therefore they are in favour of government buying, or something to that effect. Now, we are in favour of a wheat board and government control, but we are not in favour of any man in this government exercising any political interference with the wheat board. The hon. gentleman went on to say that we believed in a national bank. Yes, we do believe in a national bank, but we do not believe that every member of this government should have the right to interefere with it. We believe that the government should look after the interests of the common people when they place their money in the bank; and if the people have exercised their franchise in the proper way there might not have been the situation that the country was confronted with some time ago in connection with the Merchants' Bank.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That was the late government.

Mr. LEWIS: All right; I am not speaking of any particular government; I am referring to governments and businesses in general. We believe so far as the Civil Service is concerned that its efficiency can best be maintained by an entire absence of political interference. Give them a free hand; let us have competitive results in regard to these things.

Before I close I wish to refer to the rest of the statements that I have scanned as made by members of the present government. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) must

have known what he was talking about when on April 12, 1918, he said:

> I walked up the street feeling for the first time in about three years I was a free man.

It is a glorious thing to be free. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) spoke in this debate some time ago about all the volumes that were issued as a result of the classification and the volume of correspondence that passed between the government and the Civil Service Commission. I wonder how much correspondence each minister would have if the patronage system came back to-morrow and the ministers had to answer every applicant for a position in the Civil Service. They would have far more correspondence to answer than they have now. The Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) says:

> The feeling was due to the fact that I realized I was free of the curse of patronage. It is because I see in the bill which has been introduced (the Spinney Bill to restore patronage) the possibility of returning to the conditions which I have eluded that I am opposed to its adoption by this House.
>
> Patronage is such a curse that my continual wonder has been that men on both sides of politics would put up with it for the length of time that it has endured.

Of course, hon. members claim that they do not wish to have the patronage system come back, and I only hope that their expressions are a true criterion of their real wishes, but in listening to this debate I have failed to hear one member on the opposite side of the House deduce a single argument in favour of the commission. I did hear a great deal along this line: You have given us responsibility, now give us the power; let us work out the administration and select the men, as is our right, and so forth. If the government can show by argument that the appointment of a committee is for the purpose of remedying the alleged evils in the service and removing for all time the atmosphere of suspicion that seems to overhang the dealings of the commission, I am willing to support the motion; but if it is
9 p.m. simply to camouflage the real issue and lay the blame on parliament for the condition that they would bring about, I must protest and vote against it. So far the arguments are lacking in its favour.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) Translation): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of maintaining the Civil Service Commission and I wish it to be so understood. In the course of this debate, I heard, on more than one occasion, statements made by members sitting on your left, Sir, in regard to the stand taken by those who support the government. According to these utterances, it would seem that we have no faith whatever in the Civil Service Commission and that we would be very willing to abolish it. I wish to state emphatically that I am in favour of retaining the Civil Service Commission.

I think this commission plays a most important part in our administration; therefore, our duty is, not only to uphold it, and, if necessary to amend the act that governs it, but also to co-operate with it in the most loyal and thorough manner.

The reasons set forth against this commission only bear out the more, to my mind, that it should exist. Some of these inferences would tend to discredit the commission by bringing out concrete cases of blundering attributed to it. To my view, Sir, such arguments should convince us the more that if we have an institution that may have erred—and this is somewhat the fate of all human institutions—we should endeavour to amend the act by which it is governed so as to prevent any further wrongs. In other words, if this institution is sound, we should not destroy it, but it behooves us as legislators to do all in our power to enable it to sail clear of such reefs.

This commission is absolutely necessary for the administration of public affairs. It is also necessary when choosing civil servants who are indispensable to the country. During the first years of Confederation, we tolerated what was known as excessive patronage. However, about fifteen years ago, Canada wisely decided, following in the footsteps of other countries, that the time had come to create a Civil Service Commission. The latter was therefore instituted, much to the country's benefit.

Broadly viewed, the commission's aim is to make known the various openings in the Civil Service, also to decide what qualifications should possess those who enter the service. Again I state, that the Civil Service Commission Act, as amended, is to-day indispensable. I do not say that it is perfect, because all institutions after a number of years of trial, necessarily need reforms to keep up with the times. Such changes are certainly needed in order that the carrying out of its duties be made more effective and to give to the numerous civil servants, in the Capital, in the neighbouring town, in fact all over the country, the greater feeling of security possible, and, so that those who, in the future, enter the service be judiciously chosen. The work accomplished, after all, is a useful one. Do not the civil servants, of this capital and the town opposite, make up one of the most important sections of the community? Do

they not belong to a select and privileged class? Amongst them are to be found men of letters, others versed in art or science, it can be said that they are a chosen lot and trusted servants of the State. These employees certainly deserve our praise for the devotion to duty in their various occupations, and as a public man, I deem it my duty to acknowledge this class of civil servants who spare no effort in the interest of our country.

I am not willing to admit that the resolution moved by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has for effect to destroy confidence in the Civil Service Commission. In the words of the mover and those who supported his motion I find nothing of a nature to bring discredit on the commission. It certainly deserves no blame. A very great task has been confided to them, an enormous undertaking. One little realizes the work that the Civil Service Commissioners and the staff entrusted with the carrying out of this act, are called upon to perform. This commission certainly deserves praise and on that score I state that I have faith in that body, and, the work which it has accomplished has been for the welfare of the Dominion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if employees are necessary to the State, it does not follow that all roads must lead to officialdom so that the youth of our country, the flower of the nation, should therein find a safe harbour. I know there are higher, more attractive and more independent callings than those attainable in the public service.

Far be it from me to appeal to the young men of our country and induce them to enter the service. I would rather beg of them to seek more independent, more remunerative positions in which they would be called upon to play a more important part for the welfare of the country. I would rather ask the young men to devote their energies towards the liberal professions, commerce or industry and seek to better serve their country in these broad walks which will be a greater source of happiness than the Civil Service can offer them.

I endorse the amendment moved by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes). I am in favour of this parliamentary committee that should be named to further inquire into the working of this act, so as to avoid the mistakes referred to by the hon. members who preceded me in this debate. I am in favour of appointing this committee so as to amend the act, to make more efficient, if possible, the staff of the commission and to give it the necessary backing in order that the application of this act should become more and more effective. I am again in favour of appointing this committee, so that the civil servants may have the opportunity to appear before it, make known their aims, claim their rights and expose the difficulties in their path. I am in favour of appointing this committee so that justice may be done to that numerous class of civil employees who underwent hardships during these last years, at the hands of foreign commissioners appointed by the previous government, to inquire into the administration of the Civil Service Act and who were responsible for hundreds of efficient employees being dismissed without any cause. I want these employees to appear before this committee and explain why, following on the shameful inquiries of Young and Griffenhagen, they were dismissed from the service; I want them to state their case before this committee. After having risen to enviable positions in various departments, many amongst them have become artisans. They had devoted the best of their life to their country and after making a career of the Civil Service, they were dismissed without warning or cause. Perhaps they are at present undergoing hardships in consequence of these shameful inquiries. This committee will afford them the opportunity of making known the wrongs from which they suffered. I have faith again in this committee because it will be a means for the civil servants to establish their claims, for instance, in regard to the bonus, so that it be included in their regular salary and also to revise the scale of salaries. I believe the appointing of this parliamentary committee is certainly justified for the reasons already mentioned by hon. members and those I have put forth. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment moved by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) and I will vote against the motion of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who is opposed to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): I feel that it is my duty to say a word in regard to this matter. I think that the amendments to the Civil Service Commission should be looked at in a reasonable way, if they are of the class of amendments that are needed. I am not acquainted with the conditions well enough to judge of that. From what I hear, I am convinced, at least, that some amendments could be made that would make the Civil Service more satisfactory and give the government a privilege that I believe they do not now possess. I have had rather an active life. Some people say that I have succeeded fairly well. However, I am not going to boast about that at all, but I have been able all my life, with all the business

that I have ever handled, to say who would take a responsibility that it was impossible for me to take, when it was more than I could handle. If a minister in the government needs a reliable helper, and we hold that minister responsible for that helper, I believe he should have a chance to say who that helper should be. That is my conviction and at the same time, I am in favour of the Civil Service Commission. I believe that there is work that they could do and should do better than anyone else. I see no harm in appointing a committee, if that committee is fairly chosen, to go into this matter and present a report to this House.

I warn the government, however, that I am not willing to go an unlimited distance in this matter, and I am not willing for the ministers to have more authority than they should have. I am not in a position to say how much more authority they should have than they possess to-day. I would like to hear the report from that committee. If the committee, in my judgment, goes too far, I will vote against their report. I do not wish to look at this matter from any partisan or prejudiced standpoint. I expect the government to be fair and square, and do as they agree to do. Let them appoint that committee as fairly as they can, and see that all parties are represented. Let the committee go into the matter, and when that report comes to the House, we will have something to work on. I believe that my quarter of the House, or my third of the House, as you might say, is going to be divided on the question. I am stating what I conscientiously believe, I am going to stand by it, and I am going to vote for the committee.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): While in favour of retaining the Civil Service Commission, being one of the men who were responsible for its appointment, I desire to give one reason why I feel, in the first place, that there are some difficulties in the way as the matter stands at present. It is not the fault of the commission, but the fault of the law. I have had the unpleasant experience during the past fourteen months of seeing more than a thousand employees in the Department of Defence retired, not on account of inefficiency, but on account of receding work. These men and women are absolutely efficient, some of them having had five or ten years' experience in the very work of the department. Under the present law, what is their position? They cannot be appointed to any other department, although they possess all the qualifications, except that they have not passed the examination. To-day, every department, I suppose—well several departments at any rate—have advertised for clerks and stenographers, and young men and young women are coming in from all parts of Canada without any experience to accept those positions, while there are thousands of efficient clerks walking the streets of Ottawa, who cannot be appointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those are temporary employees?

Mr. GRAHAM: Temporary employees in name; some of them have been there as long as ten years. It may be asked, why were they not blanketed in, that is to say, why were they not made permanent en bloc? Well, in the Department of Defence they could not be made permanent for they were going instead of coming. There was not work for them to do, consequently they could not be blanketed in without any reason. There is something wrong with the act there. Now you say, why not bring an amendment? Well, that amendment might prove impossible in some quarters. I am in favour of the Civil Service Commission being retained, but I do believe that if we had a committee fairly selected from different parts of the House, and just such cases as I have cited placed before them, and if we heard the commission and every person interested, we might find several ways in which the law could be amended without creating any difficulty with the commission and in the final result the operations of the commission would be really strengthened rather than weakened.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but express my admiration of the ingenuity of the Minister of Defence in the presentation he has just made. I have been waiting throughout the length of two days to hear some suggestion as to what amendment really was in the mind of the government that required this committee of the House to look into or to draught. I heard none, save attacks on the whole principle of the Civil Service Act, until the minister arose. He, however, has found one now.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are others. I have just given examples.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He says there are temporary employees for example in the Department of Defence and they cannot be transferred to other departments. They are not needed in the Defence department, they are temporary within the meaning, of course, of the Civil Service Act, and some of them

may have been there for years. They are not needed there, and new ones are required in other departments and these do not get the preference under the law that they ought to get. That is what I understand his argument to be. The Civil Service Commission, of course, can appoint them just as they can appoint anyone else, subject of course to the priority of the returned soldier's claim. The Civil Service Commission can appoint them but there ought to be some preference given them.

Mr. GRAHAM: How can it appoint them to permanent positions without passing an examination?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, why should they go without passing an examination?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is one of the difficulties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the government thinks they should go without passing an examination there is no amendment in the world easier draughted than that. Surely the government does not want a committee of the House to draught an amendment to enable temporary employees to be transferred without an examination. I question very much the wisdom of it; I question very much the fairness of it; I question very much if this House would pass it. All these things have been considered and reviewed a dozen times. But is what the Minister of Defence has mentioned the real object of this committee? Is there anybody in this House so innocent as to dream that anything of that nature is the object of the committee at all? If there is, then he has not read the speech of the Prime Minister, he has not read any of the speeches delivered up to the deliverance of the Minister of Defence to-night. You cannot read any such object as that into any other speech delivered yet.

Now this comes before the House in very attractive form—I mean the amendment of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes). All the amendment asks for is a committee to look into this Civil Service Act and see if something cannot be done to make things better. Nothing could appear more innocent than that. One would wonder how anybody could object to it.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh! "Hear, hear," says the hon. member for Brome. Does he remember his own speech against the same thing two years ago? Now he cannot understand why anybody should object. Two years have altered his attitude entirely. Two years ago there was a motion for a committee, and the reasons for it were frankly given from the first. They were not delayed for two days, debate taking place in the meantime on something else altogether, and then some technical suggestions made by a minister. No, after the working of the act for three years the government came before parliament and submitted, that in its opinion there were certain classes of appointments—and suggestions were made as to what they would be—that would be better handled outside of the act. First of all, that there were very minor appointments, certain appointments involving fees and no salary, appointments of labourers and the like; and then there were certain other appointments as respects which the machinery of the act was not adapted; for example the appointment of highly skilled technical men. As to the one class the government, while not naming any series of positions, suggested that a committee consider what in the public interest, might go in that schedule, and as to the second what might go there—the second being distinguished from the first by the provision that the imprimatur of the commission should be placed upon the choice of the responsible minister, both to be extremely limited in their application.

The government did not come to parliament and say "We want the power where we have the responsibility;" we did not come to parliament and present one argument after the other against the very existence of the commission itself as this government has done against every useful purpose any commission could serve. No, we came to parliament and said: "We intend to abide by that act and its principle right through;" that the commission could make appointments; except as respects certain classes which we asked the committee to consider. We asked the committee to consider if there were not certain minor classes that ought to be taken out all together, and we asked the committee to consider as well if there were not certain others that ought to come out but be subject to the commission only to the extent of having to secure the commission's approval. We were resisted in this House, resisted by every hon. gentleman who sits opposite to me, who was here then—resisted to the extent that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) rose and moved the six months' hoist. They would not consent to a committee of inquiry at that time into these definite suggestions, although the government stated that not only should the principle of the abolition of patronage be maintained but the powers of the

commission should be retained intact as to everything save those suggestions, We simply asked that these suggestions be submitted to a committee.

Now, does the Minister of Defence's speech really expose the position the present government is in in regard to this amendment? Is there anyone so innocent as to think it does? The government came before this House and, by the speech of the Prime Minister intimated that while they did not want the commission abolished, they wanted to be armed with power to appoint whom they wished. Such was the speech of the Prime Minister. I have that speech here. If anyone can read any other meaning into those words, to be found on page 364 of Hansard I would be very glad to hear from him. Just previously, the Prime Minister said that while he could not agree with the motion he "would like to associate himself with the mover of the resolution in much that he said about the importance of maintaining ministerial responsibility, and having government by a responsible ministry and not irresponsible authority." On the next page, 363, he says:

> And the government finds itself—I speak now from the knowledge of the difficulties with which the ministers of the different departments have to contend—the government finds itself continually in the position of being obliged to endeavour to carry on the work of the country with clerks who are sent to the government by the Civil Service Commission, but who do not possess the qualifications which if the minister himself were free to make the appointment, he would see were possessed by whoever was appointed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite right; the Prime Minister says "hear, hear", endorsing his statement advocating that the ministers be free to make appointments, and asserting that when they are they will make better appointments than the Civil Service Commission makes and obtain more qualified persons.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In certain cases, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Prime Minister did not at all say "in certain cases". He made his statement as a general principle. He says he knows the difficulties ministers have to face when they are compelled to carry on the work of the country with clerks sent to the government by the commission who do not possess the qualifications which, if ministers were free to make the appointments themselves, they would see that the appointees possessed. In a word, the government wants the right to appoint clerks. Now, I ask:—if you take clerks away from the commission, whom would you leave for the commission to appoint?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I answer my right hon. friend by asking him a question? When he established the Income Tax branch why did he not place it under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the simple reason that the employees, when they were appointed, were intended to be temporary. Does the Prime Minister want the whole service placed on the same basis as the employees and clerks of the Income Tax branch? If he does, then he wants to extrail the very heart of the Civil Service Act. In the thoughtlessness of the moment the real purpose of the government came out. What has the Prime Minister in mind? Is it the putting of the whole service in the position of the Income Tax branch?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then what was the significance of the question? Here in this speech he appeals to the House for authority to appoint clerks, and asserts to parliament that if the government gets that authority better clerks will be appointed than those who are sent to the departments by the Civil Service Commission. But that is not all, nor is it the worst. I know that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) will marvel at the contrast between the virility of this suggestion and the technicality of his own. At page 364 the Prime Minister says:

> May I assert, speaking of patronage, that patronage cannot be abolished by statute. It is impossible to make appointments to the public service unless they are made by some body. The Civil Service Commission as constituted to-day is a body of three or four men. Hundreds of appointments—yes, thousands of appointments—have to be made to the public service. Those who favour appointment by commission must remember that these gentlemen have the determining as to who is to fill particular positions. They have patronage as long as they have to make appointments. But while they have the patronage they are responsible to no one. The government is without patronage, as matters stand at the present time, but is held responsible for appointments with which it has nothing whatever to do. That is not in the interests of the public service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister says "hear, hear". He declares in those remarks that it is not in the interests of the public service that the Civil Service Commission should have power to make appointments, and that while they have patronage they are responsible to no one. This he declares, is not in the interest of public service; and yet he asserts that he does not want a return to patronage! No. wonder the Prime Minister sits perplexed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my right hon. friend want me to interrupt him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do, if he thinks I am not stating the facts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask the right hon. gentleman what about the ten thousand positions so-called, which the commission itself asked to have taken from its jurisdiction? That is a return to patronage at the request of the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Prime Minister apparently wants that invasion to extend throughout the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, what then is the meaning of the words I have quoted?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that there were cases where a return to patronage was a distinct advantage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister did not say that at all. He said in the language I have quoted that he is opposed to the principle of the commission appointing men, with whose choice the government has nothing to do, but for whose work it is held responsible.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend attributes the word "principle" to me. I would ask him to find that word in any utterance of mine on this subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well. The Prime Minister said he was opposed to the practice, and I thought he would be opposed to the principle. I will read again what he says:

> May I assert, speaking of patronage, that patronage cannot be abolished by statute. It is impossible to make appointments for the public service unless they are made by some body. The Civil Service Commission as constituted to-day is a body of three or four men. Hundreds of appointments—yes, thousands of appointments—have to be made to the public service. Those who favour appointment by commission—

In the following sentence he points out what is wrong.

> —must remember that these gentlemen have the determining as to who is to fill particular positions. They have patronage as long as they have to make appointments. But while they have the patronage they are responsible to no one. The government is without patronage, as matters stand at the present time, but is held responsible for appointments with which it has nothing whatever to do. That is not in the interests of the public service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, I wait for another interruption. If the English language can state antagonism to commission appointment in clearer words than these, then it is beyond my power to find them. It is not in the interests of the public service, he says, that the commission should appoint men for whose work the government is to be responsible. The moment you come to that stage you are against the commission altogether; or at least, if you are not against the commission. you want a commission that is robbed of all effective power, a commission that is colourless and worthless, a commission that is a mere mummy without any power of appointment. The Prime Minister says he wants a commission—is it to be a commission of that kind? He declares that he is opposed to the power of appointment to the Civil Service resting in the commission and not in the government. But the Prime Minister did not even stop there. He went on to say this:

> I think some commission or other body should have the power to see that the members of the Civil Service are duly qualified for their positions before being appointed to them, and that those who are already in the service should secure promotion and salaries in accordance with merit.

I will give the House the significance of this extract in a moment. He continues:

> But I do say, Mr. Speaker, if we are to have merit recognised and the measure of justice which we should have for the service, if we are to have that economy and efficiency in the public service which we should have, we shall have to get back to where the government has a larger measure of responsibility for how the public service is carried on where it will have some substantial authority and will not be manacled and shackled by regulations and rules of a body that is responsible to no one but itself, and that in many cases makes appointments not by itself, but as can be shown if the commission is brought before a committee of this House, by its own appointees who conduct examinations and make recommendations.

There, again, is an appeal to the House to have the government endowed with power of appointment, not "manacled and shackled" by any body responsible only to itself. I have quoted in three distinct passages from the Prime Minister, the declaration of his belief that the government, in the matter of appointments, should not be shackled by a commission such as he describes, responsible only to itself, and that the government would appoint better men if it had the power under the act to make those appointments. Now, I want to ask again if language could be found that declares more emphatically against the whole principle of the Civil Service Act? I have quoted only from the Prime Minister. But he has been followed by other members on his side who in speech after speech, from that of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) to that of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), uttered not a single sentence consistent with the retention of the very essence of the Civil Service Act at all.

Mr. MARCIL: If the right hon. gentleman will allow me a question? Would not he

and the House be in a better position to give a judgment in this matter after having heard the evidence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have heard the evidence. I have heard some witnesses in this debate, and I do not think that witnesses who are imbued with the idea that seems to be behind this amendment will do much to throw any additional light upon the subject. It is all a question—and this House might just as well decide it now—whether we are going to retain a virile Civil Service Commission on its present principle or not. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) nods assent. He is perfectly honest and frank about it. Now, that is what we are deciding.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If the right hon. gentleman will allow me: When he states that I am in favour of the retention of a virile Civil Service Commission, he is right. But I say that at present that situation does not exist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the hon. gentleman nodded assent when I said that what we really had to decide was whether we would retain a virile Civil Service Commission or not. He may be quite ready to maintain a virile Civil Service Commission in the physical sense. But what they would have to do, if what he enunciated in his speech becomes law, is a mystery to me. They might have to put their stamp of approval on some man selected by the government—and I fancy that is what he has in his mind—but to reach that stage is to go back ten years and wipe out ten years of civil service reform. Certain sentences of the Prime Minister's are consistent with that idea too, notably one I quoted but did not comment on a few minutes ago. If such an idea is in the Prime Minister's mind, then he purposes to abolish the reforms of ten years, he wants to make the Civil Service Commission merely a commission to pass upon the qualifications of appointees of the government—possibly before they are appointed. But I want to warn this House that there is all the difference in the world between giving the government power of appointment subject to the imprimatur of the commission, and giving the commission power of appointment subject to the acceptance or rejection of the government. Therein is all the difference between the act of 1908 and the act of 1918. Evidently what the government has in mind, if the sentence about retaining a commission quoted from the Prime Minister's speech is any indication, and if the interruption of the hon. member for Ottawa has any significance, is to reduce the Civil Service Commission to the dimensions or rather to the impotence of the old commission under the 1908 act.

They want to put the power of appointment in the government. That is what the Prime Minister says. They want to do so, he says, because it is in the interests of the public service. He has made such assertion in his speech, and he cannot escape from his words. If the power of appointment is to be in the government, what is the commission going to have to do beyond what the old commission under the 1908 act had to do? Therefore the question is whether we are ready to go back to the patronage conditions of the 1908 legislation. That is what we must decide on this amendment.

I want to add a word or two more on this question of the Civil Service Commission itself. The words have been loosely used in this debate that the commission is an "irresponsible body." It is not an "irresponsible" body to begin with. The commission, it is true, is not responsible to the government, and is not removable by the government. If you make it so responsible then you merely make it the instrument of the administration, you take it entirely out of the category of a judicial body and make it merely an appointive body—simply an instrument of the government of the day. But the commission is responsible to parliament. Under the terms of the legislation it is answerable to this House, and any member of this commission may be removed on an address of this and the upper House. The standing of the commission in its relation to parliament is similar to that of the Railway Commission, and unless you make it so you have nothing but a camouflage—you might just as well repeal the Civil Service Act altogether. Unless you put the commission in such position you have the government of the day able to exercise patronage to its heart's content.

Now, the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) in the course of his address remarked that a man responsible for the conduct of a business—he meant a private business—had the right, and could not succeed unless he exercised the right, of selecting his own employees, and the hon. gentleman intimated that he favoured such a practice in the business of government. He added that he wanted the Civil Service Commission retained. I am not able to see just what he wants it retained for. If his first principle is embodied in the report of this proposed committee he will never have anything to vote against,

because it cannot go any further than his own conception that is to put the power of appointment in the government. He argued though that because the head of a private business should have such a right, it is better that the government should have it too. I am afraid the hon. member has not reviewed the history of appointments by governments in this or any other democratic country. The relationship of a government to the affairs of a country differ from the relationship of a man to his private business. A government, of course, is responsible, and the government's duty is to conduct the affairs of the nation as it would conduct its private affairs; but a government, no matter to what party it may belong, is subject to influences, arising from the fact that it must submit itself periodically to the electorate, that to that end it must maintain an organization. Because a government is subject to these influences, unknown in private affairs, it has been deemed wise in almost every country in the world to remove from the control of government for the sake of the government itself as well as of the country this power of appointment of the officers and servants of the State. Why, this is done all through the affairs of this and other countries. It is only lately that it has been applied to the ordinary departmental clerks and the like in the inside and the outside service. But just as democratic government has evolved it has been applied in one sphere and another—in the judicial sphere, afterwards in quasi-judicial spheres as regards our railway telegraph controversies, and then in the matter of the management of the National Railways themselves—I only mention these three—also in the matter of appointments to the Civil Service. It is merely a matter of development, of placing a certain portion of what formerly was the function of government in a position where it can be more efficiently performed in the interests of the state as a whole. Consequently words which may argue well as respects a private business, argue not at all as respects a government; if such were not true we would never have had any Civil Service Act, not even the act of 1908, never the act of 1918. Therefore, I think sufficient attention has not been given by the hon. member to the history of this subject. This House and the country have decided that the influence of patronage—

Mr. WARNER: May I ask a question? I would like the right hon. leader of the Opposition to tell us the difference between a minister not having full responsibility, or having someone to take responsibility for the work that he cannot do, and a private member in his private business having someone to take responsibility from him? I fail to see the difference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have sought to explain it. Of course if the hon. member really is of that conviction he should vote for the repeal of the act. There is no reason for the act at all if it is well that a government should have the same power as have those who manage their own private affairs. Of course, I know what the hon. member has in mind. It is this: though he would like the power of appointments to be in governments, seeing that governments are responsible, he would want them so to exercise it as to give the appointments to those who merited them, not to those merely who had done political favours. Such, I presume, is what he means by saying he is against patronage. But when he states what he does; when he makes an assertion against the whole principle of appointment by a commission, then he has in effect stated he favours a return to the former patronage system.

Mr. WARNER: I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he feels that the Civil Service Act is perfect as it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Civil Service Act is sufficient for all purposes so far as I know. I know of no method—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. members who laugh are those who talk day and night about exterminating the practice of commission appointment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have so talked even to-night.

Now, let us come to what was done under the amendment of two years ago. The amendment simply put it in the power of the Civil Service Commission to make a recommendation to the government that certain classes should be taken away from the operation of the act, and the commission was empowered to make its recommendations, either because it believed that the appointment of that class by the commission was impracticable, or because it regarded such jurisdiction as not in the public interest. These latter words were inserted in order to widen the powers of the commission in the making of their recommendations. Previous to this amendment the commission had power to recommend that any class be taken out if it considered the appointment of members of that class by the commission impracticable.

Now, following the amendment, classes of a very narrow range, not amounting to any appreciable number, were taken out under the late government on the recommendation of the commission, the government approving of that recommendation by order in council. And the government that approves takes the responsibility; it cannot hide behind the skirts of a commission. I want to impress that on the Prime Minister. The idea he sought to drive into the minds of hon. members was this: "Oh, we did not take anybody out from the operation of the act; it was the commission." The commission has the power of recommendation, but the power of recommendation does not reduce the responsibility of the government by one iota; the government is responsible for taking every one of these ten thousand men out of the operation of the act. The government can say, "We exercised that responsibility because we had a recommendation; this was the factor causing us to do it." That is all right; that argument is quite reasonable. But the government is responsible for every class and every man that comes out of the operation of the act; for this whole ten thousand the government is responsible. We were responsible for those we approved of—and narrow indeed, almost negligible, was the range of those who were taken out by the late government. As showing that the government of which I was the head had no intention of invading the principle or the operation of the act to any appreciable extent, I would point to the very narrow range of cases that we took the responsibility of taking out while we were in power. Now, this government comes into office and in the month of June, 10,000 are swung away from the operation of the act. Is it any wonder that apprehension surges through the country? Is it any wonder that people come to think that there will probably be further exemptions? Is it any wonder that they think that with twenty per cent of the service gone back to patronage there is danger of more going back as well?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The right hon. leader of the Opposition mentions 10,000 exemptions. Does he infer that these were taken away under the present administration or under the late administration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were taken away under the present administration.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I refer the right hon. gentleman to the order in council of 21st September, 1921, wherein it is stated that all labourers, labour foremen, assistant labour foreman and charwomen are exempted from the operation of the statute?

[Mr. Meighen]

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they are, I do not know why charwomen are taken out twice, for they appear in this order.

Mr. CHEVRIER: When that order was passed the Civil Service Commission simply named in general terms these four classes, and it was not to operate outside the city of Ottawa. But when the order in council of the 29th of June of last year was passed, the Civil Service Commission proceeded to catalogue the positions that came under the category of labourer, labour foreman, assistant labour foreman and charwomen, and extended that to the city of Ottawa. Those 10,000 positions were taken away from the operation of the statute by the late administration, and only those that remained in the city of Ottawa came under the operation of the order of 1922.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether the hon. member merely wants to make a second speech or not, but what he says does not in the slightest degree detract from my argument. I used the figure 10,000 in my speech the other night. Those figures had been used by Dr. Grant. I asked the Prime Minister if he objected; if they were not right—because I did not know whether they were or not—as relating to the number of persons exempted under the order in council of the 29th of June. The Prime Minister said he would not say that the figures were not right; consequently I have a right to assume that there were 10,000 taken away by that order in council.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is the right hon. gentleman prepared to dispute my statement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what effect the statement has that is of any importance. He says there were some charwomen taken out under the order in council.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman might possibly give the one who has the floor the right to answer his own question. There were some charwomen, as I understood it, taken out by the order in council of September, 1921, but not all the charwomen; the rest were taken out by the order of the 29th of June. I am not in a position to dispute my hon. friend's authority as to when the charwomen came out, but I know they are mentioned in this order.

This order is an order of vast extent. For the most part I quite agree that it covers minor appointments, but there are important appointments included in it. I do not wish to criticize the Civil Service Commission for making the recommendation, I say this.

though: a recommendation that takes out garage men, quarrymen, barbers, blacksmiths, boilermakers, boommasters, cabinetmakers, carpenters, ship construction carpenters, caulkers, coopers, coppersmiths, derrickmen, divers, dynamo tenders, electricians, linemen, and all the rest on this list—there are two or three pages; a recommendation that takes those out invades very seriously the operation of the Civil Service Act, and the government took a very serious responsibility—

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Would the right hon. gentleman have competitive examinations in the making of these appointments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the case of some of them, yes. The examination in each case would be made to fit the character of the appointment. It would not necessarily follow that the examination would be similar to that provided in the case say of a stenographer, the nature of which would be entirely different from an examination that would be applied say to a garage man. For myself, I know of no good reason why scores of these classes included in the order in council of the 29th of June, 1922, were on the government's responsibility exempted from the act.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What becomes of the competition if you do not have the competitive examination?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is an examination, and competitive, too. I say the character of the examination is fitted to the character of the appointment.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman think that the commission is going to advertise every time this class of assistance is needed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whenever it is necessary, and they do, so far as I know. I receive every day or so advertisements of the commission for appointments similar to these. The commission are men of brains, they are men of honour; the commission, after all are men who from the mouth of the highest dignitary of this House received two years ago when he was in political opposition to the government that appointed the commission as high an encomium as any public servant could ever deserve. They are men who have never been assailed as having acted in a partisan way, never at any time whatever. They are men who are above partisan criticism at the hands of any man in this country.

Mr. MARCIL: I have not said a word against the commission. I am a supporter of the commission, but I want the law investigated to see if there is anything wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With a commission of that character, is it not likely they will be able to judge of the qualifications of men for appointments such as this as well as, and, being at the work all this time, better than officers or members of a government? It would appear to me that such would be the case. I know that two members of the commission recommended that the long series of classes be excised from the act. I know not the reason why: I have made no inquiry whatever. But the chairman of that commission, whose presence on the commission is a fact of vital consequence to this country, I know, did not sign the recommendation, and for myself I am disposed to give him credit for not doing so. I do not say that confidence in the commission has been impaired because of this recommendation, but I say here and now that if this class of recommendation goes much further there will not only be apprehension throughout this country, but there will be an impairment of confidence. Responsibility of course is on the government, and I am quite ready to concede that confidence in them will be impaired as well, that is, if the narrow margin that is left can further be reduced. But the commission itself is an institution of permanent consequence to this Dominion, and I earnestly hope, and I express the hope now, that there will not be further recommendations going still more seriously into the scope and operation of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Were there some exemptions made on August 14, 1919?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may have been; I do not remember. There were some narrow exceptions made.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): All under $200 were exempted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why they are exempted again if they were exempted then, because all under $200 are exempted by this order of June, 1922. It may be that this is a comprehensive order including all that went before, but I do not think it is so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If so, it would have been better if the fact had been referred to in the order itself. There were some exemptions up to December, 1921, but the whole effect of them was very small indeed compared with the enormous scope of this order of the 29th of June, 1922. In this connection let me say that if the commission feels still that there should be other exceptions not included here to which no objection could be

taken if they were exempted from the operation of the act—I do not know of any myself, but if the commission feels that there are, they have power now to make recommendation, and the government on its responsibility has power to approve of such exceptions. But what the government want if they intend to narrow the scope of the operation of the act, is to walk into the commissioner's office and against the will and advice of the commission, and against the experience of these years, take whole classes of appointments out of the operation of the act. This must be in the mind of the administration if they intend to contract further the scope of operations, because so far as the commission is concerned, it has ample power at the present time to make recommendations to this end.

Now I want to say it is not a matter to be wondered at, after the government of this country exempts these large numbers from the operation of the act, that men in this country in high positions who are indeed deeply interested in the perpetuation of the merit system as a real merit system, and not a farce, should take alarm. No man should be criticised because he takes alarm or because he attributes some of his fears to the action of the government in approving that recommendation. A man should not even be criticised for doing so, but the Prime Minister comes to this House and charges "false representations" against a respectable and highly gifted citizen of this country, the head of Upper Canada College. Because, forsooth, the head of Upper Canada College declared that political forces were at work to bring back the reign of patronage in this country, and because he pointed to the fact that already ten thousand had been brought back from the operation of the act, the Prime Minister declared that he was guilty of a "false representation," and intimated such
10 p.m. an assertion was inconsistent with Dr. Grant's claim to be engaged in a moral reform. In the first place, Dr. Grant has said nothing about "moral reform." This was merely attributed to him to suit the purpose of the Prime Minister. Now the Prime Minister cannot point to a line, he cannot point to a sentence in Dr. Grant's utterance that is not true, that is not undeniably true, that no person who takes himself seriously could dispute for a moment. Does anyone deny that the forces of political patronage are at work? Has anyone listened to this debate and come to any other conclusion? Is there any other inference from the speech of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), or from the speech of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power)?

Mr. POWER: Is there anything insidious in my speech?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say insidious

Mr. POWER: The complaint was of insidious influences.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has lost the point altogether. Does anyone, I say, who has listened to the speech of the hon. member dispute that the forces of political patronage are at work to restore the reign of patronage? That is what Dr. Grant said, and because he said it, he is declared to have been guilty of false representation by the Prime Minister of this country. I think the Prime Minister owes to this House, and owes to Dr. Grant, the duty of standing frankly before parliament before whom he made that declaration and apologizing to Dr. Grant.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is more, that is the judgment of men of independent thought of this country. Are men outside of parliament to be lampooned in parliament for stating what is manifestly true? There is no inference here that anybody could find fault with or dispute; neither is there any inference beyond the clear meaning of the words themselves. Because 10,000 are gone, that itself, he says, is an argument to show the political forces of patronage are at work. Such is the inference and the only inference that can be drawn from his remarks. The Prime Minister says, "The inference is that we went to the Civil Service Commission and forced them to make the recommendation." Dr. Grant's words admit of no such inference in the world. Whether the fact is true or not, no such inference can be drawn from his remarks. Dr. Grant evidently knew that the government when it passed the order in council aproving the recommendation took upon itself the responsibility of removing 10,000, and the fact, he says, that the government took the responsibility of removing 10,000 goes to prove that the forces of political patronage were at work. And if he wanted confirmation, all he would require to do would be to read the Hansard of two days ago or come and listen to this debate to-night.

Now what this House decides is whether the principle of that act is to remain. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken have used words consistent only with the determination that the Civil Service Commission shall go altogether. I do not say that all the lan-

guage of the Prime Minister is consistent only with that view. Some of it is consistent only with such a view, but other language of the Prime Minister is consistent with the opinion that what he wants is the commission to remain but to exist as a mere approving body, a body whose duty it is to examine the qualifications of men and then to leave the government free to make its selection. Some of his language is consistent with such an idea: other of his language is consistent only with an opinion on his part that the real functions of the Civil Service Commission should go altogether.

Now the Prime Minister said at other times "I do not want the commission to go. I do not want patronage to return. I want the commission to remain." But there is not a line in his speech consistent with having the commission remain clothed with any powers which are effective for the purpose of appointments. For this reason I am opposed to any committee. I am opposed to a committee that is launched from this House with the manifesto of the Prime Minister, as spoken the other night. So far as my influence in parliament is effective, I am determined that if this government is powerless to build, it at least will not be permitted to destroy.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has purported to quote from my remarks in a previous stage of the debate, words which he sought to construe as equivalent to an expression on my part that the Civil Service Act should be repealed, and also that the Civil Service Commission should be abolished. How fairly and how widely he quoted, I will permit the House to judge by reading the sentences immediately preceding the sentences which he quoted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read his words when he said the Civil Service Commission should remain, and apply the merit system, and I commented on what he had in mind on that occasion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He read part of my words, but not all. He took good care to omit, at the outset of his remarks, the sentence which I shall read, which precedes the paragraph he quoted. He quoted first from page 362 of Hansard. Immediately after referring to the motion introduced by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Power) I said:

> I think it would be a great mistake to repeal the Civil Service Act.

Those are my words. My right hon. friend never quoted them to the House. I again give them to the House as expressing my view with respect to the Civil Service Act. I think it would be a great mistake to have the Civil Service Act repealed. That refers to the act which is on the statutes at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say the hon. minister wanted it repealed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think hon. members will agree that my right hon. friend sought to have it appear that I would like to have the Civil Service Commission abolished. He did not read the following words, which appear on page 365 of Hansard—

> I hope I have made it very clear that I would strongly oppose any move to abolish the Civil Service Commission.

The second statement which I have just read was made when I spoke after recess. The previous statement had been made before recess. Both times I made my position very clear, that I was entirely opposed to the repeal of the Civil Service Act and entirely opposed to the abolition of the Civil Service Commission. But I did make the statement that I thought it was desirable to have the present Civil Service Act amended, and I gave as my reason for it that the government during the period between sessions, in its desire to effect economies and further efficiency in the public service, had had conferences with both the Civil Service Commission and the deputy ministers, and that, as a result of those conferences, as well as of experience gained in the work of administration, the government was persuaded that the Civil Service Act could be amended to the advantage of the public service. It was in that connection that I advocated a reference of the act to a committee of this parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to where I stand in this matter, and as to where the government stands, despite all the efforts of hon. members opposite to have it appear to the contrary, may I state emphatically, that we are opposed to the repeal of the Civil Service Act, that we are opposed to the abolition of the Civil Service Commission, but that we believe it to be in the public interest that the Civil Service Act should be looked into by a committee of this House, with power to make recommendations to parliament; and that amendments to the act which may commend themselves to the judgment of this House should be passed. That is the position of the government. I do not think I can make it any plainer.

Then, my hon. friend said that I had made charges against Dr. Grant, the principal of Upper Canada College, and that I ought publicly to apologize to Dr. Grant in this parliament. May I read to my hon. friend just what I said about Dr. Grant? I think I confined my reference pretty largely to his own words. I drew the attention of the House to the fact that a good deal of the feeling with respect to the Civil Service Commission, and the government's relation thereto was the result of a statement attributed to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in an address delivered in the city of Toronto, which was copied by the press of this country from one end to the other. This statement was to the effect that some 10,000 had been withdrawn from under the operation of the Civil Service Commission, and that this was due to the insidious action of politicians, implying the government in power. Let me read the words Dr. Roche was supposed to have uttered which appear in direct quotations in the press reports to which I am referring. I ask hon. members in their own minds to determine what the meaning and purport of these words are. Dr. Roche is reported in the paper in direct quotation as speaking as follows:

> The fate of this law however—

That is the Civil Service law—

> —"however, is beset with dangers due to the insidious, unseen and silent manipulations of the adherents of patronage in political life," he said. "Slowly, but surely, the politicians will gain back to their own control more and more of the service by the process of exemptions. On June 29 last an order in council was passed exempting from the operation of the merit law a great many positions, which affects in all 10,000 persons out of a total of 50,000 employees, thus placing back into patronage one-fifth of the whole public service.
>
> The effort at present is aimed at the return to patronage of the system of promotions which at present has been so splendidly developed by the Civil Service Commission. Technical positions are also under immediate attack, and there can be no doubt that the whole merit law is in danger unless the strong arm of public opinion is organized to oppose its attack.

These are the words which were publicly read as having been uttered by Dr. Roche, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I ask hon. gentlemen of this House, are these words capable of any interpretation in the minds of a reading public, other than that Dr. Roche was protesting against the action of the government in withdrawing 10,000 appointees from under its jurisdiction? Those statements are false. These are not true statements.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What statements?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I have just read.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Which ones?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole business is false. In the first place there is no one prepared to say how many persons were withdrawn from under the operation of the provisions of the Civil Service Act in virtue of the order which my hon. friend has read, and which was in reality the recommendation of the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does he say that the number 10,000 is wrong?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I say I believe it is wrong. I think the figures are a mere guess. I could not say whether 5,000 or 2,000 is nearer the mark. I say they were used without any knowledge on the part of the person who used them; the numbers were called in question and also the inference. But I am prepared to leave it to the judgment of fairminded members of this House as to whether, reading that statement, at the time it appeared, the reader would not believe that Dr. Roche was protesting against the withdrawing of a number of positions, whatever the number may have been, from the control of the Civil Service Commission and making it appear that they were being withdrawn at the instance of the government, when, as a matter of fact, they were withdrawn at the instance of the Civil Service Commission itself. If my hon. friend will let me have the order to which he has referred, I will quote from it the reason for the commission's action as it appears in the commission's recommendation:

> The Civil Service Commission is of opinion that it is not practicable to prescribe a system of competitive examinations or tests as required by the Civil Service Act.

The Civil Service Commission made that statement in the recommendation they sent to council asking that the positions enumerated should be exempted from their control. They stated they did not believe it was practicable to prescribe competitive examinations or tests. My right hon. friend asks about the government assuming responsibility. Certainly we assume responsibility. But what would our responsibility have been if, after the Civil Service Commission's recommendation of the withdrawal of these classes because it was not practicable to hold examinations, the government had refused to accept the recommendation of the commission and compelled that body to go on with the system of advertising positions and holding examinations? We would have been found guilty, and rightfully guilty of being negligent in the matter of caring for economies in the public service.

Now what does Dr. Grant say? Here is Dr. Grant's letter to Dr. Roche. I will quote just one paragraph. The letter is dated "Upper Canada College, Toronto, December 21, 1922," and the paragraph in question reads:

The items complained of—

And the passage that I have read contained the items complained of—

—were not in your speech at all,—

This is what Dr. Grant writes to Dr. Roche—

—but in a memorandum circulated by me on my own responsibility,—

An hon. MEMBER: He is a liar then.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: (reading):

—and sent to the press on the day before your address, in the hope of stirring up interest in it, and in the possible formation of a National Civil Service Reform League, which I have much at heart. The Globe reporter, who had your speech as an "assignment", evidently acted in a way familiar to all journalists, and wrote his report from my memorandum: the report consequently bears no relation to your speech as actually delivered.

Then Dr. Grant goes on to say:

Your speech contained no reference whatever to the 10,000 civil servants exempted from the operation of the Act. It was a model of good taste and reticence. No human being could have told from it that you had ever belonged to a political party or whether your relations with the present government as chairman of the Civil Service Commission were better or worse than they had been with previous governments. Personally, I had a natural longing for a little more "spice".

There is the statement that Dr. Grant has written to Dr. Roche and my right hon. friend says that I ought to apologize to Dr. Grant!

An hon. MEMBER: It would be a shame to do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I only hope my right hon. friend will always be as ready to apologize.

Mr. Speaker, while these various classes have been withdrawn from under the control of the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission, they have been withdrawn, as I have already intimated, because of the commission's mention of the following:

The Civil Service Commission is of opinion that it is not practicable to prescribe a system of competitive examinations or tests as required by the Civil Service Act.

However, even with respect to these appointments, the commission goes on to lay down certain requirements by which the government is bound and which forms a part of the same order. My right hon. friend did not refer to this. Let me read what it says:

The commission is further of opinion that there is good ground for believing that the above classes were among those which parliament had in mind for exemption in amending the Civil Service Act during the Session of 1921—

In other words the Civil Service Commission assumes there its responsibility to parliament and says that when it recommends the withdrawal of these particular classes, it believes it is doing what parliament had in mind. To continue:

—and the Civil Service Commission therefore, has the honour to report that it is not practicable to apply the Civil Service Act to the classes mentioned above and to recommand that they be excluded from the operation of the Act and dealt with in accordance with the following procedure:

1. That the selection of employees for the above classes shall be left entirely in the hands of the departments, subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the appointment is necessary for the efficient carrying on of the work of the department.

(b) That the preference extended by section 39 of the Civil Service Act 1918, as amended, shall be observed.

(c) That the person selected shall satisfy the department as to his qualifications.

(d) That he shall be suitable as to age, character and habits.

2. That the compensation shall not exceed the salaries provided in the classification schedules, and that where "Prevailing Rates" are provided as the compensation for a class, or where no class schedule exists, the rates of pay shall be such as are recommended by the department and approved by the Governor General in Council, and that the compensation in these cases shall carry no bonus.

Provided that, where any position which is exempted under the provisions of section 38B of the Civil Service Act, 1918, as amended, (with the exception of those in groups 1 and 2) is to be continued for more than six months, the department shall report the duties thereof to the commission in order that the position may be classified and that no further payment of salary in connection with the same shall be authorized until the position shall be so classified.

Provided further that a report shall be made by every department to the Civil Service Commission in the months of January, April, July and October in each year, setting out the name, duties, salary, place of residence and place of employment of each person appointed under the authority of these regulations during the preceding three months, with the date of commencing duty and the probable duration of employment. In each case where the employee has been on military service overseas, the letters "O.A.S." should be added after the name.

Is it not evident that the report which I have just read to the House far from being capable of bearing the inference that the government had sought in any way to return to patronage by carrying out the recommendation of the commission is capable only of bearing the inference that the government in the action that it has taken has sought to carry out the recommendation of the commission in giving expression to the wishes of parliament as the commission itself interpreted them. This

effort to have it appear that the government is desirous of returning to patronage is well understood. We all understand the purpose of it, we all know the reason of it. I am sure that no hon. member of the House, who has any responsibility, would welcome a return to patronage where it can be avoided. I would like, however, to say this: There are even fewer members of the House who, having positions of responsibility, would like to be held responsible for appointments in the making of which, in many cases, they had absolutely no voice. That is a different situation. There are two sides to the case and I am putting both sides to the House in order that hon. members may understand them.

My right hon. friend has drawn attention to the fact that this recommendation was signed by two members of the commission. Most of the recommendations that come from the commission are signed in that way. I ask my right hon. friend does he repudiate the signatures that are on this recommendation? The signatures are those of the appointees of his own government, they are not the appointees of this government. We have accepted the members of the commission just as we found them. We have made no change whatever in the personnel of the commission. A recommendation comes to us from them and we put it through. This recommendation is from the right hon. gentleman's own appointees. What I have said should be a sufficient answer to the representations made by hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that we wish to return to patronage.

Now my right hon. friend asks what is the object of the government in asking that the Civil Service Act should be referred to a committee. He asks "Is anyone so innocent as to believe that the motive is that which the government has expressed it to be?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: The signatures to the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, I understand, are those of Mr. LaRochelle and Mr. Jameson. I was under the impression and I am sure it will be confirmed, that we did not appoint Mr. LaRochelle but that he was appointed by the Laurier government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I should have intimated that Mr. LaRochelle was appointed years ago, was continued in office by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), and was a member of the commission during the time he was in power. To that extent I am prepared to stand corrected.

But now, as to the motive the government had, I thought I had made that clear when I spoke before. I said that during the recess between sessions the government had given serious attention to the important question of efficiency and economy in the public service. I said that the government had invited, into conference with its members, both the commission and the deputy ministers, and that both the commission and the deputy ministers had expressed the view that the Civil Service Act was capable of amendment in particulars that would make it a better working and more efficient instrument for the purposes for which it was intended. In addition to that, the government imposed on the deputy ministers a special obligation to report to it with respect to the workings of the Civil Serivce Act, and more particularly with respect to economies and efficiency in the different departments of government. Prior to the framing of the Estimates the government sought to have each of the deputy ministers go carefully with the officers of the various branches, into the whole question of the numbers of their staffs with a view of seeing where it would be possible to cut down. Hon. gentlemen ask us to reduce the numbers of the civil service. What would they say if ministers began to make changes in the civil service without consulting with the deputy ministers? The deputy ministers are the permanent heads; they are part of the service itself; and the government is bound to act with respect to the numbers of the service more or less on their advice. Every minister is more or less obliged to take the word of his deputy as to the requirements of his particular staff, and the extent of its personnel. After the conference with the government, the deputy ministers grouped themselves into a body for the purpose of making a joint report to the government. I have in my hand the report which was submitted by a committee of the deputy ministers, and which bears the names of the following gentlemen:

Messrs. W. W. Cory, E. L. Newcombe, R. M. Coulter, Major G. A. Bell, Lt.-Col. N. F. Parkinson, J. H. Grisdale, J. B. Hunter, F. C. T. O'Hara, A. Johnston and F. A. Acland.

I will ask the House to bear with me a few moments while I read extracts from this report, as therein will appear the reason why the government has suggested the advisability of a committee of parliament hearing the deputy ministers before any recommendations are made as to changes in the Civil Service Act. The report reads in part:

The Committee of Deputy Ministers, appointed at a meeting held on the 30th June, 1922, at the instance of the government to consider matters affecting the Civil Service of Canada, begs respectfully to report that the various departments have been consulted in this connection, that the material gathered has been carefully

analyzed and that the following is a precis of the recommendations which have been adopted. The scope of the activities of the committee embraced the following subjects, namely:—

(a) Appointments;
(b) Promotions;
(c) Classification of positions;
(d) Transfers;
(e) Leave of absence;
(f) Cost of living bonus;
(g) Whitley Councils;
(h) Superannuation;
(i) Reduction of staff.

Then there are quoted three subsections of section 43 of the Civil Service Act. The report continues:

The effect of this section is to place all appointments of whatever nature they may be, under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and your Committee is of the opinion that its provisions should be amended in the following direction:—

"That appointments to professional and technical positions, or to those of assistant deputy ministers, heads of branches and all officials in the higher grades, say those appointed to positions for which the minimum compensation is $2,400.00 per annum or over, be made by the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the head of the department based on a report in writing from the deputy head."

Your committee also desires to offer the following recommendation, namely:—

"That there are certain outside services, such as employees in offices outside of Canada, rural postmasters, etc., as to which it is impracticable to apply the provisions of the Civil Service Act reasonably, and these should be removed from the application of the Act, a list of such services to be supplied by the various departments."

Section (b) deals with promotions. It quotes the sections in the Civil Service Act with regard to promotions and then goes on:

Your committee considers that the best interests of the service require that promotion should be departmentally regulated, and recommend therefore,

"That the present Civil Service provisions with regard to promotions be repealed and that there be substituted therefor a provision to the effect that promotions shall be made for merit by the Governor General in Council upon the recommendation of the head of the department, based on a report in writing from the deputy head, and accompanied by a certificate of qualification by the Civil Service Commission.

Section (c) deals with the classification of positions: The report reads:

The Civil Service Commission has provided a complicated classification which, besides being a positive hindrance to effective administration, requires special study properly to understand. This is more especially illustrated in the case of clerical assistance which is subdivided into scores of special classes, the qualifications for many of which are practically the same, i.e., the incumbent of any of these might readily perform the duties of the other clerical positions.

Your committee considers,—

"That this complicated classification should be repealed and that the Civil Service be divided into a number of classes on lines similar to those established by the Civil Service Act of 1908 or 1918."

Then there is a part of the report dealing with transfers and yet another with leave of absence. The latter is worded as follows:

The Civil Service Commission should make workable regulations with regard to leave of absence, but the administration of the same should be left entirely in the hands of the deputy ministers who are in a better position than the commission to pass judgment on the applications submitted to them.

There are also sections dealing with the cost of living bonus, Whitley councils, and superannuation. On the subject of the reduction of staff, the report reads:

The committee has given careful thought to the question of reduced expenditure. This is a matter which lies in a measure within the authority of the deputy ministers with relation of existing governmental services; new legislation, however, frequently entails new services and the most rigid economy may not prevent increased expenditures. It has been sometimes suggested that the government service is at the present time functioning on an abnormal basis, the outcome of an unnatural development of the Great War, and that every effort should be made to return to a normal or pre-war basis. The committee has learned that reports on these matters have been in the case of many departments forwarded by the departmental heads directly to the Prime Minister; also that the views expressed by the Prime Minister in his remarks to the deputy ministers with regard to the desirability of bringing about a substantial reduction in the public expenditure have received careful attention and that much has been already accomplished along the lines indicated. It must not be, however, overlooked that many years have passed since 1914, the date usually accepted as indicating normal conditions, and during these years the growth of the business connected with the permanent and essential services of government has been considerable; and moreover new departments or branches of the service, growing directly out of the war itself, have been established, as, for instance, in the case of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Soldier Settlement Board, Pensions Boards, etc., and also many new statutes have been enacted which have to be administered, requiring addition to the staff. Precise comparisons with previous periods therefore become difficult. The committee, however, realises the intent of the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to these matters, and is able to state with some confidence that the departments generally are doing what is possible to secure the largest possible degree of economy in the public administration.

The report concludes:

It is obvious that the adoption of the recommendations of the report would eliminate expensive services which are wholly concerned in the making and enforcement of artificial requirements regulating appointments, promotions, transfers and the equipment generally of the staff requisite for the discharge of the essential duties of government, and in the view of the committee this very considerable saving may be effected without in any wise impairing the standard and efficiency of the service, while at the same time avoiding the delays and inconveniences incident to the references to the Civil Service Commission, which the present regulations require.

The committee was appointed on the 30th of June, 1922, and submitted its report on the 4th day of December, 1922.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister state whether or not the signatures of the deputy ministers whose names appear on the report are affixed to the report and whether or not they take responsibility for all the deputy ministers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is submitted as a report of a committee of deputy ministers on civil service matters. The names I have mentioned appear on the front page as composing the committee appointed. It is signed by the chairman of the committee. All the deputy minsiters whose names I have mentioned take responsibility for the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do the others?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As far as I am aware this committee embraces all the deputy ministers who were in the city at the time. All were invited to the conference and all were asked to join in the report. There must be a few names omitted. Why, I do not know. Possibly they were not in the city. There may be other reasons for the absence of their names from the committee. They may have authorized others mentioned to act on their behalf.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Maybe I misunderstand my right hon. friend. Is the committee a committee of all the deputy ministers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government asked all the deputy ministers to meet it in conference. The deputy ministers came and conferred with the government in the council chamber. We went very fully into the whole question of the conditions in the service and the possible reduction of the staffs. We asked for a frank expression of views on the part of the deputies as to the working of the civil service regulations. We got very full and free expressions of opinions from the deputy ministers. We then asked them as a body to prepare a report for the government; to constitute themselves a committee for the purpose; to make such recommendations to the government, as in their opinion seemed to be advisable to improve the efficiency of and to effect economies in the public service. This is the document we have received, it purports to be, and I believe is, a report of all the deputy ministers.

Having this report in its hand the government might have proceeded, as some hon. gentlemen have suggested, we might have proposed amendments to the Civil Service Act in accordance with these recommendations. I ask hon. members who have listened to this debate, what would have been the first criticism levelled at the government if it had taken that step? We would have been told, and the country would have been led to believe, that we were seeking a return to patronage. The country would never believe we were trying to effect economies and to promote efficiency in the public service. This is not a report from the government but a report to the government from the heads of the Civil Service itself, and it is the class of recommendations contained in this report that, we submit, might reasonably be considered as possible amendments to the Civil Service Act at the present time. Who is to know of the effective working of the act better than those who are responsible for administering the different departments?

Let me now come to the last point, because I feel I have spoken at too great length already. Why did I suggest to my hon. friend the other day that this matter should be referred to a committee of parliament? Well, I might answer—although the reason was not in my mind at the time, but it is suggested by what my right hon. friend has said about the Civil Service Commission—that parliament or a committee of parliament is a body to which the commission should report. He says that the commission is not responsible to the government, but to parliament. Well, all that this amendment asks is that the commission which is responsible to parliament be given an opportunity to appear before a committee of this House and report to its members upon this very matter. Are hon. gentlemen going to vote against that? Is my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), after he says that this commission is responsible to parliament, going to refuse a committee of this House the right to hear representations from the deputy ministers and members of the Civil Service Commission with respect to the very act for the working of which they are responsible? That is one of the reasons we ask for a committee—that the Civil Service Commission should be given a chance to appear before a committee of parliament to which my hon. friend says it is responsible.

But there is another reason, and it is the one which governed me in the matter. At the very opening of the session one or two hon. gentlemen opposite referred to the attitude which the government had adopted toward the House. They expressed appreciation of the circumstance that before proposing legislation on many matters that were of concern to the country as a whole we had invited the opinion of parliament, that we had sought to obtain the views of the different groups, that we were in the open and had sought to afford a full knowledge of the circumstances governing recommendations which we were proposing to embody in our legislation.

They expressed the hope that the government would not depart from that practice.

Mr. HOEY: Will not the Prime Minister admit that in its initial stages this motion was not introduced by the government but by a private member in a way that was exceedingly antagonistic to hon. members on this side of the House?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very sorry that my hon. friend feels there was any antagonism in the matter. I do not know that he should feel any more aggrieved than the government itself. We were not able to accept the recommendation in the form in which it was introduced. It was not a pleasant duty for me to say to my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) that I could not accept his resolution. But I said so openly, and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite should feel any more aggrieved in that regard. It was I who made the suggestion that the matter should be referred to a committee of the House, and I am giving hon. gentlemen opposite the reason for the suggestion. Let me say with all candor and frankness that either it is in the interests of the public to proceed in the way that has been suggested, or it is not. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel that they should be taken as much as possible into the confidence of the government. I am anxious to meet them in that regard. I am anxious to have the reasons for the legislation that goes through this House as thoroughly appreciated by every group as is possible consonant with the government assuming its full responsibility for what it introduces. And I say in regard to such a measure as civil service reform, that this is the very class of measure with respect to which the government would not be justified in assuming a high or arbitrary attitude, but is of the kind which should in the first instance be submitted to a committee of the House composed of members of the different groups.

It is because I am anxious that hon. members who will be criticizing the estimates, who will be finding fault with the fact that there are not more reductions in the Civil Service—as my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) implied there should be this afternoon—should know why those reductions are not greater than as they appear in the estimates. They will find out the reasons if they will bring the commission and the deputy ministers before them. The government is pretty much in the hands of these two bodies, and all we ask in the matter of effecting economies is that hon. gentlemen opposite shall know and appreciate to the full what our difficulties are. If they think that it is perhaps on the whole better for the country to pay out a little more money for examinations, for transfers and for promotions, effected as they are by the Civil Service Commission, that it is going to serve some public interest to spend more money and to keep our staffs a little larger than they need be because of the mass of regulations to be complied with, well and good. We will then be in the position at least of knowing that parliament is with us in our inability to make any further change.

I wish to say emphatically to hon. members that the government is doing the best it possibly can to effect economies in every direction. This is the direction in which we have found the most difficulty, and I submit that it is in the interests of the country that there should be certain amendments to the Civil Service Act—not amendments arbitrarily suggested by the government, but amendments that may recommend themselves to the intelligence of the groups of this House represented on a special committee. For that reason I am supporting the amendment which has been moved, that the Civil Service Act be made the subject of reference to a committee with power to make such recommendations to this House as it may see fit.

And may I say this in conclusion? After those recommendations have been made, before any change can be effected in the existing law, the recommendations themselves will have to be embodied in the form of draft legislation and considered here on the floor of parliament. What is the cause for alarm in that method of procedure? I submit that if the purpose is a sincere one, that if hon. gentlemen are really in earnest in their desire to have full justice done the deputy ministers in their effort to carry on the work of their departments efficiently and effectively, if they are sincere in their contention that we must seek to carry out economies in the public service, then it is their duty to support the amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking any further part in this debate, but the Prime Minister has made some remarks that I think perhaps are levelled just a little at myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, no.

Mr. FORKE: I am not taking any offence. The remarks were perfectly fair and perfectly honest. I know I made recommendations along the line on which he spoke. The

Prime Minister made a very plausible speech in favour of the amendment. I agree with my deskmate, the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), that the tone of this debate at its commencement was very different from the tone of it now, and that had some of the speeches made by hon. members on the other side been in line with the Prime Minister's remarks, we might have been prepared to listen with at least a great deal more sympathy and consideration. But in view of the speeches that have been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Speaker, I have been forced to the conclusion that the idea is to lead to nothing less than the repeal of the Civil Service Act. I may be wrong; quite a number of hon. members on the other side have not spoken. I am dealing only with those who have spoken, the tenor of whose remarks was all along the line of getting the patronage back into the hands of members representing the different constituencies.

I saw to-night quite a large volume of evidence that was taken before a commission two years ago—so large a volume that it was useless for me to attempt to master what it contained. I wonder what has happened during the last two years to make it necessary to hear that evidence all over again? Were the deputy ministers not consulted at that time? Did they not give evidence? Were these difficulties not experienced at that time? I do not know. Of course, I have learned something to-night, I admit, from the statement made by the Prime Minister. However, I cannot but believe that the argument advanced by the right hon. leader of the Opposition is sound in the main. I know very well —I do not want to make any insinuations— that it makes quite a difference from which side of the House you speak. Perhaps there was not much temptation for hon. members to my right, when they were in power, to make very many changes in the Civil Service Act; I do not know. At any rate, the temptation may not have been so great then as it is in the case of the present government.

We realize now what recommendations have been made by the deputy ministers, and perhaps they are reasonable. But in view of the feeling that prevails on the other side, and judging from the speeches to which I have listened, I am a little afraid of any report that might be made to this House by a government majority committee in connection with civil service reform. If we could have a committee representing equally the different parties in this House, I would not be so much afraid. I feel that members are perfectly honest in the views which they express; they are contending for what they think is right. I believe the majority of the members who have spoken really think that the Civil Service would be improved by their having some power to make appointments. However, while I should approve of the idea of a committee to consider many other subjects, I cannot see my way clear to withdraw from the stand I have already taken in this respect. I know very well that a good many hon. members on this side will not vote with me; it is entirely a matter for themselves to judge. I am speaking only on my own behalf, and not on behalf of the party that I have the honour to lead.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I had not the privilege to be in the House during the first two days of this debate. However, I considered the matter of sufficient importance to justify my reading the whole of the discussion as it appeared in Hansard, and I came to certain conclusions. After listening to the debate to-day I see no reason to come to a different conclusion from that which I reached after reading the report of the first two days' debate.

I have noticed more than once since coming to this House evidences of the fact that the government might well pray to be saved from its friends. We noticed that last year when, on the question of the government ownership and operation of railways, certain supporters of the government took occasion to launch out at great length against the principle of government ownership. I felt that if I were a member of the Liberal caucus I would want to discipline the members who made such an exhibition on that occasion. It is not calculated to create confidence on the part of the people in the giving of government ownership a fair chance to have supporters of the government speaking as they did at that time.

I think we have another illustration here to-night: the government might well pray to be saved from its friends. Undoubtedly the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) expressed what were his own ideas when he moved that resolution. I have no doubt that when it was put upon the order paper it was expressive of his view that the Civil Service Act should be abolished. I think it was somewhat unfortunate that the rules of the House compelled the Speaker to rule that the motion could not be changed as the hon. member suggested. The ruling was no doubt in harmony with precedent, and I make no criticism on that score, except that had it been different the discussion would have been sim-

plified. However, we know where the member for Quebec South stands.

Then, other members say they do not want to go that far but wish to turn to the act of 1908, which would take the outside service away from the Civil Service Commission. Unfortunately a great deal that has been said in support of the resolution has certainly left upon many hon. members the impression that the desire is to go back to patronage as far as it is possible to do so. There is a Scotch expression like this: "We get the meanin' by the mumpin.'" And it seemed to me the "mumpin'" was sufficiently strong in certain quarters to give us an idea of what was in the minds of some hon. members. It cannot be wondered at, therefore, that we in this corner of the House came to the conclusion that hon. members supporting the resolution, including my good friend from King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), for whom I have learned to entertain a very high respect, wished to go back to the old system. I know they managed to clothe the patronage system in some beautiful garments; undoubtedly they gave to Satan the appearance of an angel of light.

We should remember that this patronage question has two faces. So far we have dealt only with the matter of appointments. The other side of the question was the one that aroused the most abhorrence in the minds of fair men, namely, that of dismissals. Many sordid things took place in the matter of dismissals from office, especially of persons in the outside service. It was not an uncommon thing during an election campaign to have members going around with an appointment in their pockets, and if the time came when the persons making promises of jobs were in a position to implement them, why, good and faithful servants were dismissed from office without very much consideration being shown to them. I do not know that one party was more guilty than another. I can go back as far as 1911, and I have one case in mind—it was some years after 1911 because it hung fire for a long time—where a public servant who had two sons in the army was dismissed while his sons were overseas. Now it is things of that kind which have raised the antagonism of the people of this country to the old system of patronage.

Mr. CARROLL: Who did that?

Mr. BROWN: It was done during war time.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What year?

Mr. BROWN: Before 1921 anyway. That is only one illustration of the kind of thing which has made people revolt against any thought of going back to the old patronage system. These dismissals were generally made on the ground of offensive partisanship, and therein in the past we have been guilty of a good deal of hypocrisy. I recall one instance under a former administration where, when it was pointed out that certain persons had been guilty of offensive partisanship the reply was made "They are not offensive to us," and that disposed of the matter. Now if partisanship is an offence, then let us say so. I might make complaints of offensive partisanship in the last election. There were some whose partisanship was offensive to me I know, but I have not made any complaints hitherto in the matter.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is my hon. friend aware that section 32 of the Civil Service Act provides that:

> No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with any such election, or contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for any party funds.

Mr. BROWN: That, of course, refers particularly to the inside service.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It refers to both the inside and the outside.

Mr. BROWN: Does it refer to postmasters and custom house officers?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Certainly.

Mr. BROWN: All I know is that I have a postmaster in mind who has taken refuge under what he supposed to be the protection of the Civil Service Act, and I say that his partisanship was somewhat offensive to me, although I have never made any complaint. But here is the point I want to make: If this parliament decides that civil servants shall not take part in political affairs beyond exercising their franchise at the polls, let us say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the law now.

Mr. BROWN: In that case let it not be considered an act of partisanship justifying dismissal from office until the offender is known to have transgressed the law, and let it not be left to the government that happens to be in power simply to dismiss from the service those whose partisanship has been offensive to itself and not at all those offen-

sive to the party on the other side. It is on this question of dismissals that 11 p.m. the ire of the public has been particularly aroused. I understand human nature well enough to realize something of the resentment that hon. gentlemen oppostie, we will say, feel when they know that dismissals have been made and the positions filled by those who were just as truly partisans as the ones dismissed, and in many cases more so. That is a question we might very well consider.

When the question of appointing a committee was suggested, I might say that the suggestion appealed to me, and after reading the speeches that were delivered during two days debate of the subject, my conclusion was that it was a reasonable request to make of this House. The deputy ministers had made certain recommendations, and the commissioners themselves had made certain recommendations, and I came to the conclusion that the request for a committee of this House was a reasonable one, and that we ought to be willing to meet them. To-day's debate has not in any wise altered my opinion upon that point. At the same time I would point out that if in any large degree that committee should be composed of those who have advocated extreme views in regard to the question of patronage, it might very well mean that those of us who hold other views might have to retire from the committee at once in the event of our being appointed. But it does seem to me that the proposition is a reasonable one that we should express a willingness to meet those who are charged with the administration of the act, and whom we might very well suppose to be competent to give some information as to the way in which that act ought to be amended. Personally I am absolutely opposed to any return to patronage in the old form or in any form. At the same time I can quite believe it possible that the present act is not absolutely perfect and that it is capable of amendment. I think the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) put it very pertinently when he asked the hon. member for Calgary "Was not the British Civil Service Act brought to its present state of perfection by a series of amendments?" or something to that effect. Though the act may have been of good service up to the present time, I am quite prepared to believe that it may be capable of rendering better service, and for my part I could not justify myself in taking a position which would seem to indicate that I have no desire for any further information on the subject.

[Mr. Brown.]

Mr. GOOD: Would the government be prepared to have a committee appointed composed of an equal number from all parties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend suggests an entire change in the procedure of the House. It has always been customary to have the chairman appointed from the government side and for the government to be represented on the committee in proportion to its majority in the House. That has been the procedure for years.

May I also point out that any recommendations the committee may make will have to be considered by the House. The government has not such a large majority in the House that it will be able to drive anything through; and after the legislation has passed this Chamber it has to go to the Senate, where again the government has not such a majority that it can force any of its measures through.

Mr. POWER: I have risen on two or three occasions in order to call attention to the fact that I have a right to reply to some of the observations which have been made in the course of this debate.

An hon. MEMBER: Too late.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman was the mover of the principal motion and he is entitled to reply. I am sorry he did not catch my eye.

Mr. POWER: I am informed by an hon. member that, thinking that Mr. Speaker would give the usual warning to the House that if the mover of the resolution were to speak no one else would be entitled to speak after him, he was waiting for this warning, and had not been able to catch the Speaker's eye. The hon. gentleman from Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. McKinnon) wished to say a word.

Mr. SPEAKER: In deference to the hon. gentleman, I have asked twice, "Is the House ready for the question," and the answer in the affirmative seemed to be unanimous. However nobody is prevented from speaking if he wishes to.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. POWER: There has been considerable criticism of the mover of this resolution, some of it, if I were to use the words of the hon. gentleman for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), rather antagonistic, and some of it, perhaps, actuated by the prejudices of the moment. The hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) has stated that he would, per-

haps, have consented to give a favourable vote on the amendment had it not been for the remarks made by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) a man whom I respect, has almost challenged me to say that I was opposed to the Civil Service Commission. I stated very distinctly that I was. I do not think he should try to make opposition to the Civil Service Commission a crime. It strikes me that he wishes to add to the considerable number of crimes which are already enacted in our statute books; but to accuse me of the crime of lese majeste because I do not think the Civil Service Commission is a body to administer the affairs of this country is, I think, going a little too far.

I have listened to the debate in vain to hear one solid argument urged against the contention which was made by some hon. members on this side of the House, that it was not good business to have an outside commission name employees to positions of trust and to positions in which executive ability is required. It is true one hon. member stated that there was this distinction between business and the affairs of a political department, that business men were born to the job. The commissioners in charge of the Civil Service must be reborn, because at least two of them took a very active part in politics before becoming commissioners of the Civil Service. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) stated that there was this distinction; that after all business was not quite the same as politics, that you could not introduce the same methods in politics that you could in business. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is the aim and object of this government, and of the party that supports it,—to introduce business methods in the government of this country, and if the hon leader of the Opposition found it impossible to do that, then let him, at any rate, give somebody else a chance to do something along that line. I have not heard any real argument to destroy the contention that the present system in many cases is not practicable.

We have heard a great deal from hon. members about the evils of the spoils system, about the electorate of this country being debauched, but we have not heard any hon. member tell us honestly that he thought the Civil Service Commission sitting in Ottawa could efficiently and judiciously make the appointments of labourers in British Columbia or in the far eastern provinces of Canada. We have not heard it urged that we, the members of this parliament, were right in putting out of our own jurisdiction the affairs of the civil servants of Canada. I pleaded for what I thought was responsible government, for government that would be responsible to the people, and in reply I heard from the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) that this same argument was used fifty years ago. I never claimed that the argument or the idea, was original. Does the hon. gentleman from Calgary not know that fifty or a hundred years ago people died for the cause of responsible government? If the hon. member has read history—and I know he has, because he is an astute lawyer and he has literary taste—he will know that for many years the politicians of Great Britain and of Canada were agitated by that very question of responsible government, and I am not at all displeased when he tells me that I have returned to the arguments which were used by our forefathers, and for which they are constantly being praised and lauded, even in this House.

Reference was made to the remarks which I made in 1921, when this Civil Service Amendment Act came up for discussion in this House. I do not suppose the hon. member for Calgary West who so charitably referred to my stand at that time, had taken the trouble to read these remarks. For his benefit, if not for the benefit of the other members of the House. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will permit me to read portions of my remarks on that occasion. I said:

> On behalf of certain of my constituents who voted for hon. gentlemen opposite, believing in their promises to carry on the public services in a way in which they had not hitherto been carried on and that thereby the abuses of patronage would be abolished, I think I have a perfect right to register my protest. It is our duty to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are not guilty of any backsliding, that once having entered on the path of reform and of uplift they shall continue to the end of their days, which we all believe will be soon.

I protested on behalf of certain of my constituents who supported the leader of the Opposition. These supporters of the Opposition leader apparently did not think that my work on their behalf was sufficient, because I am sure the great majority of them actually voted against me at the last election. Therefore, I think my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) will be quite willing to admit that I am freed of any obligation which I might have had towards them at any rate.

To be more serious for a moment after having listened very attentively to the speech of the leader of the Opposition I have come to the conclusion that his reason for opposing a reference of this matter to a committee is very similar to that which I gave some days ago for opposing the amendments to the act which he introduced in 1921. I said then that I did not trust the Tories. After having carefully considered the speech of the leader of the Opposition I have come to the conclu-

sion that his reason for not supporting the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) is that he does not trust the Grits. He states at great length that it may be very well for us to have a committee, but that behind this demand for the appointment of a committee there is the insidious influence—he did not use those words, but that is what he meant—of those of us here who do not approve of, who do not believe in, the Civil Service Commission. He says "On our side of the House we knew when we brought down this legislation what we wanted. We merely wanted to amend the act, and nobody on our side of the House attacked the Civil Service Commission." I wonder if he heard, or if he read, the speech of the hon. member of West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) during the debate? His speech was so bitter an attack on the Civil Service Commission that he was constantly called to order. I wonder if he read the speech of the Hon. Mr. Edwards or the speech of Mr. Currie, or the speech of Mr. Fripp during that debate? Surely if he is entitled to doubt our bona fides to-day we are entitled to doubt his motives at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member should permit me to say that I did not state in my speech that there were no members supporting the government opposed to the commission. What I said was that no member of the government, in any speech, intimated the least thought of abolishing the active work of the commission, or of restricting it in any respect whatever.

Mr. POWER: I would recommend to the Prime Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, leader of the Opposition.

Mr. POWER: I mean the leader of the Opposition—that he read the speech made at that time by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken).

Mr. MEIGHEN: I heard it.

Mr. POWER: You heard it? Well, the right hon. gentleman's recollection is not the same as mine and I refreshed my memory by reading that speech not long ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I made no statement as to the speech of the member for West Toronto. I referred to the speeches of members of the government.

Mr. POWER: If it is quite fair for the leader of the Opposition to make references to the speeches of the members of the government at that time it is quite fair for me to refer to the speeches of those who then supported the government, and to draw the same inference after reading the speeches of hon. members who supported my right hon. friend.

At the time this resolution was introduced, I, at least, allowed it to be understood that I did not expect to obtain the support of the majority of the members of the House. I stated frankly what my views on the subject were, and some other hon. members have done the same thing. I frankly believe that we cannot get the most efficient service out of the Civil Service Act as at present framed. There may be only a few of us on this side that believe it. There may be more than that number, but I am under the impression there will only be a few. That is no reason for hon. members opposite refusing to the government the opportunity which it asks of obtaining before a committee a full and free discussion of the different situations which have been created by the Civil Service Act as it is at present worded. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have said we do not need a committee because we had one two years ago. Do those hon. gentlemen not know that for five years—more than that, for perhaps seven years—year after year, session after session, we had a committee on Pensions and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment which revised, reviewed and amended the Pension Act, the act with regard to the re-establishment on the land and several other statutes? Surely it is no worse to amend the Civil Service Act than it was to amend an act which dealt with a far more important matter, that of the welfare and well-being of our soldiers who had fought overseas.

Another view of the situation has been taken by my hon. friend for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) and in order to reassure him I will ask the Prime Minister, or rather the chief Whip not to appoint me on the committee. I do not know, though, why he does not carry his argument to its logical conclusion and retire from the House, or request the electors of Quebec South to ask me to retire. However, for the sake of peace and harmony, I am willing to ask the chief Whip on the government side not to appoint me one of the members of the committee. I hope that will meet the view of the hon. member for Lisgar, that it will answer some of his objections, that he will see to it that he is confirmed in his desire to do the fair thing by the Civil Service Act, by the government, and by this House, and that he will vote in favour, at least, of referring the study of this matter to a committee.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Hughes) which was carried on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	MacLean (Prince,P.E.I.),
Baldwin,	McBride,
Béland,	McGiverin,
Benoit,	McIsaac,
Binette,	McKay,
Black (Huron),	McKenzie,
Bouchard,	McMaster,
Boucher,	McMurray,
Bourassa,	McTaggart,
Brown,	Malcolm,
Cardin,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carroll,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carruthers,	Marler,
Casgrain,	Martell,
Chevrier,	Michaud,
Clifford,	Morin,
d'Anjou,	Morrissy,
Déchêne,	Motherwell,
Delisle,	Munro,
Denis (St. Denis),	Murdock,
Desaulniers,	Neill,
Deslauriers,	Ouimet,
Duff,	Parent,
Ethier,	Pelletier,
Euler,	Power,
Fafard,	Prevost,
Fielding,	Pritchard,
Finn,	Putnam,
Forrester,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Raymond,
Fournier,	Reed,
Gauvreau,	Rhéaume,
Gendron,	Rinfret,
Gervais,	Robb,
Gordon,	Roberge,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Robichaud,
Graham,	Robinson,
Hammell,	Robitaille,
Hatfield,	St. Père,
Hudson,	Savard,
Hughes,	Séguin,
Hunt,	Sexsmith,
Irvine,	Sinclair (Oxford),
Jacobs,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Stewart (Argenteuil),
King (Kootenay),	Stork,
King, Mackenzie (York),	Tobin,
Lapierre,	Trahan,
Lapointe,	Vien,
Léger,	Warner,
Lovett,	Woods,
	Woodsworth—103.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Anderson,	Gardiner,
Arthurs,	Garland (Bow River),
Bancroft,	Good,
Black (Yukon),	Gould,
Bowen,	Grimmer,
Brethen,	Halbert,
Caldwell,	Hanson,
Campbell,	Hoey,
Carmichael,	Hubbs,
Charters,	Jelliff,
Church,	Kellner,
Clark,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Coote,	Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Davies,	
Dickie,	King (Huron),
Duncan,	Knox,
Evans,	Ladner,
Fansher,	Leader,
Forke,	Lewis,
Lovie,	Shaw,
Lucas,	Simpson,
MacKelvie,	Speakman,
MacLaren,	Spence,
Maclean (York),	Spencer,
McDonald (Timiskaming),	Steedsman,
McKillop,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Maybee,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Meighen,	Stewart (Leeds),
Millar,	Sutherland,
Milne,	Thompson,
Preston,	Thurston,
Ross (Kingston),	Wallace,
Ryckman,	Ward—66.
Senn,	

Main motion (Mr. Power) as amended, agreed to, on the same division.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Logan,	Bristol,
Murphy,	Porter,
Kyte,	Boys,
Papineau,	Drayton,
McKinnon,	McQuarrie,
McCrea,	Stevens,
German,	Chaplin,
Copp,	Baxter,
Mitchell,	Manion,
Maclean (Halifax),	Guthrie,
Chew,	MacLaren,
Lavigueur,	Sheard,
McMurray,	Ryckman,
Fontaine,	Tolmie,
Boivin,	Hocken.
Mercier,	Jones,

Mr. CHAPLIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TOLMIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fontaine). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I was paired with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. COPP: I was paired with the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Baxter). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Mackinnon). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PREPARE SCHEDULES

The House having reverted to the order, "Motions":

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish now to move the committee to which is to be referred the bill for the readjustment of the constituencies. I made mention yesterday to the House that the government were of the opinion that a small committee was advisable rather than a large one; that it should consist of possibly eleven members at the outset, certainly not more than fifteen. However, it has been represented by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that some injustice would be done his group if it were not represented by four members on the committee, in which event, following out the proportionate representation in the House, it would be necessary to have a committee as large as nineteen. Now, the government is anxious in this matter of redistribution that there shall not be so much even as the shadow of an impression that anything is being attempted other than what is reasonable and just in all particulars. The government wishes to avoid anything in the nature of party controversy if possible, and under the circumstances we propose to meet hon. gentlemen opposite and grant a committee of nineteen. I would therefore move:

That Bill No. 15, intituled An Act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Béland, Boivin, Caldwell, Euler, Hanson, Johnston, Low, Kennedy (Glengarry Stormont), King (Huron), Macdonald (Pictou), McMurray, McQuarrie, Morrissy, Motherwell, Speakman, Stewart (Argenteuil), Stewart (Leeds), Stork and Sutherland, with instructions to prepare schedules to contain and describe the several electoral divisions entitled to return members to this House and to report the same and that Rule 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion, of course must have unanimous consent, because under rule 40 two days' notice must be given of a motion for the appointment of any committee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to discuss one of the principles that I think should be had in mind in the consideration of this question, namely, representation by population and the distribution of the seats on that basis. The British North America Act, section 51, says:

On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—

(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of sixty-five members;

(2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained);

(3) In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part not exceeding one half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number;

(4) On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards:

(5) Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

52. The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this act is not thereby disturbed.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that population is the basis of readjustment not only as between the provinces but also as to the subdivision of the various seats within the provinces. The constitution of this country, in the provisions that I have read, provides that redistribution shall recognize the principle of representation by population and nothing else. But strangely enough, since this act came into force we have had several redistributions all of which have clearly ignored the law in this respect. Take my own case: according to the last census, the figures of which I have under my hand, I represent a population of over 100,000. At the last redistribution it was a little over thirty thousand. Now as a matter of fact, these one hundred thousand people are out-voted by five other constituencies in this country whose members represent less than twenty thousand people.

Mr. MALCOLM: Would the hon. member mind informing the House what percentage of that one hundred thousand people turns out to vote?

Mr. MACLEAN: (York): They all turn out.

Mr. MALCOLM: The census does not show it.

Mr. MACLEAN: (York): They come out and vote just as much as the people in any other portion of this country, and sixty thousand of them have the right to register now, including women. I say that if this is a democratic country, one man's vote is as good as another man's, but as it is now there is an

unfair discrimination against the urban vote in favour of the rural vote. Why that should be I do not know. I could read out a list of twenty-one constituencies to illustrate my point, but here is the fact. Toronto and Montreal together have almost one-fifth the population of this country, but they have not anything like the representation that the rural parts have, or the representation that I say they are entitled to have under the constitution. I therefore take this occasion of insisting in so far as I can upon the recognition of this principle that the value of votes in this country should be absolutely on an equality based on population. I think I am backed in that by the Prime Minister and by the Progressives from the West who absolutely admit this democratic principle, and recognizing that principle, I think the House also must recognize it.

What is the history of this question? I could go back over the thirty years I have been in the House, and still further back to other redistributions. In the first election I ran I was a supporter of Sir John A. Macdonald. I knew Sir John A. Macdonald and at that time he was trying to cultivate the votes of the cities of this country in favour of his National policy, but he never went the length of telling the people at that time that one man's vote was as good as another's, and that the cities and towns should have equal representation and influence in this House with the rural sections of the country. After him came Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and he also for some reason or other refused to recognize the principle of equality of representation, not only as between constituencies, but also as between individual voters, and this principle of equality was ignored. Since then the population of this country has been growing, particularly of Ontario and Quebec, so that to-day the urban population in both these provinces exceeds the rural population, and yet they have not anything like the same representation in this House. In other words, there are twenty-one or twenty-three constituencies where less than twenty thousand voters have the representation that is accorded to my constituency with one hundred thousand people.

As pointed out by the Prime Minister in his address, the unit of representation, which is based on the population of
12 m. the province of Quebec divided by sixty-five, will be thirty-six thousand under this redistribution according to the last census, and that is the basis upon which the redistribution should be done. That is what I am insisting on here, and so far as any discussion has taken place in this House, I can claim that I have the acceptance by the Prime Minister of the old principle of representation by population. I am quite sure that the Progressives from the West also, while it may be said that the rural population ought perhaps to be entitled to a little more representation, will admit the absolute correctness of the principle of equality. How can we ever have a democratic government in this country unless we absolutely recognize the principle of equality of representation as between citizens and as between constituencies?

Therefore I make this contention, and I ask the House and the committee to admit this principle in the new distribution, so that this discrimination as against the urban population in favour of the rural population will not be continued. It never should have happened. It does not obtain in any other democratic country in the world. This principle on which I insist absolutely governs the representation in congress in the United States, and there is a much fairer representation in the British parliament to-day where the value of votes in the cities and rural parts is the same, than we have in this country. The same rule obtains in all the British Commonwealths except Canada, where for some reason or other, partly through inadvertence, partly by a mistake in the past, partly because we started wrong, this injustice has not been righted, I stand in my place to-day on behalf of the urban population of this country and ask the committee to recognize the justice of this principle of equality being applied not only to the representation apportioned to provinces but also to the constituencies that will be defined.

I admit, if it has to be admitted—I do not think I should admit it—that it might be unfair at the present time to apply the change too strictly, I would be prepared to still give the rural constituencies some advantage on the understanding that eventually the principle of the equality of values shall be strictly applied to constituencies as it is now applied to the provinces. If there must be and there ought to be in every democratic country this equality, I say now is the time to make the change.

I quoted in this House the other day the attitude of some of our politicians in the past, and pointed out that William Lyon Mackenzie in the old, old days in this country, was in favour of representation by population. The Hon. George Brown was in favour of it also. The Liberal party favoured the principle, and I never heard of the party going back upon it when the question came up. But gradually in the readjustments we have had, and the four or five reconsiderations of this question, we have allowed ourselves to go

wrong, and to be unfair, and to-day we are unfair to a majority of the population; because, if you look up the census you will see that the majority of the population in both Ontario and Quebec is urban, as against rural. If that is the case, now is the time to make a change, and, on behalf of the great cities of Toronto and Montreal, and of the towns and smaller cities in every province in Canada, I ask that we begin to correct this mistake and to adopt the principle as we have adopted it as between provinces in the creation of constituencies in the respective provinces. I am sure I can appeal, in making this contention, to the fairness of all the parties of this House, Liberals, Conservatives, Progressives and Independents, and I expect that we shall have to-night an expression of opinion from the government and other members of the House as to whether they are of opinion that representation by population from now on should govern in every measure of redistribution that may be brought into this House, and that the constitution be respected and observed. I have read from the British North America Act, and I cannot find in any of the amending acts any alteration in the law set out in the sections I have quoted.

I leave the matter for the present, but will follow it up on some other occasion, perhaps before the committee, but I ask for some expression to-night from this House as to whether it is not time we should make this change and adopt the great democratic principle that one man's vote is as good as another, and that the value of a vote in one constituency ought to be the same as the value of the vote in any other constituency in the Dominion of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Friday.)

Friday, February 23, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Copy of agreement between His Majesty the King and Sir Henry Worth Thornton, K.B.E., to act as directing head of the railways, steamships and other undertakings, comprised in the Canadian National railway system.—Hon. Mr. Graham.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House on Monday next go into committee on the following proposed resolution:

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that the minister may pay, out of moneys applicable to the relief of distressed seamen and appropriated by parliament for that purpose, such sums as are deemed necessary for the relief of shipwrecked or destitute seamen who are not entitled to relief under any of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts; also pay any reasonable expenses incurred in any British possession or any foreign country on account of subsistence or transport of such seamen who have been domiciled twelve months in Canada; and to provide further that in the case of passenger steamships registered in Canada, the Governor in Council shall have power to authorize the acceptance of passenger steamboat certificates issued by the Imperial government or by the government of a British possession; and further to provide that, in the case of seagoing ships, the Governor in Council shall have power to authorize the acceptance of survey or inspection made by an exclusive surveyor to an approved society or association for the classification and registry of shipping, in lieu of Canadian government inspection.

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

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the government propose to take for government business, Monday next, which is Private Members' day?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is the usual expression—Monday next. It means Wednesday or Thursday as well.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved that the House go into committee on the following proposed resoluton:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Temperance Act, chapter one hundred and fifty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by addition thereto of part V, and to provide for the prohibition of importing, sending, taking or transporting into any province in which the prohibitions hereunder are in force, any intoxicating liquor; to further provide penalties for the violation of this act; and to provide for the revocations when such have been declared revoked by an Order in Council of the Lieutenant-Governor of a province affected.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

NOTICE TO THE AUDIT OFFICE STAFF AT MONCTON, N.B.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I desire to put a question to the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) with respect

to a notice which, I am informed, was posted in the office of the Canadian Government Railways at Moncton yesterday in these terms:

To audit office staff. I have been instructed to notify you that the revenue accounts of the entire Canadian National railway system are to be handled at Montreal, commencing May 1st. It is intended that the auditing of the Canadian Government Railways revenue accounts for April will be completed at Moncton and that as soon as practicable after May 1st our staff will be moved to Montreal. Any clerk who does not desire to go to Montreal but prefers to sever his or her connection with railways will please advise the chief clerk accordingly.

W. H. ESTANO,
Auditor of Traffic.

I am instructed that this affects 180 employees at the very outset, of whom 110 are married men, for the most part owning their homes at Moncton. Is this notification correct?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): The organization and distribution of the staff is entirely in the hands of the Canadian National Railway Board. I have no knowledge whatever of that notice.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the minister find out and let parliament know? I know how earnest a devotee he is of the principle that parliament should know all the details of operation.

Mr. JACOBS: I thought we were taking the railways out of politics.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): At the same time, I would like to ask the minister if he would also advise us whether all the staff which has been looking after the auditing of the Canadian National Railways will be moved from Toronto.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Canadian National Railway Board and its offices are open to my hon. friend just as they are to me. A few days ago he moved for a copy of all letters that had been sent by any member of the government to the Canadian National Railway Board. This would add to that one or two letters, and it might be brought up in the House that we were trying to influence the railway board. The board have a difficult task to perform. Any information that is required, for which hon. gentlemen will ask in the regular way, I will endeavour to get through the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is asked for in the regular way. If the minister takes the ground that he will not disclose such information in parliament, I can understand that position. If he does take that ground, of course, he will have to reverse himself. We want the information, if he says as he said two years ago that it should be given.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am, of course, out of order just as my right hon. friend was. But I did not take any such ground; I did not hint at any such ground, rather the contrary. I said that the information could be secured from the board by any member; I also informed him that they could communicate with that board. But I added that if it was so desired, I would try to secure the information.

Mr. FIELDING: Is my right hon. friend not reversing his position when he asks for such information?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not at all. If the government say that they do not feel it is in the public interest that these details should be given, I will abide by that decision.

Mr. FIELDING: The government is not supposed to possess such information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But we are asking them to get it.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure that they have the right to get it under the rules.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is different from the position taken two years ago. If my hon. friend would take the position that was then taken by us we would not complain.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman should stand by his own position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do, precisely.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Agriculture—health of animals, $1,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister enters upon his estimates will he be good enough to tell the House whether or not the embargo on Canadian store and breeding cattle entering England has been actually removed?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): We do not expect that the removal will be actually operative until about the first of April, when the United Kingdom authorities expect to have all the preliminaries ready to allow of the importation of stores under the provisions of the act. The question of breeding animals, however, has not yet been disposed of by the British parliament. I might first of all answer one or two

questions that were raised on the last occasion we were in supply. The hon. member for Qu-Appelle (Mr. Millar) then and on a previous occasion referred to a practice which, it was alleged, was in vogue in the vicinity of Calgary—at all events, the allegation appeared in the Farm and Ranch Review of that city —with respect to the purchasing of reactors and the re-sale of them to owners of herds that supplied milk to the cities. I think that was the purport of the complaint.

Mr. MILLAR: The article that appeared in the Farm and Ranch Review of Calgary states that some people are making a practice of buying old cows at about $8 a head, the inference being that they are acquired in the belief that they will readily react. Then at the proper time they ask for an inspection, and when the cattle react they receive from the government $40 a head compensation. The article states that this practice prevails to a considerable extent around the stockyards of Winnipeg.

Mr. BROWN: In the case of animals sold at the stockyards the indemnities would come from the condemnation insurance fund and not under an item of this kind.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Since this matter was first mooted my deputy took it up with the Veterinary Director General, and I might read a paragraph from a communication of his on the subject:

> On January 8th, I wrote to the Editor of the Farm and Ranch Review. As no answer had been received on February 15th, a second letter was sent to him by registered mail. To this letter no reply has yet been received. I enclose copies of both letters.
>
> I think it proper to point out that the dishonest purposes referred to in the newspaper story cannot be achieved as simply as is made to appear possible. Protection to the financial interests of this department is afforded by the fact that no compensation is paid for animals which reast to the first test in addition to herds under the municipal tuberculosis Order. Dishonesty of the kind is possible only by roundabout methods.

If the animals are purchased in the manner described and, being sold to owners of municipal herds, they react on the first test, then no compensation is given. And this provision is intended to obviate just such a practice as is alleged. With regard to the other suggested practice of buying cattle and holding them until an opportune time for inspection, when they react, I do not see how the owners of such cattle could benefit by this practice if the cattle are grade animals. There is no compensation for grade cattle unless they are tested in conjunction with pure-bred herds. As I have explained, there is no compensation for grade cattle that react on the first test, and it is not likely that people would be able to buy pure-bred animals at $8 or $10 apiece; there are not many people who would sell pure-bred cattle at that low figure. So, I presume that the cows purchased at $8 apiece are grade animals; and if they are it is impossible for the owners to get compensation. If they are acquired in the way described they cannot earn compensation because municipal herds are not eligible for compensation under the first test.

Mr. MILLAR: Would the minister like me to read the article in full? It is already in Hansard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think that is necessary. Now, I would refer to one or two other matters while I am about it. It was very gratifying to me to note the objection taken to any reduction in the agricultural estimates, but I endeavoured to make it plain the other day that we hoped to keep up this important service with this reduced amount for the next year. It will be recalled that I spoke of $75,000 or $80,000 being spent in this current year for operating the restricted area in Manitoba. Possibly it would be of interest to the committee to refer to the first report in regard to that restricted area, comprising three municipalities in the neighbourhood of Carman thirty miles from Winnipeg. The Veterinary Director General writes:

> A recent telegram from Dr. Hall, who is in charge of the area testing in Manitoba, has reached this office, and it will be interesting to you to hear the progress that has been made. Up to February 21st there have been 255 herds tested, comprising 3,238 cattle, of these 258 reacted, giving a percentage of 7.9.

That is not a large percentage when you take them just as they come, one herd after another.

> The staff engaged in this work numbers 12, exclusive of Dr. Hall, who probably is not actually doing any testing himself but supervising and arranging the work of his staff. The area covered comprises a large part of the municipality of Dufferin, and Dr. Hall says that he expects to finish the testing of all the cattle in Dufferin municipality by the 28th instant, and adds that weather conditions have retarded progress.

Because of shortage of funds, for one reason, it is not intended to go ahead next year with any further experiments in this restricted area enterprise. I have explained already that the intention was to gather by an actual try-out, information of what it would cost to clean up a given area. When we had that information we were going to the provinces to see if we could not induce them to co-operate with the federal authorities in tackling this big national work. I might say incidentally that the provincial authorities of British Columbia engaged on the work of compensating for tuberculous animals slaughtered before the Do-

minion authorities ever took it up, but it was found to be such an enormous task that the federal government had to come to their assistance and take it in hand . Now the enterprise is so vast and important that all authorities we can get behind it should be induced to co-operate, but we cannot get them to join us until we are in a position to advise them as to the probable cost. We do not contemplate such expenditure next year, and consequently that much can be taken off last year's estimate and still meet the ordinary demands incident to this work. In addition to that, there will be found on the back of the Votes and Proceedings a resolution indicating the intention of the government to bring in a bill reducing the compensation for pure-bred animals that may be slaughtered on account of being affected with tuberculosis. If that bill passes,—I make that qualification because it did not get through last session; if it had we would not be so short of money this year on this vote; if it passes—it will mean that $300,000 next year will go as far as $400,000 would this year, or 75 cents next year will go as far in the actual payment of compensation as $1.00 this year.

Mr. GOULD: In the area referred to in the Carman district of Manitoba does the work embrace grade cattle?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, everything that is bovine in character. Another reason is that I think we will have to get along next year with a smaller staff of inspectors, as the work arising in connection with the removal of the British embargo is likely to draw off thirty or forty of our veterinary staff. I expect to have the embargo staff returned inside a year, but in the meantime, we will have only three-quarters of our veterinary staff available for the accredited herd areas. For that reason we purpose keeping up the second examination of all herds that have been tested this year. It is very important that we should do this if we want to clear up those herds that have already been taken in on the first examination.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did I understand the minister to say that his department is not taking on any new herds this year under the accredited herd system?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. Somebody said that, but I denied it very emphatically. If my hon. friend will subtract $285,000 from the total of $1,500,000 he will find how much money we will have to work with. When we make allowance also for the lesser compensation which I am proposing in my resolution, and, for the fact that we will not undertake any further restricted area work, it will be seen how it is possible for us to make this reduction in the vote and still keep up the work.

Mr. BRETHEN: In reference to the $1,500,000 for administration and enforcement of Animal Contagious Diseases Act and Meat and Canned Foods Act, how much of that money was spent on the accredited herd system last year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I placed that information on the Table two or three days ago, but it may not have come to my hon. friend's attention. Speaking from memory, it was, roughly, $400,000 for pure-bred and $300,000 for grade.

Mr. BRETHEN: How much of this money was spent in the restricted area work?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not that work completed yet, and therefore do not know how much it will cost eventually.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then the minister is taking on new herds under the accredited herd system?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, yes, we are taking on every herd that is coming along in these three municipalities. We want to get that work done in the winter time as we can do it cheaper then.

Mr. CALDWELL: But over Canada, generally?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, not over the rest of Canada; but we are conducting second examinations.

Mr. CALDWELL: But you are not taking on any more herds outside of that restricted area?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that was the substance of my answer. We are accepting applications, and they will be taken up in order of priority when we get our new vote.

Mr. CALDWELL : I am very sorry that the minister has seen fit to take this course, because I believe the testing of pure-bred cattle in fact of all cattle, is one of the most important undertakings in Canada to-day, for it affects not only our herds but the lives of our people as well. I am very sorry that the minister has seen fit to restrict the work in this particular.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not.

Mr. CALDWELL: Had I got this idea the other night I would certainly have opposed his increase for the experimental farms,—

that is, if that increase is at the expense of the necessary funds for the testing of cattle. That is one of the most important works his department is engaged in. As a breeder of pure-bred cattle, I would even be willing to forego compensation altogther if necessary, and I would certainly be willing that the compensation per head should be reduced, if by so doing he could extend the work of testing cattle for tuberculosis. I think the compensation for animals destroyed under this act is a very small factor in the whole proposition; the more important feature is the health not only of the animals but of the people who use the products manufactured from milk. I sincerely hope the minister will reconsider his decision to cut down his vote and will not restrict this very important work.

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree that the accredited herd system as introduced is perhaps one of the best, if not the only means in fact, that can be employed to encourage the ultimate eradication of tuberculosis. It has been clearly shown that any plan to make a clean sweep of tuberculosis over any extended area, such as a state or province, cannot be carried out, simply on account of the volume of work and expense involved. In Massachusetts, New York, Illinois and one or two other states where this great work was undertaken, it was found to entail so much expenditure and labour that it was finally abandoned. Therefore we have adopted the accredited herd system, hoping thereby to create little centres free from disease and at the same time educate the people up to the time when we will be able to take hold of the eradication of tuberculosis on a much larger and more successful scale.

It is very important that this work should be carried on without restriction. We have got our farmers educated to the point where they are anxious to have their herds cleaned up, as is indicated by the large number of entries in this particular line. We have already made arrangements with the United States for the exchange of our cattle from accredited herds on both sides of the line without the usual inspection at the boundary. We have a large market on the American side, and it would be a great pity if there should be any interference with the very valuable trade with the United States in pure-bred animals at the present enjoyed by this country. There is another point: can we afford to stop it, or even to ease up? In 1922 we slaughtered 488,000 head of cattle in our inspected abattoirs. In 1910 the percentage of tuberculosis animals among those inspected amounted to 2·96; in 1922 the percentage amounted to 5·26, a very marked increase indeed. A still greater increase is apparent in connection with our hogs. Last year we slaughtered something like 1,700,000 head of hogs in these inspected establishments, and it was clearly shown that the percentage of infected animals had increased from 5·26 in 1910 to 21·86 in 1922. Can we afford to ease up on this work of cleaning up tuberculosis in Canada? An enormous wastage is involved, not only in the compensation paid, which is very small, in the cleaning up of accredited herds, but also in the interference with trade and the severe losses incurred in shipping the animals to the packing houses. When we see this large reduction of $285,000 in the estimates for carrying out the work of the Health of Animals branch, we wonder if the high degree of efficiency maintained in the past can be continued under those conditions.

Canada to-day possesses an enviable reputation so far as the health of animals is concerned. In fact, it was shown before the royal commission sitting in London in 1921 to inquire into the embargo question that Canada was the freest country in the world from contagious diseases among animals—surely a very proud position to hold, a position that has been attained through the excellent work done by the Department of Agriculture, particularly the Health of Animals branch, in years past. This reputation is of the greatest value to us, particularly when we begin to export our animals, either in live or in dressed state, to outside markets. In fact, it is safe to say that the strongest argument we had to present before that commission in 1921 was this statement of Canada's freedom from contagious disease. While other factors undoubtedly had a good deal to do with the removal of the embargo, that in my opinion was the pivot on which the whole thing turned.

I should like respectfully to offer to the minister a suggestion or two in connection with work that perhaps is not receiving as much attention in the department as it might. I understand that the department is expending about $32,000 a year on research work, including that of the pathological division of the Health of Animals branch. The men engaged in this work are experts in their respective lines, and in addition to carrying on actual research work their time is taken up in the manufacture of tuberculin, etc, I understand that they have put up sufficient tuberculin and mallein to more than cover the amount of money expended on that particular division. While the tuberculin test is the best test we know of at present for the diagnosis of tuberculosis where no physical symptoms are shown, still, its efficiency has

not reached the point where it can tell us just how badly the animal is affected. That is, it does not pick out the animal that would be likely to recover from the disease from the one that might be what we call an open case or a spreader of the disease. That is the very serious drawback to the use of tuberculin. I feel that there are great possibilities for research in this connection; we would probably find that from fifty to seventy-five per cent of the animals affected with tuberculosis might naturally recover. The question might also be taken up of vaccination and immunization of animals against this disease. Here is a tremendous field for work that ought to produce very excellent results. At present we are testing and actually destroying those affected, but we spend very little money on trying to discover a remedy that would place us in a very much better position and save us millions of dollars.

Fortunately, we have in connection with the pathological laboratory one of the most experienced animal pathologists on the North American continent. I refer to Dr. Watson, Chief Pathologist of the Department of Agriculture, whose ability has been amply demonstrated in the past. A few years ago a disease affecting horses broke out on the prairie, known as dourine. Several hundred animals were affected, and the compensation paid ran into thousands of dollars; in one year I think it reached $43,000. This gentleman first made a careful diagnosis of the disease. He was able to carry out a blood test devised by himself whereby he could diagnose the disease before any physical symptoms were shown, and in five or six years he had completely eradicated the disease from the country —surely a very excellent work. Quite recently he has scored another triumph in the carrying on of experimental work in connection with glanders; he has produced a serum in the laboratory in Hull, that gives great promise as a remedy for this disease. Quite recently a case of glanders broke out on a farm in Manitoba, and both the farmer and the medical man who treated him became infected with the disease. There had been no cure for glanders in the human being, so far as was known; it is a disease that is very prevalent in some countries, particularly in Russia. A serum produced by the Chief Pathologist was sent out to Manitoba and used in both these cases, and the farmer is now back at work and the doctor making rapid progress towards recovery. Certainly that is a very satisfactory result from the efforts of this gentleman.

I feel that the pathological division should receive the strongest possible support. You have a man there whose experience and ability it would be hard to dupliciate and who would be quickly taken hold of by others if his efforts are not fully appreciated and if he does not receive satisfactory assistance in his present capacity. Here is a field that promises very excellent results if a sufficient amount of money and proper encouragement are given to this gentleman. I should be very sorry indeed, Mr. Chairman, to see the vote stand in its present position, with that very large reduction of $285,000. I would respectfully suggest to the hon. misister that if he is unable to change the present vote he at least make a very strong effort to have an amount placed in the supplementary estimates that will give proper aid to this very important branch of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let me right at the outset thank the hon. gentleman for his exceedingly constructive suggestions and criticisms. The fact that we brought down last year $75,000 in the supplementary estimates for this department is an indication that I am not unfamiliar with the fact that what you cannot get by one bite you can sometimes get by two. So it is not too late yet. We shall know inside of three or four weeks, before the supplementary estimates come down, whether the embargo provisions are not bringing about the change that might be expected, and if the worst comes to the worst, why, I am glad the Finance Minister has heard my hon. friend's suggestion; he will know what it means when I recommend to him and my colleagues that we should get a little more, in view of the altered circumstances in connection with the embargo. That was the situation that arose last year; representations were made by the Manitoba authorities after the main estimates came down, and we made provision for a further amount in the supplementaries. That is why the suplementaries are there. So that without making any promises, all I can do is to say that if I find it is required to keep up the work to the full, I will certainly make the same endeavour to meet the situation as I did last year. I am sure that will meet the expectations and hopes of every hon. member in this committee.

With respect to the member of the veterinary staff, Mr. Watson, who has been successful in discovering a serum for the curing of glanders when man is affected by it, I may say that I feel particularly interested in that discovery. Further it seems to me too bad that we have such primitive surroundings for our excellent staff to work in, but I suppose

we walk before we run, and it seems to me the surroundings we have and the accommodation must answer for the present. We have just moved our biological laboratory from the Experimental Farm to Wellington street, where we have more accommodation, but after all it is not a public building and it is not suitable. It is better than where it was, and the accommodation over in Hull, to which my hon. friend refers, is not what it should be either, but in time, as we find the financial situation eases up a bit, possibly we may be able to spend a little more in the construction of these very necessary buildings. In the meantime, I may say I was almost affected with glanders and I can sympathize too in the full. We have had cases where men have had glanders and have been cured by this newly accepted method worked out by one of the veterinary staff. The men responsible for building up the staff have established it in pretty good shape in the last few years. I do not want to take any credit myself but I am convinced that there is only one policy to adopt, and that is full steam ahead to the capacity of our finances. To show the committee the experience of the United States with respect to this matter, I may say they are also doing the same thing, having only one limitation, and that is money, and I feel that this is a case where many hands make light work. There are other considerations. For instance, having the municipal authorities as well as the provinces interested in it financially, I think, would produce better results in the end, besides being easier on all hands. I have before me a communication from Dr. Torrance to Dr. Grisdale which reads as follows:

> Dr. Mohler, the chief of the bureau of animal industry, in his last annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1922, states that co-operative federal state tuberculosis eradication had given highly encouraging results. Fully accredited herds had increased in the United States during the past year from 8,201 to 16,216.
>
> There are now fully accredited herds in each state with the exception of California and New Mexico and in these states there are 129 herds with 1,370 cattle and 724 herds with 5,575 cattle which have passed one test respectively under this plan.
>
> Dr. Mohler also states that they had on fyle at the time of his report 35,239 applications from owners of herds for accreditation, which they had been unable to handle, and that these herds contained more than one-half million cattle.

I am informed by my staff that while there were a lot of herds on application at the first of this year, we have caught up during the past year on the applications for accreditation. We have not caught up entirely, but have caught up pretty well compared with the condition a year ago, so that we are not even marking time. We think the work is in better shape to-day than it was one year ago. That is, when you take into consideration that we have taken up a new feature of work in the restricted area, and we are following up the second examination. I am sure the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), whose heart must be in this as an old practitioner, knows the value of it possibly as no other member of this House knows it. I knew the value of it as a sufferer before there was any compensation for slaughtered animals, and I think the committee should be prepared to assist in extending this work and laying the foundation for a new policy in getting the necessary information to enable us to go, I hope, successfully, to the provinces, to start on a plan to take care of the work in a comprehensive way. We will have our limitations however. It is quite possible if we get the municipalities into this matter of accredited herds to co-operate with the provinces and ourselves, we will find more applications than can be taken care of, judging from the experiences of the United States.

Mr. LOVIE: Can the minister tell us how much it costs for the treatment of glanders in Treesbank, Manitoba, and that district?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We will take a note of that, or if the question is put on the order paper it will be better.

Mr. LOVIE: The minister has no record of it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not that information. It is a continuous work. I think we can dig it out of the accounts, but there has to be some limitation in the matter of available documents here. I will be very pleased to answer my hon. friend, if he will put it on the order paper.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister says the reason he is cutting down this vote is lack of money, but I think the explanation is hardly fair, in view of the fact that he has increased some of the other items. If he had said he cut this out to switch money to some other purpose, we would be able to prove it by the very estimates themselves, but in view of the fact that the estimates are $14,000 more than last year, and that what I consider the most important item under this head is cut down, I feel it is a mistake to switch off from this work money that should be devoted to it, and add to some other branch of the service. I think this is the most important service under the Department of Agriculture. I sincerely

hope, as the minister has suggested, that he may bring down a vote in the Supplementary Estimates and that he will continue this work on at least as large a scale as before.

With regard to the restricted area in Manitoba, it is just possible the atmosphere is so much drier in Manitoba than at Hull, that it would be a good plan to locate the restricted area in eastern Canada. I do not think he should locate it in Hull. It would be better in the Maritime provinces where we have a moist climate, but not similar to Hull, because the moisture comes from the ocean.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In discussing this with the staff and the gentleman from Manitoba, who probably in a practical way was the first to draw my attention to it, my first thought was to get some portion of Canada that had a distinct boundary line, so that we could operate within certain distinct boundaries, and Prince Edward Island was my first thought and Vancouver Island my second. We had no applications from either of those and no agitation for it, and as one of them does not like innovations very much anyway I was rather disposed to take—

Mr. CALDWELL: Which one?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will leave it to my hon. friend to guess. I thought it was best to take it up with the Manitoba representatives who were ready and anxious to try it out. After all, if you suggest it to somebody else, you would not have them enter the work with the same enthusiasm as the province of Manitoba would, who are already anxious for it, have passed the necessary resolutions and have worked up public sentiment ready to go into it. However, when Canada's ship comes in probably, we will be able to take action elsewhere. I would like to see it tried in either of those places I have named, because then we would have a complete boundary line beyond which no contagion would escape.

Mr. WALLACE: Has Manitoba contributed anything towards the cleaning up of this area?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to know whether the proposition to reduce the maximum compensation paid has had the effect of reducing the number of applications?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Has it had any effect at all?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I do not think it had a particle of effect.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister stated that the work is being nearly overtaken. Is he counting the applications that have come in that are not being considered to-day?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I might point out that there is a certain amount of "hang over" yet that affected the work last year. I had to stop the taking on of new herds for want of necessary funds. We had to do the best we could with less money and endeavour to keep the work going. That is one reason why we are not taking on the Manitoba works further. That can be done cheaper in the winter time. We have just recently assembled our men there at a time when the farmers will be free to give the necessary assistance.

Mr. CALDWELL: If the department is not free to take on any more accredited herds what was the use of issuing the pamphlet a copy of which I hold in my hand?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are taking them up now.

Mr. CALDWELL: But you are not testing the herds, and do not intend to do so.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think that is fair.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not want to say anything that is unfair, I want to get at the real purpose behind this. For instance here is a pamphlet which has been distributed instructing people how to proceed to get their cattle tested. In this pamphlet this question and answer appear:

Q. But I can get help if I want a test?
A. Certainly.

Then this question and answer appear:

Q. What is the minimum of animals that will be accepted?
A. Ten pure-bred animals, one a pure-bred herd sire.

Now the minister is telling us that he is not taking on any applications with the intention of testing them this year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have got to do one of two things. We were $50,000 short of our expected revenue and, when our expected legislation did not go through last session, that was tantamount to requiring $50,000 more to do a given amount of work. We are taking on the applications as they come to us with the intimation, as I have already stated to the House, that our men will devote their time to certain examinations and work in Manitoba for the balance of the fiscal year. Then, as soon as the new vote is available we will go on with our examination of the new accredited herds. That is exactly the same policy that we pursued last year.

Mr. CALDWELL: The more the minister explains the matter the less I am satisfied. He says that he was $50,000 short of the money needed to carry on the work last year, and yet he is asking for a largely decreased vote. I am afraid that my hon. friend is asking for less money in order that he may not have to carry on this work. I am very much in earnest about this work and I will tell the committee why. In New Brunswick we have been specializing in potatoes but I think that in that respect we have made a mistake. Our farmers are now beginning to realize that it is necessary to adjust our farming operations and go into mixed farming. We want, in particular, to go into stock raising. A great many of the men who are beginning to breed pure bred cattle want to buy stock from accredited herds; they do not want to commence breeding with diseased cattle. Therefore, as beginners we are more or less handicapped by reason of the fact that the department is not going on with this work. I feel that at the present time the utmost encouragement should be given to the farmers in the Maritime provinces who want to go into mixed farming to a greater extent than in the past. In order to promote this laudable desire I think it is only right that this testing should be carried on, and that there should not be any restriction.

4 p.m. I am not putting these questions for the sake of worrying the minister — I would be very sorry to have him think that—but I am very much in earnest about it and hope that he will see his way to extending this work.

Mr. HARRIS: I am sorry that the minister did not explain this vote a little more fully as to one matter which concerns a big industry in the Dominion of Canada, and that is the raising and feeding of hogs. Last year in discussing this particular estimate we had before us the case of one man upon whom we thought the operation of the act had wrought injustice—a man by the name of Alderson. In discussing that case the minister said in part:

> Sometimes justice falls short. We have known innocent men to be hanged, and we may expect a similar fatality to be meted out sometimes to a hog.

Now the minister has had the opportunity of looking into the records of the department and perhaps can give us some more information in regard to this particular issue. Of course, if he does not, we will all try our level best to remember this little passage and perhaps we can read into it that a similar fate may be meted out to a certain political party. I would like the minister to tell us frankly if he feels that in reviewing any of these issues, justice has in any way fallen short. At the time referred to there was considerable discussion regarding the feeding of garbage to swine, and the minister had in mind, I think, that perhaps the garbage which was not properly cooked by steam process might be cooked perhaps by direct heat in larger kettles. Those were the words he used as will be found by reference to page 1029 of last year's Hansard. He said, on the occasion referred to:

> The only change that has been contemplated at all has been the substitution of larger kettles for cooking garbage, so as to avoid the necessity of procuring more expensive boilers.

I would like, before this vote passes, that this minister would be good enough to give me some information on this matter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I feel disposed to keep my eye on the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) when I touch upon this somewhat delicate subject. However, we all appear to be in pretty good humour now, and possibly I can get the desired information to the committee and escape the danger point.

I may say that last year I was impressed with the idea that possibly there had been a miscarriage of justice somewhere—I mean in equity not in law; I think Mr. Alderson got all that was coming to him in law, but, as has been said, that sometimes that falls short of equity. At least I was understood to have said that. After the House prorogued last year I took some steps to investigate the matter further. In the meantime Mr. Alderson took the case to the courts, but not having a case in law he fell down; he did not, as he thought, get justice. My deputy sent to Toronto and got a copy of the evidence that was taken in the proceedings, reviewed it very thoroughly, and tried to get at the bottom of the matter. I had understood that there were certain strictures made by the judge with respect to certain witnesses, but if so they did not appear in the copy of the evidence we got. But I can see where Mr. Alderson fell down. He sought to prove there was no disease in his herds but unquestionably there was disease present; it could not be proven that it was attributable to other causes than uncooked garbage. I received a communication from Mr. Alderson after that asking me if he might have an opportunity of discussing the matter with me, and, as I naturally wished to see the gentleman over whom there had been so much discussion, I immediately made an engagement with him. He came down and we had a long talk, and I was very much impressed with Mr. Alderson's sincerity and

truthfulness. I am confident that he felt that he was abused and that he was telling me a true story. So much so that I arranged for a conference in my office between Mr. Alderson, one of his sons, and a neighbour, and three or four of my staff, including the deputy, and myself. I suppose we were there for an hour and a half, or possibly two hours, going into this complex question, and endeavouring to secure a solution that would deal with the matter from the standpoint of equity. We thought we had secured a solution. I felt that if such a thing as compassionate compensation—shall I call it?—could be given to Mr. Alderson, that should be done. I felt in my heart that it should be done; but I am not a legal authority, and I was informed by the Auditor General, when this was attempted to be done, that under the law we could not pay compassionate compensation. The law is there for the purpose of compensating the owner of animals that have cholera. On the other hand, it was found that the bulk of the evidence went to show that, while cholera was present to a very restricted extent, a considerable number of animals had been slaughtered that were not diseased at all. That was the situation. Mr. Alderson slaughtered thirty-three head of animals, which under examination proved to be all right and fit for food. In view of that, the evidence seemed to indicate that a considerable number more had been slaughtered that would have proved to be all right if they had been salvaged. I think Mr. Alderson should have been allowed to salvage either the entire bunch or none at all. I was not in charge at the time; I do not know what the regulations were, and I have not gone into them intimately enough to know whether a mistake occurred or not. I think, however, the veterinary inspectors felt they went far enough when they allowed Alderson to salvage thirty-three. But having salvaged thirty-three, Mr. Alderson came to the conclusion that they had not cholera at all and that if the rest had been salvaged, he could have got the value of them on the market. There is, however, no question at all that cholera was present, and, further, Mr. Alderson could not prove that it had been contracted by any other means than by garbage. Therefore, on the cholera-affected animals, he was not entitled to any compensation, and the ruling of the department and the officers of the department is strictly and legally right.

As regards the animals that were slaughtered and salvaged, and that proved to be all right, there is presumptive evidence that if more had been salvaged, they would have proved to have been fit for human consumption, and that is the place where I feel an injustice was done. Whether that was due to wrong regulations or to regulations not being carried out according to the instructions given, I do not know. All I know is that immediately I became familiar with the facts, instructions were given that, in future, owners of all herds of this nature must be allowed to salvage anything that did not show any clinical signs of disease. Then the post mortem, after the animals were slaughtered, would indicate whether or not they were fit for human food. That is the situation. If my hon. friend has any suggestions to make with regard to the matter, I should be glad to have them; I have made an attempt to meet the situation. The hon. member for South Oxford made such strong representations and came back so frequently in regard to this case, that I came to the conclusion that his action was not to make a noise, not merely to play the game or to indicate that he was active on behalf of the interests of his constituents, but because he believed in his heart that justice had fallen short somewhere. I will give the hon. gentleman credit for that, and it was for that reason that I pursued the investigation further. I then ran up against the stone wall of the Auditor General who, in effect, intimated that no such thing as compassionate compensation could be paid under the provisions of the law.

Mr. HARRIS: Any one who knows anything about the workings of the department and particularly the Health of Animals branch knows that they are doing a great deal of good work. I appreciate the minister's statement that, in future, occurrences of this kind will be prevented. The injustice, however, already done to this particular party, who by the way is no constituent of mine, is not righted by taking care of some case which might happen in the future. At the present time this man is some seventy years of age, and he is destitute through the necessity of the department cleaning out his herd of swine and is not being able to receive compensation to a larger extent than he did to take care of his particular case. I would respectfully ask the minister if it is not possible for him to bring down in his supplementary estimates some measure of relief which will compensate in some small degree this man to whom a gross injustice has been done.

Mr. LEADER: I cannot help but think the government has adopted a policy of passive defence in regard to this very important work of the eradication of tuberculosis from our cattle. The minister has made it

plain, I think, to everyone present that while the government are willing to accept applications that may be made, they will be unable to act upon them this year at least; in fact, they will not be able to take on new work in Manitoba except in this restricted area.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is for this current year.

Mr. LEADER: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That will soon be out.

Mr. LEADER: The fact that the government will not be able to take on any new work is due not to lack of funds, but to the opinion of the minister that this work is not as important as other work. It will be remembered that the other night I protested against the increase of $200,000 in the appropriation for experimental farms, and I think my contention was sound in that regard. To-day I am going to suggest that the minister endeavour, in his fight with the rest of the Cabinet, to get more money for this particular work of the eradication of tuberculosis and to bring such further sum down in the Supplementary Estimates. I am particularly interested in this phase of agriculture; I know something about it. My herd was, perhaps, one of the very first in Canada to be accredited. I am going to be looked after, so I cannot be accused of looking at this matter from a selfish viewpoint. But my neighbour, who has not had the advantage of getting under this system, is going to be out in the cold for this next year at least. I think this work is so important, not only to the farming interests, but to the people who live in our cities, that every endeavour should be made, not just to stand pat, but to carry on an aggressive campaign against this disease. Last year, in speaking about this matter, I mentioned that glanders had been almost entirely eradicated from horses by the action of the government. As has been proved in the United States, if the same aggressive action is displayed as regards tuberculosis, the same results will be achieved. It will, however, never be achieved by the policy of passive defence that is taken at this time. The minister has paid me the compliment of stating that, in a moment of weakness, he agreed to raise the compensation last year. I hope that I have enough influence with him that he will feel obliged to insist in Council on $285,000 for the accredited herd system, the same as was asked for last year. I am going to suggest that he make a fight for that amount.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should like to refer to the matter that the minister was dealing with just a few moments ago. I appreciate very much the careful manner in which he has inquired into the case referred to, that of Alderson, who had some 245 hogs slaughtered under the Contagious Diseases Act. This man has received no compensation and as a result he has been practically ruined. He had a large experience in this particular business and it is to be assumed that he knew quite well what the consequence would be if cholera developed in his herd. The minister observed that the case had been taken into the courts and that the man had failed to establish his position. Mr. Alderson endeavoured to show that there was no disease in his herd; he staked everything on that issue. There was the alternative by which, if he could establish that the disease might have been introduced from some other source rather than from garbage feeding, he would have been entitled to compensation. But he said that he was satisfied in his own mind that there was no disease in his herd and that therefore he would undertake to establish his case on those grounds. The judge in his finding points out that the evidence of Mr. Alderson and three or four of his witnesses was absolutely in contradiction to that of the officers of the department; and he adds that he finds it necessary to accept the statements of those who are experts in the diseases of animals rather than the testimony of the owner of the animals. And the owner not having tried to establish that the disease had been introduced from some other source than garbage feeding, there was no other recourse for the court than to disallow compensation. A post mortem was held on one small pig out of this herd of 245 animals. A few culls from different litters were put into a pen together and it was on one sickly-looking little pig that the post mortem was held. The man pleaded with the officers of the department to allow him to slaughter as many of the animals as he could and dispose of them for food. He was given permission to kill and dress what he could in one day and disposed of 33 of them in this way, every one of which was passed by the inspector. Now, it is remarkable that although the inspectors, on taking the temperature of six or eight of these hogs, declared the animals to be diseased, and to have a high temperature, yet when they were slaughtered no disease was discovered in them. I am not going to argue that there was no disease in the herd. The evidence of the officers has been accepted by the court, and the assumption is reasonable that some of these sickly runts among the culls that were in this pen would be most susceptible to disease if it was introduced

from any outside source. And the returns show that some animals that had been taken to the place a few weeks previously for breeding purposes had died, though other animals that had been brought about the same time and taken away had not developed disease. The assumption, therefore, is that the disease might possibly have been introduced from this outside source, although Mr. Alderson might not be aware of its presence. The officers of the department might have found disease in one of these animals and concluded that it was necessary to slaughter the whole herd. The minister stated his conviction that many of these animals were fit for food; and that, Mr. Alderson having suffered a great injustice, he had taken steps to see that the regulations under the act should be amended so that an incident of this kind could not recur in the future. So that now where disease breaks out, if there are any animals that are free from it and are fit for food they will be salvaged and not be a total loss to the owner.

The man concerned happens to be a resident of the constituency that I represent. But I want to say right here that I interested myself in the matter not by reason of any political services he had rendered me, for he had been a staunch Liberal all his life, but because I had known him for many years and was convinced that he was upright and honourable. I am satisfied that when he went into court to endeavour to prove that there was no disease in his herd he firmly believed that there was not; and I do not think that the officers of the department showed him the consideration to which he was entitled. He declared in evidence, which I think was corroborated by other witnesses, that he was assured by the inspector that he would receive two-thirds compensation for the animals slaughtered, that he would have his premises cleaned up, and that he would be enabled to go into business again. Far from that being the case, he finds himself now in the possession of property of very little value, for he has not since been able to utilise his pens for breeding purposes. In short, he is simply down and out. In view, therefore, of his sincerity and his loss which the minister admits, I think he is entitled to some consideration. And the fact that the minister even went so far as to recommend a compassionate allowance would indicate the justice of his claim. If the law as it stands precludes some compassionate allowance being made for a person injured in this way, I think that some steps should be taken to see that justice is done. We talk about passing an old age pension law and other measures for the relief of the people, and it does seem very hard indeed that a man who is trying to earn an honest living should, by an incident of this kind, find himself absolutely deprived of his means of livelihood. I hope the minister will bring down something in the Supplementary Estimates to provide some measure of justice to this man. The very fact that every one of the 33 animals that were slaughtered and dressed was found by the department to be absolutely free from disease and fit for food goes to show that the disease was not general in the herd. The minister is convinced that an injustice has been done in the owner not being allowed to salvage the animals that were healthy. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) stated that in 1910, 5.26 per cent of the animals inspected were infected with tuberculosis, as against 21.86 last year. It shows an alarming increase of disease in our hogs, and renders imperative that heroic remedies be resorted to for its eradication, otherwise we shall find ourselves without even sufficient hogs for domestic consumption.

I am not going to deal with the accredited herd system. I know the minister is anxious that progress should be made in this matter. It is likely, as was indicated in the discussion the other night, that under the present regulations governing compensation some people may have taken advantage of the department. I suppose it is impossible to frame laws that will absolutely prevent all fraud. However, the case to which I have referred happened in the spring of 1920. Since that time the man aggrieved has been living in hopes that some compensation would be paid to him for the loss he sustained. Now, I would ask the minister to give this matter a little further consideration, and although the Audit department may not be prepared to pass any compensation payment under a strict interpretation of the act as it was, I hope that some means can be found to provide a remedy.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to know how many accredited herds we have in New Brunswick and who the owners are; and the same information in respect to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The total number of fully accredited herds, that is, those which have had two clean tests, is 374 in all the provinces; the number in process of being accredited is 1,069; the number of applications received is 181—or a total of 1,624. Taking each province the figures are: Prince Edward Island, fully accredited, 14; under

process, 29; not tested, 6; total 49. Nova Scotia, fully accredited, 8; under process, 6; not tested, 7; total 21. New Brunswick, fully accredited, none. My hon. friend does not seem to have taken advanatage of this system.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are Harding Bros. not there?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. There are 14 under accreditation, but they have to get two full clean tests before they are recognized as fully accredited. The number not tested and waiting is 3. So my hon. friend has not got any very great grievance after all—only three on the waiting list. There are often more men waiting in a barber shop.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, I think possibly the minister has lost the point that I made a short time ago. While I have often seen more than three men waiting in a barber shop, I do not think such a waiting list applies to the present case. I would call the minister's attention to the fact that we are simply beginning this line of farming in New Brunswick, which accounts for there being 14 herds under process. This indicates that what I am saying is absolutely correct. Due to the fact that this pamphlet has only been issued very recently—I did not get my copy until two months ago—very few of our people knew that this system was in operation. A good number of our farmers intend to apply for accreditation of their herds, and they will be very much disappointed when they find that their applications are deferred. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick, as the old saying is. Another point. Here are 14 herds under process of examination, and in due time they will be the only accredited herds for the whole province of New Brunswick. We have quite a large number of other breeders of pure bred cattle who will be absolutely unable to get their herds tested, and consequently they will not be able to sell their stock, because our beginners are aware of the fact that tested stock is worth far more money than untested. Untested stock may be all right, but you can not sell it. I am raising some pure-bred stock, but I have not got them accredited yet. I was going to make application, but I shall not do so now, for I do not want to be on the waiting list when there is no barber to attend to me.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The sooner you apply the sooner your turn will come.

Mr. CALDWELL: The result will be that the 14 breeders who get their herds accredited will corner all the business in New Brunswick, and no other breeder will be able to sell pure-bred stock in competition with them. My hon. friend for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) pointed this out, and as his herd is accredited we cannot impute to him any selfish motives. I have not a very big herd, but I know large numbers of breeders who have, and who would like to get their herds accredited. I have been doing some work along this line and I am very sorry, because having told the pure-bred stock breeders in my province that they could get their herds accredited, I now find myself in a false position.

Mr. BRETHEN: There seems to be a misunderstanding regarding this matter. I take it that there is no money at present to carry on this work for the current year, that is, until after the 31st March?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Except in Manitoba. We are taking on new work there now.

Mr. BRETHEN: In the restricted area?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, and the retest, second, third or fourth, as the case may be.

Mr. BRETHEN: I quite agree with what the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) has said regarding the value of this work. I believe that this accredited herd system is the first and about the only stimulus to people who own herds of cattle to try and eradicate tuberculosis, and I believe that for every person who was interested in it at first there are at least a hundred now interested as a result of this compensation scheme. I should like to have an assurance from the hon. minister that the vote as it stands at present will look after the applications now on file and new applications to the extent it did last year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think we can do that.

Mr. BRETHEN: That is the only thing I wish cleared up.

Mr. JELLIFF: Have we any accredited herds in Alberta?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In Alberta the figures for accredited herds are: Fully accredited, 7; under process, 41; on the waiting list, 6; total, 54. If any hon. gentleman wants to know about any other province I shall be glad to give the information.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Ontario?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Fully accredited, 185; in process, 422; on the waiting list, 78; total, 685.

Mr. KNOX: Saskatchewan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Fully accredited, 13; in process, 50; on the waiting list, 19; total, 82.

Mr. LEADER: Quebec?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Fully accredited, 98; in process, 301; on the waiting list, 52; total, 451. Manitoba, fully accredited, 26; under process, 179; on the waiting list, 9; total, 214. British Columbia, fully accredited, 23; under process, 27; waiting list, 1; total, 51. No report from the Yukon.

Mr. CALDWELL: Where can we get the names of the men who own these accredited herds?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I suggest that my hon. friend ask for a return containing that information. We have everything else here, but we shall be glad to supply that.

Mr. GOULD: I am sure that enough evidence has been furnished in the remarks of hon. members on this question to prove that it is one of very great importance. I have wondered whether the minister has been deprived of this $285,000 by a process of duress, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) suggested the other day in regard to another matter. There is no doubt that disease is prevalent not only in pure bred herds but among other cattle as well. Only two days ago I received a letter from my home stating that one of our nearest neighbours had lost twenty-one head out of a herd of twenty-three because of tuberculosis. The disease is prevalent in herds of grade cattle, and the department have not the same opportunity of finding out to what extent it prevails there that they have in the case of the pure bred herds. That is one reason why I urge upon the minister that this item be increased by $285,000. In view of representations that have been so generally made here to-day I have no doubt that if the minister will again go to his colleagues and ask for the amount taken off from last year, he will get it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have stated in answer to another hon. gentleman that it all depends on how things work out. I will have all the information inside of a month, and if this amount will not do the work, I will do my best—as I did last year and succeeded—to get an additional amount in the Supplementary Estimates. I am interested and delighted to know that even what appears to be a reduction, not in efficiency but in the size of a vote; a better use of money—alarms the members of this committee when it is applied to agriculture.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have been requested to take up item No. 48 for the same reason that I gave in respect to No. 45.

Agriculture—live stock, including grant of $6,000 to Stock Growers' Protective Association, $1,230,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: To what branch of live stock does this refer?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member who asks the question drew attention, under the previous item, to the importance of live stock in the Maritime provinces. The same importance is to be attached to live stock all over Canada; I had occasion to draw attention to that in a former debate. This vote applies not only to the beef types of live stock but to our dairy herds. I will give the details; it is largely a speeding up along every line. I may be asked why we increase the appropriation and decrease it somewhere else. Well, our information is not yet complete in regard to the possibilities of the embargo, and that is the reason why we left it to be dealt with in the Supplementaries. But in this case we know only too well that this amount of money will be required—and more if we could get it—to put our live stock in better shape all over the Dominion of Canada. You could take a radius of twenty-five miles right around where we sit and find that in a lamentable number of dairy herds the average production per cow is lower than 3,000 pounds per annum; and we are competing with countries whose average is 6,000, and who are close to a market, at that. So you can see what a tremendous handicap we suffer in competing with other countries which are active in the dairying industry. We must do all we can to remove that disability. It is true that much depends upon the individual but education enters largely into the matter. If we can convince the dairyman that poor, scrub live stock is a money loser, we have done something towards starting him in the right direction; but it is remarkable how much of that educational work seems to be necessary with some people. Some farmers may think that they get along better with poor stock because it will stand more hardship, but they are money losers in these times when nothing but the best can make the grade under the conditions to which I have referred. The details of this vote include: horse breeding division—federal assistance to horse breeding; cattle division; distribution of pure-bred bulls; sire purchase policy; scrub bull campaign; boys' breeding

clubs; free freight policy. The latter is the payment of freight on carload lots of female stockers which the farmers purchase at the various stock yards for winter feeding or breeding. Sometimes a large number of females will be rushed onto the market, and in order to see that they do not go out of the country the freight is paid on them back into the interior from any recognized stock yard. Then, the amount covers activities of the poultry division, stockyard service, national live stock records, egg and poultry markets intelligence service; egg inspection and grading, record of performance, co-operative marketing, and so on.

Mr. CALDWELL: It does not include cow testing for butter fat?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is under the dairy division not the live stock division.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like some information about the Stock Growers Protective Association. I always have a suspicion of a "protective" association.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Southern Alberta at one time was practically all devoted to ranchers. There is a certain residue in the vicinity of Calgary, in the foothills and the Lethbridge country, and adjacent district, who have been devoting their activities almost exclusively to cattle growing,—just as the wheat men devote their time to growing wheat, and the potato and fruit growers devote their time to their own products,—with the result that they have been hit exceedingly hard this year with the deflation in live stock prices. A number of men have organized this association for protective purposes in the securing of markets, in the improvement of their herds, and doing all those things which seem to be requisite for the purpose of tiding them over these very trying times. It was a heroic effort put forth by these ranchers to try and meet the present situation, and we feel that they have done a very large amount of educational or propaganda work. They have had correspondence both with the United Kingdom and the United States and with various parts of Canada, for the purpose of improving their conditions with respect to the markets.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister spoke of a grant for fox inspection.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Fox inspectors, registration and inspection.

Mr. CALDWELL: How much money is spent in that branch? I should like to ask the minister if he realizes just what fox farming means?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I intended seeing it last fall.

Mr. CALDWELL: I wish the hon. minister had. I am getting on thin ice, because I see the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. MacLean) looking at me very sharply. To my mind it is a matter of speculation or has been in the past, and I would be sorry to see the Department of Agriculture contribute anything towards speculation. I have no doubt that men who have lost money in fox farming lost largely because it was a great deal like the Vancouver boom in real estate a few years ago—there was nothing behind it—and men who bought foxes at fabulous prices were not able to sell the offspring for anything near what they paid for the breeding stock, and in fact they are killing them now and selling the hides for fur—breeding stock that costs thousands of dollars a head. I would be sorry to see the department restricting important branches and devoting money to fox breeding.

Mr. LOVIE: Under this item I would like to take up the question of federal assistance to horse breeding. It is known that for the past number of years there has been what is known as a federal scheme for the assistance of horse breeding. As the law stands at present, it works out quite an injustice. It is not very fair in its application. I could best illustrate to this committee possibly if I mentioned what took place in my own district. I belong to what is known as the Holland Clydesdale Horse Breeding Association. There are other associations in the same district but this one has been running now for probably about twenty years. We follow one pure-bred draft stallion and keep him some years. We have had high-class stallions, the best we could get, and yet simply because a number of us club together and purchase our own stallions, we get no assistance from the government, whereas if we were going into the hiring of stallions in that district we would get $8 for every mare in foal per year. That is a handicap and an injustice and there seems to be no way of remedying the injustice. As an association we seem to be penalized simply because we invest good money to get the very best stallions we can procure. We have a stallion called the Chicago Junior Champion and the Brandon Grand Champion, and yet because we own these horses we are penalized. Could any change be made in the law so that this injustice could be wiped out? The law works with our association in such a way that it will put us out of business and members will drop it. It is not conducive to community breeding.

I would like to know what the minister would have to say about changing the law.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let me deal with the question raised by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) referring to the fox industry. There is no question about the fact that there was an inflation and a deflation in that business, as in many other businesses, but as far as I know, regarding the fox industry of Prince Edward Island particularly, it is in a good healthy condition at present. It is true that it has been hit by the American tariff, but it will surmount that. Foxes are agile creatures and will be able to leap over the Fordney tariff. We are doing certain inspection work. The live stock records take care of the registration, just the same as with the domesticated animals and the department engages in certain inspectorial work. It is partially self-sustaining and will eventually be entirely self-sustaining. I think the time is approaching when nearly all these services being rendered by the federal government will have to be paid for, just the same as in the older countries. At the present time it has not been done except in a few cases, such as the inspection of a carload of wheat, for which they charge 90 cents. The time is coming when the same principle will have to be adopted with regard to other services.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the hon. minister leaves that subject, how much money is spent on the fox inspection?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was $8,000 last year, and $10,000 is set apart for this year. I have a two-page memorandum in regard to it, if the hon. member for Victoria wishes to read it.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not wish to delay the vote, but I call attention to the fact that it is an unwise expenditure of money, in view of the fact that the hon. minister has not money enough to test our cows. He is cutting down important work and branching out into speculation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think we have got to develop our farming. I like the thought of new ventures that will enable farming to become more diversified, even if it is only in the matter of fox breeding. Take such a matter as the growing of hemp, flax, tobacco, or the breeding of foxes, or anything that will appeal to the people and give them a diversion, I think it is sound policy to develop these things. I am not a protectionist and I think this industry has proved that it would be wise to lay the foundation for a line of pure-bred foxes, and their registration certificates are recognized in the short time in which they have been recorded as being valid, and they have a high standard already.

With reference to the question of horse breeding, my hon. friend (Mr. Lovie) wanted to know why groups of men purchasing a horse could not get the same assistance as clubs of men renting a horse. That looks reasonable enough, but it opens up the old question which dates back to the early days of the western provinces, when there was a general campaign from there, what we called syndicating horses. A great many abuses grew up, and I think one of the reasons is that they do not want to encourage the old policy of syndicating, but I think the object is not so much to help the man who has two or three stallions. The purpose of the assistance is to help the individual farmer who has no other way of securing the services of a good animal except through the medium of the group—that is where five, six, eight or ten, whatever number there may be, group together and rent horses under the assistance given by the department. Now, the giving of assistance to the individual who finds it impossible himself to buy an animal, is the primary purpose. That means giving encouragement also to incidentally the man who owns the horse, but the primary object is the individual; the man who owns the stallion benefits in a secondary way.

If we were to encourage the men who owned the horses, I am afraid it would help to restore the old syndicating business that I am sure some of my hon. friends opposite me must have run across in their early experience in Manitoba and elsewhere.

Mr. TOLMIE: I notice there is an increase of $170,000 in this appropriation, and I would like to know whether any particular expansion of the live stock industry is contemplated under the increased vote?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We shall devote ourselves to a general propaganda, carrying the message of better live stock to the people and then following it up by rendering such assistance as we can, and carrying out hog grading also. It is estimated that our expenses in connection with the hog grading alone will amount to about $50,000. At the beginning there has been a little exception taken to our policy, as is always the case in connection with any new policy—but sooner or later it will be generally accepted as right and proper. When the breeds have so improved as to comply with the standard—to the extent, at least, of 50 or 60 per cent in the matter of "selects"—then the time may

come when something will have to be done by way of fees to take care of the cost of the work.

Mr. GARDINER: In connection with this item I would like to inquire as to the possibility of finding a market for western raised horses. Doubtless the minister is well aware of the fact that in that country we have a great number of surplus horses, and the department may possibly be able to do something in the direction of finding a market for that surplus. Is the minister contemplating taking any action along this line?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is in the various eastern provinces a very good market for good sized horses, say over 1,350 or 1,400, but I think there is sufficient market in the province of Ontario to take care of all that class of horses offering for sale. That was the information obtained by the Live Stock branch about six weeks ago; and we have a man in the West now helping to develop that business, and indicating the portions of Ontario where a sale for animals of that description might probably be looked for. But unfortunately the largest number of animals offering there on the western market are animals weighing about ten or eleven hundred pounds, animals running on the prairie, range horses. Some of them, I suppose, will run from ten to twelve hundred, and some under. We have been endeavouring for over a year to find a market in Europe for such animals. We can find the market, but we cannot discover anybody who is prepared to pay for them—that is the difficulty. There is plenty of demand in countries that are unable to pay, and that is the way in which the matter stands.

Mr. GARDINER: In connection with this vote I would like to make a remark or two in regard to hog grading. There is a good deal of dissatisfaction amongst the farmers in connection with the present system of hog grading. I believe those who are alive to the situation realize that hog grading in the long run is going to be the best policy, but they point out this important fact, that in so far as the department's officers are concerned they only grade the farmers' hogs when they go into a stock yard. Now, their contention is that the hogs should be graded after having been slaughtered at the plants. The present system, I am afraid, will never be satisfactory to the farmers until the hog grading takes place in the plants as well.

5 p.m. We believe that the packers are in a position, by judicious selection after the hogs have passed into the plants and been slaughtered, to get a good deal more number one meat sent out of the plant than they pay for on the open market, and I therefore suggest to the minister that he should look into this question to see whether it is not possible for him to extend the hog grading proposition so as to provide for grading in the plants as well.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince): With reference to the market for horses, referred to by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Gardiner), I may say that there was a carload brought down to the Maritime provinces this year and the farmers there—although a market was found for the animals—were very much disappointed with the character of the stock. It was intimated, in the advertisements of the sales that these animals would be useful for the purpose of improving our stock, but the Maritime province farmers found that they were just ordinary work horses and not very desirable. However, I believe there is a market in the Maritime provinces for the right kind of horses, that is typical horses, calculated to improve the stock that we have there at the present time.

Some reference was made to the question of fox breeding, and I think that it is only fair to say that possibly from no line of live stock has the government received such a large amount of money in taxes as it has received through the breeding of foxes. I can name one company in Prince Edward Island that has paid as much as $1,000 a year in income taxes. A very large amount of money has been invested in that industry, but it was only within the last year or two any assistance was given to it. We had local registration in our province which was not recognized in shipping animals across the line into the United States, and it was with a view of facilitating that export that the breeders there asked for live stock records to be started in Ottawa. A small amount has been expended in that way—some $8,000 or $10,000. It is not, however, a free grant to the ranchers, as they consider that the fees that are charged for registration are extremely high. I think it is only fair that it should be made known that the government has received very large amounts in the way of income taxes from the fox breeding industry. The breeders are still paying heavy taxes and suffering from certain handicaps which we feel the government should endeavour to remove. With a view to providing remedies an experimental station has already been started.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to inquire of the minister how many breeders there are

who are paying such immense income taxes. If the enterprise is such a money making business I do not understand why the government should be called upon for assistance to the extent of $8,000 or $10,000 a year. I know of no farmer in New Brunswick who has been doing anything more during the last three years, than merely meeting expenses, let alone pay income taxes. I am more convinced than ever that there should not be any extra appropriation for this industry when it is in the hands of a few breeders and when, as I said, it is a matter of speculation. I hope those engaged in it are making money, but when they are able to pay such large sums in income taxes it is pretty good proof that I was right in the contention I advanced.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The fox industry is not confined to Prince Edward Island at all; it extends throughout Canada, and my prompter tells me that the largest branch is in New Brunswick.

Mr. CALDWELL: That does not make the matter any better. That is the reason I know about it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These fox ranches developing throughout Canada, and the work that is being done can be done only by the government. The question is only one of doing the work as we are doing it without any cost; or if we start a policy of fees, we shall have to pass the fee system around to many other things than the foxy fox.

Answering the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner), I am pleased to note that he agrees with the principle of hog grading. Theoretically, and in practice too in small countries, the method of grading is undoubtedly after slaughter. But that does not seem to be practicable in a country like Canada, where animals are shipped long distances and where the owners do not appear on the scene at all after shipment. In a little country like Denmark, a farmer will load his animals on a cart or some other conveyance and take it to the abattoir. He will then go down town, if there is one there, and do a little shopping. Then, on his way back he will get his grade and money and return home, and the transaction is completed. It is not practicable to do that in Canada; but that is the ideal method if conditions would permit. We have a man now investigating the whole question and also getting information that, I think, will lead in a short time to the adoption of a policy of grading the bacon itself. Grading the live hog is only one of the processes that should be checked up and controlled by grading the bacon, especially for export, so that we may then know just what relationship exists between the select hog and the select bacon. We have made a nice start on the matter, but we are looking forward to the introduction of new features which experience shows to be desirable.

Mr. HALBERT: How many hog graders have we in Ontario at the present time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Twenty-two, all told, nine of whom I understand, are in Ontario.

Mr. HALBERT: It would not be possible then for them to grade all the hogs that would go on the market at the present time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend means, grade them before slaughter?

Mr. HALBERT: No, after slaughter.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They are graded at all the chief abattoirs and stockyards, whereever they are slaughtered. I may say that we have in mind making provision that, just as a farmer can have his wheat properly graded by the load, a farmer can ask that his hogs be graded at the point of shipment, but for want of time we have not yet succeeded in bringing that about. We are starting at the large centres. My experience has been that, the farmers generally where there are local markets, have not asked the local buyer or drover to grade their animals, but I think a system can be worked out whereby a farmer can demand the right to have his animals graded, and his animals will be tagged, so that the report of the grade can be sent back, and he will know whether the drover has given him the proper grade.

Mr. HALBERT: Supposing a carload is shipped f.o.b. to the packing house, without going on the market, are such hogs graded?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. But as a rule, a drover in the country gives simply a flat price for the whole bunch, unless there are some old derelicts.

Mr. MILLAR: Have the weights fixed by regulations for "Selects" and other classes proved satisfactory? I have heard some complaints in that regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is quite a problem. It depends upon whom my hon. friend refers to as the one that should be satisfied. We do not pretend to make grades to suit the present bunch of hogs. What we wish to fix is a set of grades that will suit the buying market, and then our desire is to encourage the people to raise hogs that will fit the grade and have a weight that will meet the demand abroad. Mr. Archibald is over-

seas now, as I told the House the other night, in order to secure a number of breeding hogs; but he is also going over to Denmark to find out what they have adopted as the proper weights of live hogs to make select bacon, and we shall be able to get some information from Denmark. She is supplying the same market, and with the information received from there and our experience here, we shall be able to arrive at just what constitutes a proper size for a select bacon hog. At the abattoirs the weight runs from 160 to 210 pounds, and this means, not always but generally, nearly 220 pounds at point of shipment. If we can raise this without hurting the quality of the Wiltshire side, I would be in favour of raising it; but we must find out exactly what the market wants. It appears to want a bacon side from a hog running from 160 to 210 pounds, but we shall supplement our information with what we can secure from Denmark before we make any change.

Mr. BROWN: No matter what weight is chosen for the premium hog, it seems to me desirable that the next grade should not have the same maximum weight; it should be higher. On that point, there is more dissatisfaction than on anything else; that is as regards taking hogs out of one grade and putting them into another where the maximum weight for the two grades is the same. The minister, perhaps, has the recommendation of the Council of Agriculture on the matter, and it is worth while considering on that point.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The weight, of course, does not determine the class of the hog. You can have a chunky hog that will not make good Wiltshire.

Mr. BROWN: This comes out of my investigation of the Winnipeg stockyards. More dissatisfaction seems to arise from the fact that the maximum for the premium hog is the same as the maximum for the next grade.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is probably because a number of people do not understand what we are aiming at.

Mr. WARNER: Have we really any kind of bacon except the Wiltshire that they are willing to accept in Great Britain? The greatest dissatisfaction in our part of the country over this hog grading is because the farmers who were asked to raise a bacon hog, did not understand that they had to raise a hog that was so hard to raise and to get at as the Wiltshire-side hog. They understood that they were to raise a bacon hog that could be produced out of the breeds that they already had on hand, and the consequence is that they are so badly discouraged that they are giving up the idea of trying to raise a bacon hog if they have to have the Wiltshire-side hog altogether. It was not understood—and I understand this is the case quite extensively—that they had to qualify for the Wiltshire-side. They claim that the breeds they have will not produce enough of the Wiltshire-side to pay them to undertake raising Wiltshire-side hogs. In many places, about one per cent is as high as they get; in some places, they might get a little more than that; but they claim that it is not worth while to try, and they do not believe they can change the breed of their hogs so as to reach the mark that is set at the present time. But they did hope that they could raise bacon hogs.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are three brands of Wiltshire-side, leanest being the highest, lean the second and prime the third. So that there is a reasonable variation. I recollect having read of other recognized brands in the Old Country but I do not remember them. These are the standard brands, however. I can understand the difficulty my hon. friend speaks of. For over a year we have talked about the advantages of grading hogs. The matter was taken up a year ago last November by various organizations, local, provincial and federal, and there was worked out the best system that could be devised with the information available. Of course, there is always room for improvement as we acquire more information. But this is the difficulty: too many people expected to have a grade that would fit their hogs and they went back home disappointed. As I have suggested to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar), the idea is to establish a standard to suit the market. This is the day of the buyers' market and not the seller's. During the war everything went in the shape of a hog, because the world was hungry for hogs and everything else eatable. But now the boot is on the other foot and our people are disappointed because they cannot get into the select grade and obtain the 10 per cent extra. They will simply have to try to breed better bacon hogs to meet the export requirements. About 50 per cent of the quality of a bacon hog is due to heredity and 50 per cent is controlled by the feeder. As a rule, unless you have lots of dairy by-products you cannot produce a hog of the best type. You cannot make a Wiltshire-side by turning a hog loose at a self-feeder; especially if it gets the kind of feed the average hog is given. By a properly balanced ration you can produce

a good bacon hog, using a reasonable amount of dairy by-products in the feed. We have not paid adequate attention to feeding with a view to the production of good bacon hogs. As I say, feeding represents 50 per cent, and breeding the other 50 per cent, of conditions that produce good bacon hogs, and we must endeavour to educate the breeders up to an appreciation of that fact.

Mr. WOODS: Is there any system of government grading, inspecting and stamping of bacon which is dressed in the abattoirs for export, or is this left entirely to the packing houses?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For many years there has been in vogue a system of grading by the packers themselves, who follow whatever system they think suits the market. That also formerly applied to live hogs. This system was satisfactory to the packer but not to the buyer, and therefore we are introducing a system of government supervision and standardization. We hope to introduce a system of government inspection of Wiltshire sides, and we shall thus be able to control the quality of export bacon, so that it shall go upon the market in the approved and recognized grades. We have not taken that matter up yet, but we are progressing in that direction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister says that 50 per cent of the success in the raising of good bacon hogs is due to heredity and 50 per cent to feeding. The grading of hogs is a new thing in this country. Prices have kept up fairly well considering the deflation that has occurred in other branches of agriculture, and grading has not been practised long enough to determine whether or not it will be the success it is expected to be. The prices of beef animals have always been fixed according to quality; and the packers have been buying hogs and doing the grading themselves. Now, however, the government intends to fix regulations under which this grading must be done. A minimum weight and a maximum weight are established, and if the animal weighs 3 pounds over 220, it does not receive the premium. If it is underweight, on the other hand, I suppose it is not entitled to the premium either. But you do not follow that up. A packer may take in an overweight animal and if it is of good bacon type he will probably be able to dispose of it at a select price, so that your system is really of no effect. At the Winter Show at Guelph last fall the grading of hogs was a surprise to people who were interested in the business. In many instances animals that did not grade very highly on foot graded well when dressed, and vice versa. And they were examined by men who were experts in the business. I am not finding fault, but it shows how difficult it is to grade animals.

The only true test is that which is made after the animal is dressed and is in the hands of the packer. The packers have graded carcasses for many years, and the government is now stepping in to do something which in any other business is done by one of the two parties to the transaction. I take it that the government is undertaking this duty on the assumption that the farmer is not in a position to take care of himself. The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) said the farmers were somewhat surprised that some animals were not grading. It is quite evident, I think, to anyone who has been engaged in the live stock business for any length of time, that the proper type of bacon hog is one that cannot be economically fed. It is what one might call a long-geared animal, and that type is not regarded highly by the live stock breeders of the country. I venture to say that you will find in the corn-growing districts of western Ontario, when this matter is put to the test, that the farmers will not raise the kind of hog which it is claimed will produce select bacon in the Old Country. This is one of the things that should be demonstrated at the experimental farms, to ascertain the cost of producing bacon under these conditions from the different types of hogs. Many of the breeds that the people are now being advised to try out may cause disappointment and our breeders may quit the business. And of course you cannot grade hogs if none are raised.

Another factor which enters very largely into the successful raising of bacon hogs is pure feed stuffs. In fact in this connection it is of more importance than anything else that may engage our attention this session. The minister admits that 50 per cent of hog disease is due to bad feeding. We have for years permitted the adulteration of feed stuffs, and the disastrous results following their use have driven many hog raisers out of business. In my part of the province it is impossible to purchase hog feed without finding on the bottom of the sack "Screenings not exceeding mill run." It may be said that the law specifies the quality of feed stuffs and prohibits adulteration. But what is the use of such legislation if the millers do not supply feed stuffs of this standard, but, on the contrary, offer us substitutes adulterated with poisonous weed seeds on which we are expected to raise bacon hogs. Hogs of the type described by the hon. mem-

ber for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) might have the capacity to overcome the bad effects of these poisonous weed seeds, but the bacon hog's constitution is too delicate to resist, and thousands of such hogs have died before reaching maturity. I have pointed out the serious damage which is being done to our hogs by the marketing of these adulterated feed stuffs, and on several occasions I have introduced a bill to prohibit adulteration, but without success. However, that matter will come up very shortly when I shall have an opportunity of discussing it at greater length.

I understood the minister to state that this increase of about $50,000 is for propaganda to stimulate the raising of cattle and hogs. We cannot pick up an agricultural paper today without coming to the conclusion that there is propaganda on foot to try to convince our farmers to follow a certain line of production. For months past every agricultural paper in my province has been loaded up with propaganda to persuade farmers to put their money into a business that is not co-operative at all, but is absolutely a joint stock company. After a great deal of effort in this direction we are now informed that nothing further is going to be done along co-operative lines during the present year. I recall another line of propaganda to which the minister has also referred, namely, the grading of cheese. I notice that right here in eastern Ontario our cheese producers have met together and protested most emphatically against this proposal, yet in spite of their protests steps are being taken to compel them to submit to it. It is all very well to pass laws and frame regulations under them to compel people to do certain things, but unless they find it is profitable to do these things all our efforts at compulsion will be fruitless. I very much fear that this propaganda is not good business. The farmer is a fairly intelligent man as a rule, notwithstanding what some people may think about him. He knows when he is engaged in some branch of his business on which he is making a little money or losing, and if he is not making a profit in any particular line we may be certain that he will quickly discontinue it.

This department has now men over in the Old Country to purchase a certain class of animals which the department desires our farmers to handle. If they are of the type which I have seen very recently, I am afraid that in many instances they will appeal only to those breeders who are anxious to make money out of the introduction of such animals by the department,—in fact in many instances these men are simply promoters. We heard a year ago about efforts being made to develop markets for our live stock, and a couple of prominent men were sent to South America for that purpose We have not heard very much so far this session about what they accomplished. I asked a question as to whether one of these parties had been appointed Commissioner of Agriculture. In reply, the minister stated that this gentleman was only temporarily engaged, and I believe he referred to him as his "special messenger" in connection with this live stock business, and that he hoped he would be able to go to South America, but sickness had prevented him accompanying the other gentleman. I hope that a lot of this propaganda is not designed for political purposes, but I rather suspect it is. At the close of last session when I arrived home I was surprised to find that this supposed Commissioner of Agriculture was up in my riding addressing a gathering of Liberals. The chairman of the meeting, a member of the executive of the Liberal party for Ontario, was down here in Ottawa at the close of the session; I knew that. Well this "special messenger" of the minister, addressed a meeting of Grits in my constituency. At the commencement of this session I placed a question on the order paper respecting his standing in the service, and to my surprise I find he is still in the employ of the government at a salary of $6,000 a year with several more thousands for expenses. But my inquiries with reference to his activities in my constituency and in other ridings were not answered by the minister. This is the kind of propaganda that is being carried on, and I am afraid that about 50 per cent of it will be found to be political. I am sorry to think that, I am indeed, but my conviction is that in the province of Ontario there is more camouflage along that line at the present time than ever before. Even the president of our Agricultural College at Guelph came into my constituency and addressed a political gathering there.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that what he is discussing comes under Civil Government. If he seeks to criticize the actions of some of the officers who come under this vote, he will of course be quite in order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to violate the rules of the House. This item being in regard to live stock, and we having been told that the party I have referred to was engaged to develop a live stock market in South America, if I can show that while engaged for that

purpose he was devoting his time to political propaganda, I do not feel that I have transgressed the rules. However, I shall have an opportunity to deal with this subject at a later date.

When the estimates for the experimental farms were going through the minister informed the committee that the system was being changed to meet the changed conditions in the country, and that efforts were being made to develop live stock depots at our various experimental farms for the breeding of animals to supply the adjacent districts. I assume that part of this money will be used to stock up the experimental farms with these animals. The minister shakes his head?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; that comes under the experimental farm vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I notice that the farmers of western Canada are in a position to avail themselves of the concession granted to them in respect to what is known as the shipment of carload lots of feeding cattle, whereas the farmers in Ontario are not. Ontario has been the great market for the feeders from western Canada during this past fall, on account of their being practically excluded from the United States and Old Country markets. You can understand, therefore, the unfairness of the present regulation which does not enable the Ontario farmer to have these animals shipped back under as favourable conditions as those available to the western farmer. Another source of injustice to Ontario is that a very small proportion of the male animals distributed for breeding purposes are placed in that province. We have not found any particular fault in that regard, but I have endeavoured to show that so far as experimental farms, live stock and all these things are concerned, practically no encouragement is being given to agriculture in Ontario. The minister will realize that it is not fair or in the interest of those who are shipping their feeding cattle from western Canada to Ontario to find that when they arrive there, very high rates have to be paid on the shipments of the cattle back to the farms. There is another preference given in respect to the shipment of animals for breeding purposes from the live stock markets, but so far as I know that preference has not applied to Ontario. The chief complaint I have, however, with regard to rates is in connection with the carload lots. I hope the minister will look into this matter, if his attention has not already been directed to it, and see that some concession is granted along that line.

Item agreed to.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): May I ask the minister what amount of money has been expended in the scrub campaign throughout Ontario ,and whether there is co-operation with the provincial government in that resepct?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that $5,000 has been spent under that head. The provincial departments in the West, and also those in Ontario, are co-operating. The extent of that co-operation is pretty hard to define.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to ask the minister a question in regard to the protection of pure bred stock.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to direct the attention of the hon. member to the fact that that item has been carried, after a great deal of discussion.

Agriculture—administration and enforcement of Destructive Insects and Pests Act, $310,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: Will the minister explain the increase of $70,000? Perhaps he will tell the committee also what progress has been made in connection with the campaign against the corn borer in Ontario.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Nearly all these increases are due to the development of our ordinary activities. In the case of insect pests, there seems to have been increased difficulty during recent years in many parts of Canada. In the East the corn borer has been active, and we have had the grasshopper in the West. The activities under this item may be divided into two heads, one botanical and the other entomological. The botanical end of it deals with the following subjects: potato inspection; plant pathological investigation; cereal rust; potato diseases; white pine blister rust; fruit diseases. Laboratories are maintained at the following points: Ottawa, Charlottetown, Kentville, Fredericton, Quebec, St. Catharines, Brandon, Saskatoon, Lethbridge and Summerland. Take the question of cereal rust; we have been looking for the best man we can get to carry on the investigational work in that connection, but the kind of men we need are not available at the prices we offer—prices which, as hon. members know, are not entirely controlled by the department. I suppose that after a while, when we have failed a sufficient number of times to get a proper man as expert on fungus diseases of this nature, we shall be able to get a reclassification that will command the best man for the purpose. In the meantime we are doing what we can in this direction with the limited supply of men we have. In the Entomological

branch, activities are carried on in respect to insect pests affecting field, garden and orchard crops, forest and shade trees, and so on. Methods of controlling these pests are studied at the following branch laboratories and field stations, which are maintained out of this appropriation: Annapolis Royal, N.S., Fredericton and Bathurst, N.B.; Hemmingford, Aylmer, and Lake Edward, Que.; Strathroy, Vineland and Port Stanley, Ont.; Treesbank, Man.; Saskatoon, Sask.; Lethbridge and Banff, Alta.; Vernon, Agassiz and Victoria, B.C. The second branch of activity is the inspection and fumigation of nursery stock. In this connection stations are maintained at Montreal, St. John's, Que., St. John, N.B., Montrose, Ont., Toronto, Niagara Falls, Windsor, Winnipeg, North Portal, Vancouver. Then, there is the matter of brown-tail moth control in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec. There is the European corn borer quarantine and control work in Ontario. The invasion of this insect pest gave rise to the possibility of a very serious interruption in the development of many of our fodder crops. However, quarantine methods have been employed; the habits of the insect are better understood, and the corn borer menace is not looked upon as being as serious as it was a year ago. We are taking all precautions for the purpose of circumscribing as far as may be the activities of this insect. Then there is the question of apple sucker quarantine in Nova Scotia, and alfalfa weevil quarantine in Alberta.

We have the gypsy moth scouting in Quebec, and the satin moth scouting in British Columbia; then there is the introduction and distribution of parasites and other useful insects, and the study and control of insect pests by their natural enemies and the distribution of these native enemies. These may look like very strange activities, but when I was at the Agassiz farm I visited the entomological laboratory there and found the men engaged in gathering the cocoons of the natural enemy of the spruce bud worm of the Maritime provinces and eastern Canada. They were catching these little fellows and sending them down here to propagate their species and attack their natural enemies and their natural source of food. That is what keeps the animal world and the plant world properly balanced. When they get too many of one kind something else bobs up and feeds upon it, and thus preserves the equilibrium. We are trying to destroy harmful insects and pests by subjecting them to the attacks of their natural enemies, and we are attempting in this way to take care of these invasions.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. CALDWELL: What results are you getting in the extermination of the spruce bud worm?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It takes time. The parasitic insects multiply with amazing rapidity. Nature as a rule takes care of these matters. In reference to the invasion of grasshoppers, I believe nature has done as much to take care of the extraordinary invasion in the West, in the way of providing parasites of the grasshopper as all the other agencies supplied by man. But British Columbia is a long way from the Maritime provinces and nature has to be supplemented by the transfer of parasites from British Columbia to the Maritime provinces. I have had the opportunity of transplanting beaver to Saskatchewan and placing them in some of the forests reserves—taking them from their native haunts and putting them on the forest reserve. You would lose sight of them in the jungle and somebody years afterward would discover a dam across the road and then somebody would find the beaver. This practice will manifest itself, but it will take time. It depends on the condition. Then as to the spruce bud worm,—I have this memorandum.

Investigations in eastern Canada have shown that the Spruce bud worm problem is not a purely entomological one, but that it involves the entire administration and management of timber resources. Only by the adoption of the broadest practices in the administration and management of these forests will it be possible to establish conditions necessary to prevent a repetition of this recent catastrophe. Our investigations have awakened a very great interest in this problem among foresters and lumbermen and have resulted in co-operative studies and experiments by forest entomologists, foresters and forest pathologists, through which we can hope to obtain in the future a bud worm proof forest. The losses to balsam and spruce in eastern Canada have amounted to at least 150,000,000 cords which would have been worth in manufactured value billions of dollars. As an indication of the savings which have already resulted from our study in the province of New Brunswick alone, it has been estimated by the deputy minister of the Crown Lands Department of that province that following our studies the cutting of Balsam fir and the salvaging of bud worm-killed Spruce and Fir have been of benefit to the province in the past two years to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the brown-tailed moth invasion of New Brunswick increasing or decreasing?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand it is decreasing.

Mr. MAYBEE: Is the grasshopper pest under control?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It seems to be working westward into Alberta and western Saskatchewan. It is prety well circumscribed in Manitoba and if the hon. member for

Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) were here he would be able to give some particulars, but I have not heard of any serious invasion in Assiniboia where it first asserted itself some four or five years ago. It has been travelling up towards Swift Current, and I think appearing at intervals at various places in Alberta and British Columbia, but the various provincial governments have adopted restricted measures and, assisted by their municipalities, they are on the alert. Forewarned is forearmed. They are in a better position in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta than we were in the early days of the invasion. They are now more or less in a position to meet the situation, although it is not quite under control. I think the danger is almost past.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Has the codling moth situation been improving or otherwise?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have made inquiries and there is a certain amount of this insect pest prevalent and there are fears as to its expansion. Precautionary measures are being taken and fumigating is being done in the cars which have been affected. My hon. friend asked if we contemplated stopping the importation of fruit altogether, in the event of the pest becoming sufficiently serious to warrant it. So far as my investigation has gone, I do not think that point has been reached. I think it is better understood now than previously and the preventive steps have had results. I do not apprehend any serious increase in the danger from this pest. However, everybody seems to be aware of the trouble, and therefore preventive measures are adopted. Taken as a whole, the situation is not any worse.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): To what extent is the aeroplane assisting in the war against insect pests particularly the insects attacking the forest, and in what part of the Dominion has the aeroplane been used for scouting?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is the only medium practically to-day for scouting, both in Ontario and Quebec, and the Interior department is doing a great deal of it.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Will this item enable the minister to do any scouting over the forests in Saskatchewan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If there is any occasion for it. There is none of this spruce bud worm that I am aware of in northern Saskatchewan. There may be other pests, but they are largely in the Maritime provinces, Quebec and British Columbia. The forest difficulty referred to, however, has not asserted itself and has not been brought to our attention on the prairies. Wherever the conditions are thoroughly understood the less difficulty there is from any sort of insect pest, but some further remedies will be available when the necessity arises.

Mr. JELLIFF: When this same item was up for consideration last year I drew the minister's attention to a particular species of pest that we have to deal with in our part of the country, and that was the pest to our live stock,—timber wolves. I think the minister will recall that last year I read communications from a number of our stock growers, located along the foot hills of the Rockies, complaining of the depredations and havoc that have been wrought among their herds by these timber wolves, and I specially stressed the matter and asked him that some provision, if possible, be made tending to the rapid extermination of that pest. In addition, I went to the trouble of corresponding with the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and obtained a statement of the methods which they were employing in exterminating the wolves in that country and also data as to the results they had achieved, and I think the minister has that memoranda in his possession. I am not going to hold up his estimates to-day except to avail myself of the opportunity of calling his attention to this matter anew, and seeing if something cannot be done to track these timber wolves to their regular breeding places in Waterton park, and other reserves, that are under the control of the Department of Interior, and exterminate them. I do not suppose that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture wants the stock in which he is so particularly interested eaten up by the wolves that belong to the Minister of the Interior, and I would suggest that these two ministers get together and, possibly along the lines of the suggestions contained in the report from the United States, formulate some plan whereby these wolves can be hunted to their breeding places and destroyed. These pests are killing not only the young live stock which our dairymen and stock growers prize so highly in that part of the country, but also the deer and other game in the parts referred to. The ordinary man along the foot hills has no right, under the regulations of the government, to go in there and hunt these animals. Under the United States regulations, however, the government employs expert hunters to trace up these wolves and exterminate them, and the hunter is allowed a regular salary for doing it. In return the pelts go to the government by whom they are sold, the

receipts from this source tending to offset the expenditure involved. Where a farmers' or stock growers' association will undertake the work they pay the hunters, and the pelts are turned over to the association to help repay the cost. Now it seems to me that some plan can be worked out along that line between the two ministers. Our farmers and stock growers are very insistent on this point, and I hardly feel like giving the matter up until I see some aggressive action on the part of the two departments concerned. I hope the minister will look up the correspondence and data in question, and see that some attention is given to the matter.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Fruit, $182,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This increase is about on a par with the other increases that we dealt with this afternoon. All activities in connection with fruit are being speeded up. In addition to that, the act that was passed last year with respect to vegetables including potatoes, is administered under the Fruit branch. That involves the expenditure of a small amount of money for potato inspection and such like, this accounting for a part of the additional expense. Other activities are in connection with marketing and grading. This year there is a consolidation of this act, and this will involve a certain amount of additional expenditure.

Mr. CALDWELL: In connection with the matter of enforcing the grading of potatoes, is it proposed by the government to have inspectors who can settle disputes between shippers and buyers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know what my hon. friend means by settling disputes; but they will settle what the grade is. For instance, if a buyer and a vendor have a dispute as to the grade, the inspector will decide upon the grade, and then they will have either to abide by that or to go to court. At any rate, that will be the authentic decision of what constitutes the grade.

Mr. CALDWELL: How many inspectors has the minister now for this purpose? In this connection, while possibly I am out of order on this, I should like to mention one point in connection with enforcing potato grades, seeing that potatoes come under this item. In the grading act, as passed last year, there was no clause providing that an inspector's report or decision would be final as a settlement of a dispute between parties over grades. I would like to see that amendment made to the act, because unless you have such a clause, the inspector's decision has no authority under the act. I thought of this last year, but it slipped my mind when the matter came up in committee. Under the act you compel the consignor to furnish the grade contracted for, but you do not compel the consignee to accept that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend is right. There should be either a provision of that nature, or a provision for a survey board to pass upon a decision of an inspector, in which latter case the decision of the survey board would be final, but I do not think a survey board would be necessary. It is implied, possibly, that the inspector's decision should be final; but if it is not in the act, it might not hold in a legal case.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the minister be willing to move such an amendment as that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the act is up for consideration, or if my hon. friend thinks the matter is of sufficient importance in itself, we will look into it. Has any difficulty arisen with respect to disputes between buyers and sellers? Such disputes might easily arise.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not know that any have arisen, because very few potatoes have been sold in Canada this year under the act. Most of our potatoes are for export. There is a possibility, next year, if the crop should be short in Ontario, that we would be shipping large quantities of potatoes to Ontario as formerly: In former years, many disputes arose between shippers and consignees, and they had no way of settling them.

Item agreed to.

Publications, $28,500.

Mr. HALBERT: Perhaps, a good deal of waste occurs as regards publications in connection with agriculture, and I would suggest to the minister that such publications be sent out with a note stating that the copy sent is a sample and requesting, if they would like to continue to receive the publication, that they fill in the form enclosed. That would save a great deal of money on publications.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is precisely the practice that is being pursued.

Item agreed to.

International Institute of Agriculture, $15,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is an institution that has been in existence for approximately ten years, and I think David Lubin was one of the gentlemen responsible for its organisation. It consists of an organisation with headquarters at Rome, Italy, and about sixty-three different countries participate in it and help to finance it. They have a permanent office now in Rome which is maintained throughout the year with a small staff, and an international conference is held once every two years for the exchange of opinions and experiences and the furthering of activities with respect to statistics, largely of an agricultural character. I believe it was through this medium that we first were apprised of the fact that this year we had suddenly jumped to the place of the largest wheat exporting country in the world. I think the institution serves a reasonably useful purpose from a statistical standpoint, although its usefulness is perhaps not quite so extensive as was anticipated by its originators. It was thought at first that by having statistical information of a world wide character flashed before the entire world of purchasers with regard to either overages or shortages of farm produce, there would thereby be provided in some measure a guide to producers which would enable them to produce more heavily in one direction, or to a less extent in another, as the case might be, according to the conditions in the various markets. I do not think that the institute quite does that, but it is a source of reliable information and as such I think it is valuable.

Mr. CALDWELL: But as a source of practical information, the results obtained from it are nil.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am afraid so myself.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the United States a member of the institute, and if so what does it pay in proportion to Canada's contribution?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The United States has three representatives on the international conference and Canada one. We sometimes send more than one, but on important questions on which a division is taken we have just one voice.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the minister think we are getting value for the money we are investing in this institute? I think he is rather of the same opinion on the question as myself.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: To be quite frank, I do not think we can afford to drop out of it. If we had an abundance of money we could well afford to stay in it; and even as it is I do not think we should withdraw. At the same time, I have often wondered whether in these days of stress $15,000 might not be expended more usefully.

Mr. CALDWELL: For example, in the testing of cattle for tuberculosis.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: However, I would not recommend that we should withdraw from the institute. I admit that I had misgivings once, but I have not as many now, and I should not like to advise our dissociating ourselves from the rest of the world in the compilation of these valuable statistics.

Mr. CALDWELL: As a matter of history I think possibly the statistics are of benefit. But is it not a fact that we get the information so long after the occurrence of events that it is ancient history when we do get it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We get the information quickly now. We got by cable, early this year, the news that we were in the proud position of the largest exporters of wheat in the world.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is the library in the West block carried on under the auspices of this institute?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I went through it the other day, and I think it is exceedingly valuable.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, it is.

Item agreed to.

Seed, feed and fertilizer control, $295,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The increase is not very large. Last year a new fertilizer act was passed which involves a little more expense; like every other growing activity it calls for additional expenditures from year to year. Possibly in the seed department there will not be quite as large an expense as in former years, but there is a considerable expenditure that is more or less fixed. A very generous contribution is made to seed fairs, which include standing field competitions. These fairs are held throughout the provinces and serve a valuable purpose. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) on another vote raised the question of the Seed Purchasing Commission. To allay any anxiety about the matter of feeding stuffs I might say that a representative conference was held last week in Ottawa of producers, users and handlers of

feeding stuffs with a view of formulating some amendments to the Commercial Feeding Stuffs Act. Since coming here I have been very much struck with the arguments advanced by some, that we have just as much right to expect bran and shorts in their purity as anything else. It is a standard article, even though perhaps not in the same sense as flour; and the farmers take the ground that when they produce grain it has to be sold on a basis of purity. For instance, weed seeds cannot be counted in the gross weight; they must be taken out, and only the net weight is considered. If there is too much moisture in butter, not only is it deducted but you are prosecuted; and it is contended that when a purchaser wants mill stuffs he should be able to get what ought to be standard articles like bran and shorts unmixed with screenings. That question has been raised and a bill is in course of preparation covering it. I have not had an opportunity of referring it to my colleagues, but if it is satisfactory it will be brought down to the House. It makes provision very much along the lines suggested by two or three members either this year or last year.

Mr. LOVIE: Do the millers claim that their bran and shorts are pure when they send them out?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, the law permits their mixture now. It allows the mixture of shorts and screenings; if you want to buy it in its purity you must procure it in small packages certified. There is a certain demand in the United States and Canada for bran in small packages for human consumption. It is known as sanitary bran or something like that. It is also produced in large quantities for the American market. When you buy shorts, however, the law permits a certain mixture. For instance, if you have a hundred bushels of wheat from which you get two bushels of screenings, those screenings go into the bran and shorts which are the by-product of the milling of that wheat. This mixture is allowed by law, and a good many feeders of hogs are very strongly objecting to the adulteration. The bill that we have under contemplation provides for a standard of purity for bran and shorts. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the full provisions of the bill in advance, but that is what we are aiming at.

Mr. LOVIE: I think the sooner those evils are rectified by the proposed bill the better, because when we sell our wheat we are docked so much for screenings, and the millers have no business to sell those screenings as they do not pay us a cent for them. There is no evidence so satisfactory as something you see yourself, and I may say that I saw in southern Ontario some time ago shorts with the milling company's brand on the bag, but so much adulterated that young pigs would die before they would touch such feed. This product was simply black seeds ground up and a very small quantity of shorts added. I tasted the mixture; it was quite bitter, and certainly pigs would not eat it. The regulations ought to be made a lot more drastic because the milling companies get these weed seeds for nothing and we pay the freight rate on them to Fort William. Instead of being used for hog feed they should be dumped in the lake.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The practice simply grew up, like Topsy, overnight as it were, until finally it was legalized. Later we began to discover the evils of the practice. As a matter of fact, shorts as we have them now, even without screenings, are not much else than fine bran. Some people like things mixed, but there is no reason why we should not know what we are getting in our by-products from the mill, and they should be standardized like everything else.

Mr. THOMPSON: How is this fund administered in connection with the field crop competition? Is it paid over to the province or does it go direct to the agricultural societies?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the western provinces the money is paid through the medium of the agricultural societies that have the administration of the seed fairs; and I think that is the way it is handled all over Canada.

Mr. THOMPSON: The minister did not get my question correctly. I asked if this money was paid over to the provincial authorities.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, it is paid to the agricultural societies because they administer the seed fairs. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAYBEE: Is it the policy of the seed department to establish seed cleaning stations; and, if so, has anything been done along that line?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have in the western interior elevators very efficient seed cleaning machinery. We have no stations established for the purpose of seed cleaning, but in Alberta they have local seed cleaning stations to accommodate the growers of pedigree seeds. The activity of the Seed branch with respect to the distribution of seed has been confined largely to the West. Even last year

when they were short of seed oats in eastern Canada the supplies were taken from stocks held in the West.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the control of commercial seed houses come under this item; and, if so, is there a standard of purity set for garden and grass seeds supplied by those houses.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We control them in this way,—we control the quality of their product. I presume we would have authority to enter and examine their seeds. All these matters are being dealt with in the bill now before the Agricultural Committee, in which bill standardization of field and garden seeds is provided for.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I intended to say a few words about garden and grass seeds, but I shall reserve my remarks until that bill comes down.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it will be dealt with next Tuesday.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it the intention of the department to continue the Seed Purchasing Commission?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend mean that we are to keep the commission going when there is nothing for it to do, or will we re-establish it when there is something to engage its attention?

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that ever since the Seed Purchasing Commission was established there has always been something for it to do. I believe there is quite a lot of work for it to attend to this year, and I would suggest to the minister the advisability of continuing the commission in force for at least some time yet. We farmers in western Canada have derived a great deal of benefit from the work accomplished by the commission and would be very loath to lose the services of such a very effective body.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Last year we had a reasonable staff on that commission and, I have already intimated, a large amount of western seed grain was distributed in the prairie provinces to take care of a shortage there. This year we were prepared to go ahead with the purchase and distribution of seed, but the provincial governments of the western provinces were not ready to play their usual part in guaranteeing payment by the municipalities where the latter were not able to pay cash for the seed distributed. Therefore we could not do business this year.

Mr. GARDINER: There is just one other point in connection with that. The Seed Purchasing Commission has always paid its way, it has never cost this country one dollar. Not only that, but the commission has provided business for the interior elevators amounting to over $600,000. Taking that into consideration and also the fact that this commission has been of great benefit not only to the West but also to the East, I believe it is the duty of the government to continue it in operation. Certainly we in the West would be very loath to lose its services.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I omitted to say that we have a small staff of two in the office ready to do business on a moment's notice if required. The Seed Commissioner, Mr. Wilson, is paid on a per diem basis and his services are available at any time. The seed supply of the West is pretty well distributed, and as the provincial governments do not think it is necessary that there should be any intervention at this session, we feel that it is not our business to take any active steps in the matter. There is no necessity of our going into the business unless there is some co-operation on the part of the province in connection with payment for the seed.

Mr. CALDWELL: What steps have been taken to see that the new Fertilizer Act is being complied with?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We usually wait until there are complaints. Our inspectors and analysts however are carrying on their work and taking steps to see that the material is up to the requirements. I do not know of any particular violations of the law this year; if there have been any I should be glad to hear of them. There is no doubt that in some parts of Canada the matter is a very important one; in fact, it is the object of the act to see that consumers are protected.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a very important matter with us in the East. Two years ago I moved an amendment to the Fertilizer Act—on account of a new bill being introduced it was not brought into effect—namely, that the manufacturer of fertilizer should state the materials from which it was made, and that such statement should appear on the tag attached to the package. It was required by the act of last year that the manufacturer, when applying for a license number for his brands, should furnish to the department the names of the ingredients that went into the manufacture of the article. The fertilizer men insisted that that should be the trade name of the article, and we amended it to provide that the name of each article entering into the manufacture should be stated. The trade name does not mean anything; you could group a lot of material which was not plant food and call it tankage, or something like that. I would like to have

the assurance that before the department grants licenses for brand numbers, this requirement of the act shall be complied with. I think also that the department should print bulletins giving all this information to those who ask for it. We feel that we have been defrauded in times past; we have bought fertilizer made of material which, though it would stand the analysis, was not plant food. Two years ago the fertilizer men appeared before our Agricultural Committee here and on that occasion they admitted that materials were used in the manufacture of the product that we at least did not believe were plant food. I refer to such things as ground leather scraps, ground mustard seed, wool, hair, feathers and so on. They say that these things can be treated and made available for plant food; I have my doubts myself, and I think even the chemists disagree in that regard. But the department should insist on having a statement of all the material entering into the manufacture of the article when application is made for the registration number of the brand.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This matter is being followed up pretty closely, because there has been a disposition to put spurious articles into fertilizer, and even with the most careful supervision they sometimes get past. There may be some manurial properties in feathers, but I should think it would be of very slight value indeed.

Mr. THOMPSON: I would like to ask the minister on what basis the grants are made in connection with field crop competitions? Is it on the basis of the amounts contributed by the agricultural societies? I would also ask whether Ontario participates in that grant, and if so to what extent? I have been president of an agricultural society for a good many years, and I never heard of the federal government giving this assistance in respect of field crop competitions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It has been going on for ten years.

Mr. HARRIS: Does the minister think that during the last two or three years the operation of this act has had the effect of improving the quality of feedstuffs. At the same time he might give the committee an idea of what the administration of this act has cost.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It certainly has not improved the quality of the feedstuffs. The hon. gentleman was probably not in his seat when I gave a rough outline of how this practice grew up of putting screenings back into the bran and shorts, until finally it was authorized by law. A good deal of objection has been taken on the ground that these screenings are deleterious, sometimes actually poisonous in their character, and the public are demanding the by-products in their pure state. It is a practice that grew up; somebody put the stamp of approval on it, and it has gone on. It is difficult to state the cost in the case of any one of these particular items—seed, feed, and fertilizer control—because the same staff of inspectors deals with them all, just as the fruit inspectors largely take care of potato inspection.

Mr. HARRIS: Do I understand that the whole of this grant then is strictly for the administration of the act?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It covers the cost of maintaining the staff engaged in the outside field work. It is also to provide an inspection service for the administration of the Seed Control, Feeding Stuffs and Fertilizers Acts, and to establish and maintain analytical laboratories for the testing of seeds, feeding stuffs and fertilizers. It is to encourage the production of superior seeds for domestic requirements and export; to encourage the manufacture and general use of a good quality of fertilizer; to develop export markets for seeds and feeding stuffs; to establish and maintain an intelligence service for seeds, feeding stuffs and fertilizers; to maintain the Seed Purchasing Commission. These are some of the activities carried on under this vote. The laboratories referred to are provided for the testing of the germinating properties of the various samples of seeds forwarded by farmers and others from time to time. We have four of these, Calgary, Winnipeg, Ottawa, and Toronto. Here is the administration cost:

General administration—	
Staff—inside service—	
Office supplies	$ 6,000
Publications	6,000
Total	$12,000
Production and markets—	
Subventions for seed crop competitions, seed exhibitions and seed centres	$65,000
Market reporting service	5,000
Development of domestic and export markets for seeds and feeding stuffs	8,000

Because of the up-to-date nature of the seed control, our seeds in Canada have a very good reputation on foreign markets, and we facilitate and encourage the shipment of them. Our seed is grown in a northern latitude and consequently it has better germinating qualities than seed grown further south. I have several times supplied the southern market with grass seed, and they would buy it because it was grown in a northern latitude, and therefore contained higher germinating properties.

Laboratory and inspection service—
District No. 1—The Maritime provinces:
(a) Inspection salaries.. .. .. $7,335
(b) Inspection service (trav. exp. etc.).. .. 3,845
District No. 2—Quebec—

	1922-23	1923-24
(a) Laboratory salaries..	1,980	7,500
(b) Laboratory service	1,200	1,800
(c) Inspection salaries..	12,150	14,000
(d) Inspection service..	8,850	8,500

And then it goes on the same way all through District No. 3 in eastern Ontario.

We have District No. 4, western Ontario, District 5, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and District No. 6, Alberta and British Columbia. For these purposes the country is divided into six districts, each constituting itself a unit for administrative purposes. I can give figures with respect to the other provinces, but it is really not worth while.

Mr. CALDWELL: Carried.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is about in the same proportion.

Mr. THOMPSON: I certainly do not want this item carried without having an answer to my question. The hon. member stated that this grant was in connection with field crop competition. I asked: What are the terms on which the act is administered in connection with field crop competition, what percentage does the department pay, and what steps are the agricultural societies taking to secure this grant? Does the province of Ontario participate in this grant? If so, to what extent?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have no desire to withhold information. I thought my hon. friend was quite satisfied that he had found out something new. These grants are being paid and as a matter of fact have been paid for ten years. I will have much pleasure in giving my hon. friend the details. Possibly I did not hear his question correctly, but I have no desire to avoid the answer. The subventions for 1923 to be paid the provincial Department of Agriculture on account of seed fairs, field crop competitions, and threshed and clean seed competitions are $75 for each seed fair, $50 for each field crop competition, $600 for each provincial seed competition and $200 for each seed crop and clean seed competition. The portion of the subvention to any province is not to exceed $2,000 for each province having not less than 1,000,000 acres under crops and $2,000 pro rata per 100,000 of total population. That is a rather involved method of distributing it, but it has worked out satisfactorily. Since 1912—I said ten years and my guess was not very far wrong—provincial departments of agriculture have been paid subventions sufficient to cover approximately one-half of the total cost of conducting field crop competitions, seed fairs, and exhibitions. Payment of subventions is governed by regulations which have been amended from time to time for the purpose of improving the quality and increasing the quantity of the seed supplies. Several millions of bushels of approved seed have been produced annually as a result of these competitions at seed fairs. This registered seed supply that is being cleaned in Alberta by these seed-cleaning depots, I think they call them, is one of the outgrowths of these seed field competitions and seed fairs. They have taken that matter up and it has become of sufficient importance for the provincial government, I think, to give some encouragement to this cleaning, where the growers of regular seed can ship their seed and get it cleaned as the law requires. That is one of the outcomes of the seed conventions to which I have referred. Taking the distribution by provinces, the subventions paid in 1922-23, and the amount available for 1923-24, are as follows:

	1922-23	1923-24
Prince Edward Island..	$ 706	$ 2,000
Nova Scotia..	1,217	2,000
New Brunswick..	2,198	2,376
Quebec..	15,771	16,402
Ontario..	13,857	20,000
Manitoba..	4,000	9,000
Saskatchewan	6,000	9,000
Alberta..	1,366	7,493
British Columbia..	2,500	2,500

The amount of the distribution in this case is based on the principle that applies in many other cases; for instance, the establishment of illustration farms. It depends on the applications made by the people in the respective provinces and so the offer to participate in this subvention is optional on the part of the people, and hence the variation between the provinces.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think there is a little misapprehension on this point arising through a statement which the minister made a moment or two ago. If I understand him correctly when the question was asked by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Thompson) whether this money was paid to the agricultural societies or to the provincial government, I understood the minister to say "directly to the authorized agricultural societies." My hon. friend from Hastings says he is president of such a society and his society has not received its grant. Do I understand now that the money is paid direct to the society or to various provinces for distribution among the societies.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the mistake arose in this way: in the early days it was paid to the agricultural society, but since my connection with the department these payments have to some extent changed. I think a change has been made and it is paid directly to the department—

Mr. GUTHRIE: To the provincial societies?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These field competitions are administered through the Canadian seed growers associations; part of it goes to the society and the other part goes through the medium of the province which has to give an accounting of it. It did not start in that way, but that is the way it developed as being the more satisfactory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I believe the minister dealt with the matter of feed stuffs before I came into the House. In answer to a question we obtained the information that the condition of the feed stuffs is becoming more unsatisfactory from year to year. I remember a few years ago the matter had reached such a stage that further protective measures were necessary, and legislation was put through in 1919 dealing with this stuff in such a way that it would be impossible for the millers to continue the practice that had grown up. The following year the act was so amended that it really became inoperative, and since that time, as is well known to all the live stock raisers throughout the country, it is absolutely impossible to purchase good feed because it is not manufactured. The act provided in a very elaborate manner for the purity of certain kinds of feed stuffs, but if you cannot purchase these what is the use of the provision? On the other hand what is known as commercial feed stuffs are practically all adulterated; an immense quantity of screenings are ground up and passed off on the buyers. The millers are more careful now than they were at one time as to the manner in which the feed is mixed; it is mixed much more evenly and adulteration is much harder to detect. I believe the officials of the Department of Agriculture are very desirous of having this matter looked after, but if the statute remains as it is I think it is absolutely impossible for them to see that the millers shall turn out these feeds in their pure state. In the first place, when the millers purchase the wheat, there is so much deducted for seeds and stuff that may be in the grain and for which they do not pay anything. This is separated from the wheat before the wheat is milled, and if it gets back into the bran and shorts it must be put there deliberately. Now it is a very easy matter to remedy this, and a year ago I brought it to the attention of the minister. I received an assurance that the matter was engaging his attention and that something would be done, but being very busy at the time I did not press the question. I did not hear the minister's statement on this subject to-night, and I would therefore like to ask now if there is any intention to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act during the present session so as to prevent the continuation of the practice complained of.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I can recall the question my hon. friend put last year with respect to the desirability of having pure milled by-products and I expressed sympathy with my hon. friend's view. But we were rushed last year, we could not do everything. As it was, we thought that we did very well for our first session. This year the advisability of having some change has been impressed more and more upon me because of complaints coming in from different quarters, especially with respect to the shorts and the deleterious effect of adulterated feed especially upon pigs. We had a conference the other day with the millers, the consumers and the middle men—those who purchase mill feed—consisting of some eighteen or twenty people. The conference arrived at certain conclusions and I have made certain recommendations to the Seed branch with respect to the amending of this Feeding Stuffs Act. Now, I cannot, at this stage, unduly anticipate what is in that proposed legislation. But I think when I get the consent of my colleagues to bringing it down, and I have not yet had an opportunity of doing that, I can assure my hon. friend that in the amendments a remedy will be found for at least some of the difficulties he has been complaining of. We believe in the purity and standardization of mill products, like bran and shorts, just the same as the flour itself. There is no reason why the public should not get pure commodities, and if they want to do the mixing let them do it themselves. That is all I can say at the present time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister is a practical man and understands this question. Therefore why the millers should be called in in order to have their views embodied in any legislation that may be passed in connection with this matter is a thing which I fail to understand. Knowing something that has transpired during the last few years I am satisfied that the millers are the ones largely responsible for the trouble that prevails to-

day and for the defects which exist in the present statute. It should be a very simple matter to prevent adulteration, there is absolutely no justification for it, and to have the act remain in its present shape, permitting them to indulge in the practice complained of, is nothing less than a humbug.

Now, I want to point out that this practice has not been a matter of gradual growth as some people may believe. The turning point was reached in December, 1917, when an order in council was passed permitting adulteration to a greater degree than it had been indulged in at any time previously. I will refer anyone who desires to look the matter up to an order in council that was put through on 3rd December, 1917, and which contains section 17 of the Grain Products Act. That section reads:

> The presence of presumably vital weed seeds in any form of feeding stuff shall be held to constitute adulteration under the act, when more than 25 seeds per pound, as enumerated in the Seed Control Act of 1911, are present in the feed.

Now the trouble is that the millers are putting in machinery that will devitalize a great deal of this seed and the result is that what the minister has referred to has taken place in many instances. I pointed out, when introducing a bill of a preventive nature, many cases of loss of animals having occurred through this stuff having been fed to them, particularly young pigs. That being the case the committee can understand the extent of the losses that have been experienced through not getting any benefit from the feed stuffs. Two years ago the millers appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and they were anxious to have a third grade of mill by-products sanctioned, known now as middlings, and what was formerly known as low grade flour. The Agriculture Committee refused to consider the matter and it was absolutely turned down by them, but it has since been sanctioned by regulation and is the practice to-day. The short, simple bill which I introduced in 1919 provided that no adulteration of bran, shorts and middlings should take place. The measure was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and after the very strongest debate, the millers having been heard, a motion was passed to this effect:

9 p.m.

> Resolved that in view of the serious results from the adulteration of bran and shorts by adding thereto great quantities of weed seeds, both ground and unground annually resulting in the death of many animals and serious injury to the health of others, besides distributing harmful weed seeds throughout the country to the detriment of those who engage in agriculture, this committee would respectfully recommend that immediate action should be taken to deal with this question by passing and putting into effect at the earliest opportunity Bill No. 7, an Act to amend the Adulteration Act.

This act was passed, and it was afterwards amended so that it is virtually of no effect and is now not in the statutes at all. The encouragement of the live stock industry and of agriculture in general in this country is something that must have more attention than it has so far received. I am satisfied that no one thing has done so much to discourage those who are endeavouring to develop the live stock industry as this curse with which they have to contend. They have paid good money for it. Is it any wonder that, under such conditions, you find that the farmers have ceased to raise the hogs that you are endeavouring to encourage them to raise? I can point to scores of well-equipped pens for raising hogs where they do not pretend to raise any at the present time. This is quite a common thing, at least, throughout the older provinces, and this condition of affairs is chiefly due to this trouble. Yet, when complaints are sent in, what do we find? We find the minister tonight acknowledging that these complaints are frequent and serious. Yet the millers are to be consulted and they are going to suggest to the department something that ought to be done in the matter. I can see very easily that that means, if their idea is to be carried out, no remedy is going to be provided for the situation at present existing. To say nothing of the losses sustained through feeding this stuff, the consequence resulting from the distribution of weed seeds throughout the country is another feature that I am not going to touch upon, but it is a very serious one. The weed menace is costing Canada millions and millions of dollars, and steps will have to be taken in the near future to control this difficulty with which we have to contend. The big mills may be perfectly satisfied. It is very difficult to come to any conclusion as to the enormous profits that they must make on this stuff, for which they do not pay anything, because they deduct from the grower of the grain much more than the quantity of the impurities to be found in it. Their contention, when they appeared before the committee of this House, was that they purchased this in the grain and they are justified in disposing of it in that way. This contention of the millers will be found in evidence taken before the Committee on the Cost of Living when the three big milling companies were present. It is absolutely unjustifiable. If they desire to sell this stuff, why not sell it for what it is, namely as screenings? That is the proper way to put it on the market. If

it has a food value—and it has if it is properly cleaned and taken care of—let them put it on the market in that way instead of mixing it with bran and shorts and having people feed this stuff which, in many instances, does more harm than good. This is something which the minister should deal with promptly instead of entrusting it to the millers, because if he does entrust it to them, the end that is desired will never be attained.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) was not present when I dealt with this matter a few moments ago but inasmuch as he has brought up a few new phases of the question, including the personnel of the conference, I wish to say that we are following, with respect to this conference and the amending of this act, just the same practice as we do with the amending of all acts. There is no reason that I can see why the millers should be ostracised in regard to this matter. The Feeding Stuffs Act deals, in deed, with many by-products of the mill. From the standpoint of the producer and of this House, we want to get information that can be secured only from the millers. We do not want to pass legislation with which it is impossible to comply. Take the highly technical and complicated nature of the conveying machinery and all the different machinery for the various separations in the mill. I must admit quite frankly that I am a layman in this respect. I know the difficulties are there; but before legislating, I want to know whether I am making conditions and laws with which it is impossible to comply. That does not mean that the millers are going to have the whole question delegated to them. We are simply using them fairly, as we do all interests that are involved in any business in the country. For instance, last year, we had a conference with regard to the Fruit Act and another with regard to the Potato Act. Every piece of legislation that we bring down is preceded by a conference of all those who are concerned especially with it, and that is the first important step towards the successful administration of an act as well as getting it on the statute book. No particular party, whether it be the wholesaler, retailer, producer or consumer of an article is going to get all his own way. The making of a law constitutes the ironing out and harmonizing of the differences that invariably exist between the various parts of the community with respect to the activities in any particular line. I think my hon. friend, on reflection, will see that that is quite right. I am sure he does not want to leave in the committee or on the country the impression that we are falling into the hands of the millers; that we are going to be engulfed by somebody, and that this act will turn out to be in the interest, not of the people who are asking for it, the men who buy shorts, but of producers of feedstuffs. Not at all. We think, in ordinary fairness to ourselves, as this parliament must be responsible for the law, if we are to have a good workable law, all parties concerned should be around the board for consultation purposes. After that is done, I think I can assure the committee that this is a measure that will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, because it is legislation concerning which we can have a long chat as to its various phases, and after we have put it through that fanning mill, if you like to call it so, it will again come before a committee of this House. Then, if there is any monster or joker in it, we can rely upon my hon. friend to diagnose and identify it and help us to dig it out. I think I can assure my hon. friend that when this bill comes down, he will be pretty well satisfied with it, even though the millers will have had a hand in assisting to arrive at the ironing-out process which is necessary before a conclusion can be reached.

Mr. ROSS (North Simcoe): At this conference to which the minister refers, and at which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and others were present, were breeders of live stock represented?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, two or three very prominent feeders and breeders in the neighbourhood of Brantford, I forget their names at the moment.

Mr. BROWN: We have spent a good deal of time on this question, and the minister has been dragged back to it three times this evening. It is a matter in which we are all interested, and I find that the minister's views and mine coincide very closely. I think I can assure the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that when the bill comes down, there will not be very much difference between him and those who sit in this part of the chamber, and I would suggest that we might let the matter rest now until the bill comes before the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The elaborate machinery the minister refers to is used in grinding up the screenings and packing it into the millfeed as evenly as possibly. That is the whole question in which the millers are interested. The minister knows very well that the live stock industry of the country cannot afford to use this stuff that is put into the

bran and shorts. There is no use dilly-dallying with a matter that has been before the House and the country so long and which is so unsatisfactory. I venture to say that the officials of the department are just as anxious as I am that this matter should be brought within effective control. I believe the minister has a splendid staff at his disposal to enforce the law and compel the millers to do what is right. There is another question the minister might answer. Have all the screenings which have been purchased by the department been disposed of? I know that there were immense quantities on hand some time ago, for which, I believe, $35 a ton was paid. It remained in the department for a long time. Has it been all disposed of, and who were the largest purchasers of the surplus that remained after the war?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The surplus has all been disposed of. My hon. friend almost tempts me to go further into the details of the prospective bill, which I should not reveal at this stage; but I can assure him that in future, after that bill goes through, he will be able to get bran and shorts straight without any admixture of any other substance.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the provinces of Canada for the purpose of assisting and encouraging agricultural instruction, grants to be made on a proportionate basis, $900,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the minister explain the decrease of $200,000 in this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In this year expires the ten-year period that was provided for when the original act was passed. Although the average of the grant during that ten years was approximately a million dollars a year, the instalments began with $900,000 and ended, as my hon. friend will see, with $1,100,000. Now, one cannot in these days forecast the requirements and the expenditures of the next decade, but I might point out the coincidence that, as did the previous ten-year period, the present decade starts with a grant of $900,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was spent last year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The entire grant has always been spent. It is allotted to the provinces on the basis of population.

Mr. HARRIS: Are there going to be any changes in the distributing of this grant?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is, in regard to the services for which it is allowed.

Mr. HARRIS: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Inasmuch as $900,000 will not pay for quite as many services as $1,100,000, there will necessarily be changes. The provinces will have to supplement the grant or the number of services will have to be reduced. That will be a matter for negotiation between the provinces and the Dominion. Changes, of course, are being constantly made from time to time as new activities spring up, or seem to require encouragement. I presume that the less important services will either be dropped or will have less attention paid them. A great many of these services are new, and I have no doubt that in the course of the past decade some will have indicated a great usefulness while others will have revealed a comparative inutility, so that the less useful will, I take it, be dropped. Some changes will therefore certainly have to be made, subject to negotiation between the two contracting parties as to what services will be continued in view of the reduced amount of the grant.

Mr. HARRIS: Have any of the negotiations between those parties been consummated?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, no negotiations have taken place.

Mr. BROWN: I am sorry that it should have been thought necessary to reduce the grant at all. I do not believe that any work carried on in Canada is of more value to the whole country than the work by means of the money provided under this item. In the report of a committee that is charged with this work in Manitoba it is stated that no single piece of legislation has had a more far-reaching influence than the Agricultural Instruction Act. I know that the work carried on in Manitoba with the assistance of this grant is invaluable. The work of the boys' and girls' clubs, of the women's institutes, and the work that is done in connection with home economics, are of incalculable benefit not only to the people of the country but to all the people of the towns and villages. What is done by the boys' and girls' clubs is valuable beyond any possibility of estimate, and I regret very much that it has been thought necessary to cut down the grant at all. I would rather see it increased.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture included in this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. I sympathise with the views of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown). I have had the duty of administering this act from both ends, provincial and federal and I know something of the activities

that have been developed under the stimulating effect of this expenditure. I have heard them criticized both favourably and unfavourably, but I feel on the whole that the expenditures have been wisely made for very profitable purposes. I cannot do better than pay a slight tribute to the hon. gentleman who was responsible for their introduction in the first instance, and nothing would please me better than to have the privilege of continuing them for another decade, but we cannot see that far into the future. All I can point out to my hon. friend is that the vote is the same today at the beginning of this new decade as it was at the beginning of the last decade. We have now twelve months to size up the financial horizon and think over the matter, and it gives the provinces too an opportunity to look around and wonder whether they are going to carry on this work in the event of these federal grants being finally dropped. This is not the only federal grant to the provinces, next year another one in respect to roads will be up for consideration. We cannot anticipate what will be done then, but it is quite possible that when the two grants confront us the country will be wanting to know our attitude towards the whole business of federal grants to the provinces.

Mr. HARRIS: I submit, Sir, that the hon. minister, having journeyed across the Dominion from coast to coast, and having shown in the handling of his estimates, to us baby members at least, that he has a grip of his department and knows whereof he speaks, surely must have some policy respecting the distribution of this particular item. Surely he can give the committee some idea as to how the money is going to be distributed among the provinces.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have already told my hon. friend that the money will be distributed in the same way as formerly, but that it is inevitable that $900,000 will not pay for as many services as $1,100,000.

Mr. HARRIS: That is just what I want to know—who is going short on the $200,000?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They will all go a little short.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Will the minister explain on what basis this grant is distributed to the provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is first a flat rate distribution of $20,000 to each province. That is to protect the interests of Prince Edward Island, which would have been discriminated against had the distribution been on a straight per capita basis. There is also $20,000 granted to two veterinary colleges, one at Montreal and the other at Toronto. The balance is distributed on a per capita basis, that is, according to population.

Mr. SPENCER: The minister has not answered my question in regard to the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture. Is that included in this item?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Where does the salary paid the Commissioner of Agriculture come in? I can not find it under the head of Civil Government.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was in the previous vote that has just been passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In view of the fact that a year ago the minister stated that the Commissioner of Agriculture was working on the Agricultural Instruction Act to determine in what proportion the federal grant should be paid to the various provinces, he will understand the anxiety of my hon. friend to the left to know what was done in that respect. We were told that this "special messenger" of the minister would possibly complete his duties at the end of six months. I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) asked the minister the question a year ago and received that answer. I am surprised that the minister did not inform the committee when the previous item was going through that it included the salary of his "special messenger," as he termed Mr. Duncan Marshall, whom I presume he sent up to my constituency to address political picnics. I do not think the minister has been very frank with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the minister states that the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture is not included in this item. Consequently he will be out of order if he discussed what should have been raised by him when the preceding vote was before the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I would rather think that the hon. minister does not want to take a sharp advantage of the members of the committee. It was only this afternoon that you stopped the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Sutherland) from continuing discussion of this gentleman's salary, which you pointed out—and quite properly—could not be discussed under the particular item then before the committee. The minister knows very well that hon. gentlemen desire to discuss the matter. There is nothing in the estimates to show from which

source the salary is paid, and I would suggest to the minister that instead of trying to take a technical advantage here he move —as I know he will—that the proper item be opened up on which this salary can be discussed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, such an appeal I am sure is irresistible. Besides, this is getting too quiet! But I want to assure the committee that I did not try to "put anything over" when they called out "carried". I am not going to stand in the way of discussing any vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was sure the minister would say that.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted in my remarks—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: —or called to order a few minutes ago, I was endeavouring to ascertain how this item was $200,000 less than a year ago. The minister has informed the committee that this is the last year in which this appropriation will be made. Although it was originally provided for in a lump sum of $10,000,000 for ten years, the appropriation has to be voted from year to year. There was nothing to prevent the minister from providing a sufficient amount under this item to meet the conditions which prevail. We were told a year ago that the payment of this amount in proportion to population would be an unfair procedure. The item is $200,000 less than it was a year ago; the minister now informs the committee that some of these branches of agriculture throughout the various provinces must go short this year. I was wondering if that was the advice tendered to him by his special messenger who, he told us a year ago, was dealing with this question. I cannot think that the excuse offered by the minister is a reasonable one. There are increases of several hundreds of thousands of dollars in other items of his estimates; why this item should be reduced as it has been is something I fail to understand. It will serve only to disorganize the machinery in existence throughout the various provinces dealing with grants heretofore received from the federal government.

Item agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood that the minister was going to reopen the previous item.

The CHAIRMAN: It cannot be reopened without the unanimous consent of the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood the minister was going to ask for that consent.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the appeal has certainly gone unheeded. In fact, it has been refused.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I responded for myself. I cannot speak for the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister himself will make the motion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh no, I will not make it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the hon. gentleman is in exactly the position I said he was in. Hon. members do not know from what vote the salary in question is to be paid. I think it is an unfortunate position, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, there will be lots of other chances.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On the budget.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On the budget? The hon. gentleman is keeping up his reputation for being a joker.

Dairying, $230,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would ask the minister to let this item stand. A number of members representing Ontario who are very much interested in the matter went home on the evening train. We would appreciate it if the minister would let the item stand for the present.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This request has come from two or three sources now. Since my former disposition to relent has not been appreciated, I am going to try it once more: I will concede the request and let this item stand until another sitting.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask whether the matter referred to in the previous item, the one that the minister was willing to have discussed, will also be opened up?

The CHAIRMAN: That item has been carried.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I guess the minister is wise in not opening it up.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I answered eighteen questions about that the other day.

Item stands.

Civil government—agriculture—salaries and contigencies, $852,925.

Mr. CALDWELL: The details as given on page 77 are not in the form to which we have been accustomed. The number of employees is given, with the salaries, but the names of the officers are not stated. Is that not unusual?

Mr. GRAHAM: I may explain that that was the former system. It was thought that members would get a better grasp of the number of employees and the salary ranges if the details were given in this way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But they are not grouped according to their activities. We do not know what job the particular employees are supposed to hold down.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister can give that information very quickly.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is an increase of 34 employees in the various branches. As the Minister of Defence has indicated, we have grouped the positions in this way, reverting to a practice that was in vogue in former years. Taking them in the same order as they appear in the Estimates, I may explain that in the case of salaries over $4,000, there is no change in the number of employees. There is, however, a statutory increase of $600.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister, before he leaves that, give us the information that the Minister of Defence said he could give us? What are the names of the eight gentlemen mentioned in the first item of the details and what jobs do they hold?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The information I have does not state them consecutively, but I think I can give my hon. friend the information. One of them is Dr. J. H. Grisdale, $5,500; the others are A. L. Jarvis, Assistant Deputy Minister, $4,500; T. K. Doherty, Commissioner International Institute of Agriculture, $4,000; J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, $5,000. That makes four.

Mr. CALDWELL: There are three at $5,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, they are not classified at $5,000. They are classified at $4,000 and over.

Mr. CALDWELL: Two at $4,500.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is one at $4,500. I will read them over again: Dr. J. H. Grisdale, $5,500; A. L. Jarvis, $4,500; T. K. Doherty, $4,000. That is on the first page.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is he the Commissioner of the International Institute?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. Then J. A. Ruddick $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the Dairy and Cold Storage Commisisoner.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then Mr. A. Gibson, Dominion Entomologist, $4,500. He has reached the maximum range under that classification. Then E. S. Archibald, Live Stock Director, $5,000. He has also reached the maximum range.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Last year he was $4,500.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not so indicated here. It indicates here $5,000 for 1922-23 and $5,000 for 1923-24.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is one of the difficulties we have when proper practice is departed from. There is no way of checking the salaries unless we go through the records. There is nothing to show the vote last year. The vote last year was not $5,000 for this gentleman, but only $4,500.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well now there will be that difficulty during the first year after a change. After another year we will have two consecutive years to compare, but every time you make a change, you will have that mixup, no matter how good the change may be.

An hon. MEMBER: Why the change?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well this will be better. That is all. This is the method I was familiar with first. I am not responsible, except in a general way, for the change. The innovation I have been discussing has been adopted all through. Here are the various appointments: Deputy minister $5,500; Veterinary Director General $5,040; three at $5,000, being the Director Experimental Farms, Seed Commissioner and Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner. Then we have two at $4,500, the Dominion Entomologist and the assistant deputy minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with that first item, perhaps he can tell us how many years he had to go back to find this system.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I must admit I have not been here very long. I can only go back one year. I do not know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the Minister of Defence, who came forward to

explain, can tell us how many years he had to go back to find this system.

Mr. GRAHAM: I had to go back to the times of good government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know. It was secretive government.

Mr. GRAHAM: When things were done properly.

Mr. HARRIS: Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us whether he thinks this way of paying salaries is better for the country or for the government?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am afraid I would not be an authority on this matter. I have tried both ways, but it is some time since I have tried this method. It seems to work all right both ways. I have not been sitting in the audience listening to the other man making the explanation, otherwise I might have been able to tell better.

Mr. LEWIS: It may be better for the government, but I must say it is not very good for the private member. It does not give us any conception at all whether the department is overmanned or not. We do not know what kind of men have been introduced into this department at all. Previously we were able to make a comparison, and we were able to tell what kind of men had been taken into the service or taken out of it, but under this system we are in the dark, and that seems to be the position in which the government wants to place us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Have the salaries mentioned in this item reached the maximum or will there be further increases from year to year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There has been some increase. There is an aggregate increase in those first eight positions of $600, due to the regularly provided statutory increases. They are all now up to the top salary range, I understand, and that is where they will stand until there is some adjustment in the way of classification by the Civil Service Commission, or some increase in salary, but so long as they remain in that category that is where the salaries will be. They are all at the top.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before passing from that item I should like to ask if there is any possibility of a change being made in the system. I observe that the deputy minister receives a salary of $5,500 and he has been on the job many years; evidently has reached the maximum, and it is quite evident that very heavy work devolves upon a deputy minister. It seems quite significant that some of the recent arrivals, whose salaries have evidently been smuggled through in some of the items which have been passed without any comments at all, should receive a higher salary than the deputy minister. I cannot understand this system. I was wondering when I saw what has happened whether this was the new system that is to be developed by reason of the activity of the government yesterday in having referred to a special committee the work of the Civil Service Commission who have control over such matters as these. Is this one of the reasons why the party referred to does not come under the Civil Service Act as these officials do? I think it is a most remarkable thing that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture—after the many years' services which he has rendered and the heavy duties which devolve upon him—should receive less salary than a man who passes his winters at a seaside resort down in Florida, makes trips across the Atlantic, goes around speaking at political picnics, and has a real good time at the public expense. This man, the minister states, is his special messenger.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I can only guess to whom my hon. friend is referring, but there is no doubt as to whom he has reference when he speaks of the deputy minister. Now, I explained last year, I think it was to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) how Dr. Grisdale's salary seems to be less than that of the average deputy minister. Dr. Grisdale receives $5,500 in cash, and occupies a rent free house at the experimental farm, an arrangement entered into before my time. The salary and emoluments are considered to be equivalent to $6,000. I made that explanation last year and my hon. friend is aware of it. I hope he will recollect it next year, and not make a grievance out of nothing.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice in reading the Estimates of last year that the estimates of the Department of Agriculture occupied three full pages of explanations wherein the names of the officials, the positions they held under the classification, and the salaries paid to them were set forth. Now the only information we get on the same subject is a mere half page, everybody being lumped together, thus affording no chance of distinguishing one official from another or making a comparison. It seems to me that the minister could very readily furnish us with the information as it appeared last year, so that we might be able to make a comparison, and see what difference there is in each case.

Mr. CALDWELL: I want to add my protest to that of other members as to the method referred to. If it were the custom to pass these items without asking any questions concerning them I realize that it would be a very advisable method for the minister to follow. But when he is called upon to give those explanations that are necessary in order to enable us to dispose of these votes intelligently it will occupy a great length of time. The information given last year, set out in the manner in which it was, rendered the Estimates much more intelligible to members. As it is now the minister gives us the names of officials and other explanations which go on Hansard. But we have not got that information before us, as we should have, and it is very hard—in fact impossible—to remember all these details when they are not before us in printed form. I must say that I was very much surprised when I turned up the Estimates and found the items set forth in the form in which they appear to-day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely the government have some intelligent reason why this change is made. For years the House has been accustomed to have proper information as to the Civil Service given to it. During the war that information was withheld for a short time owing to the pressure of business and the like, but it was again vouchsafed just as soon as the classification became sufficiently complete to permit of its being done. Now, the details have disappeared and the House is not in a position to properly consider these items. We are refused information, in so far as these estimates are concerned that we have always got. Surely the government are not here to-day to say that they do not care about this matter one way or the other. Surely they are not here to make a laugh and say that this change goes back to a time when there was proper government. Surely that is not the position of my hon. friends. Surely there is some real reason why this is done, other than a desire to make the passage of the estimates difficult. I suggest the least thing the government can do is to give us some reason for this change. Some one must be responsible for it.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Motherwell) is, perhaps, treating the committee with that courtesy to which it is entitled. If members will turn to items 153, 154, 155 and 157, relating to public works, they will find the information there displayed in accordance with the practice in previous years—that detail of information which has always been looked upon as a great advantage, and which has the effect of facilitating the passing of estimates. Now if you turn to Civil Government and these votes of the various departments—customs, agriculture, marine and fisheries and so on—you will find that they have been changed to the mysterious and obscure method referred to without any real reason, apparently, being given. There is really no information given whatever. Now there has been some general policy adopted. This does not apply merely to the Department of Agriculture, it extends to several of the other departments so far as I have been able to judge. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whose courtesy is always unbounded and whose knowledge of the departments is usually fairly complete, can give us a little information on this matter. Apparently it is a policy and method adopted generally by the government, and not simply by one department. As far as I can judge, it is very unsatisfactory and we ought to have some explanation for the change. I would suggest, before the Minister of Finance replies, if he will extend that courtesy to me, that he should give to members, before we pass any more votes of this particular class, the lists of officials as they were printed last year and the other information formerly presented. It would not take very long, it would, I think, be very acceptable to members generally, and might greatly facilitate the passing of the estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: I may say that the object was to present the estimates in a form which, it was thought, would be more acceptable to the House as showing the various grades of salaries. Of course the Estimates as formerly brought down never gave the names of officers. Some hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think that there is a departure in that respect but the Estimates in their former shape did not mention the name of any officer; they did mention the rank or the position, and in some departments there would only be a few of the higher officials, the rest being clerks. I am assured by my colleagues who had this matter more in hand that the explanation is the one I have stated. I know the object was to present the Estimates so that at a glance members could ascertain how many officers were getting high salaries and how many were getting small salaries. Whether the change is going to prove more acceptable to members than the former system remains to be seen. If the judgment of the House is that the old system was the better one I am not absolutely determined to insist upon the present arrangement. I repeat, the object was not to conceal anything but simply to enable members to see at a glance how many were high

10 p.m.

salaried and how many were low salaried officials.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not a matter of importance to know what work a man does when you are considering his salary?

Mr. FIELDING: You will find that a great many, probably the majority of the officials cannot be designated by their work; they take rank as clerks. The higher officials can be designated, such as the deputy minister, the live stock commissioner, or other commissioner, a few cases like that; but you do not designate the work of the majority of civil servants at all—they are clerks and doing the general work of the department. But, of course, the minister must be prepared to state in every case the duties of the office, the salary paid, and if necessary the name of the official whose salary is being voted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it from what the hon. gentleman says that he agrees it is advisable to know what an official is doing before we pay him. If he will agree with me to the extent that we have had a reasonable classification in the past, that ought to be continued.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like also to point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that last year we had, not only a description of the position held, but a comparison of the salary with that of the previous year. I remember, if the minister will recall, last year the House, in checking over this list, discovered a number of purchasing agents, I think, two or three in one department, and the result of that was a correction or a promised correction, at least, of an apparent overlapping in the department. All we have now, we are told, is that there is one at so much and three at another salary, without the slightest information or comparison at all. If this was designed—I say this with all courtesy—deliberately to mislead and deceive the committee, I do not know of a better form to follow than this that is now being presented to the committee. On the other hand, I can scarcely conceive of more complete details than we have had for many previous years. In fact for as far back as I have been in this House, namely, fourteen sessions, I do not remember any other system.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Apparently, this is the way we have it—

Mr. STEVENS: That is no answer. That is no explanation.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will let me get through my sentence, I was going to say, if the committee is desirous of getting out the dual system, we can let this matter stand until we do that. We may not come to Civil Government again for several days. I only want to reiterate what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said, namely, that the last thing in our minds, as was suggested by some hon. gentleman, was a desire to smuggle something through. What have we to cover up?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That is what we would like to know.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We want to give this information in the most concise and intelligent way. It is not easy to get a mass of names and figures in the most presentable manner, and as I have already intimated, I do not know which is the better way. I have tried both of them and they both seemed to work until to-night.

Mr. STEVENS: This is not working.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: How would it be if we just try it out and make some specific request for some specific information in order to see if we can get it? I have a number of names with the positions opposite, and my deputy tells me, while he has not the name opposite on this page or alongside, he can turn to each name that is represented by each particular salary. This may take a little while, but not very long.

Mr. CALDWELL: The trouble is that when the minister gives out the information, we do not have it; it goes on Hansard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is the way with all these things.

Mr. CALDWELL: Pardon me for interrupting, but I want to make my point clear. I would be the last one to insinuate that the government had anything to conceal; but I must say that we cannot consider this intelligently at all under the present method. The minister gives us the information as to these positions. It will be a wonderful man in this committee who will remember one out of five of them when that is done. The information will be printed on Hansard, but we do not get that until to-morrow. Then, we would have to go to Hansard for the various positions explained by the minister and endeavour to pick them out with the salaries, and that would be very difficult even with Hansard before us. Moreover, in the meantime, the vote is passed. I hope the minister will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) and have this prepared somewhat the same as last year. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) states that we have never had the names.

I do not think that is necessary at all. Last year, the positions were very definitely classified. There were senior clerks and junior clerks. We found that there were statistical clerks in each department, and I remember last year our honoured leader suggested that we had a Bureau of Statistics that could very well deal with all the statistics of the government, and that we should not have a statistical branch in every department as that constituted a duplication of work. We have no way of judging these things from the list as prepared, and I would not attempt to follow the minister's explanations and expect to remember very much when he was done. We do not have the information until we get Hansard to-morrow, and then it is not in such a useful form as compared with the previous method.

Mr. FIELDING: I agree at once that the committee should have the information. Whether it has it in the form of the printed Estimates or in another form, is not material. I have no objection to the committee getting information as to every rank, position and salary. There is a change in the method, and I admit it is open to criticism; but there is no desire to suppress information, and I am quite content that all that hon. gentlemen have asked for shall be given, whether in the form of these estimates or in another form I do not suppose is material.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the hon. gentleman, whose experience in this House is very long and very valuable, could tell us the reasons for the change from this old form which appears to be somewhat ancient. The Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) told us that this is going back to an old form that was used. I am quite sure that there was a very good reason for the change. I dare say the change is one my hon. friend put in himself; but I would like to know just how far back we have to go for this, because then I am going to find out without much difficulty the real reasons why this very beneficial change was made. As regards information which my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) tells us we shall have, I would suggest to my hon. friend that that information, if it is to be at all useful, ought to be in the hands of the members for a couple of days before the estimates come up again, so that they may have an opportunity of comparing the votes and making up their minds as to whether the thing is proper or not. In the long run, this will facilitate the passing of the estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot tell my hon friend when this practice existed before, if it did. I can frankly say that it never existed in my day. If it was an old practice, it antedated my day. As to the object, I will again say that I am quite satisfied, in conversation with my colleagues, that the only object in the world was to put these estimates in a form which it was thought would be acceptable to the committee. That may have been a mistake, but that was the only object in the world.

Mr. STEVENS: One thing that appears to be certain is that the change was made in the absence of my hon. friend who, I am quite sure, had he been here, would never have consented to it. Moreover, we can never get from this miscellaneous bunch of meaningless figures, any information that will give us an intelligent idea of what the vote is for. The minister (Mr. Motherwell) does not at all times show that degree of patience which he rather boasts of being master of. My hon. friend is a little fond, when we interject a question, in the informality of a committee, of reading us a little lecture or of scolding us a little. I want to tell my hon. friend that if he takes that attitude, it will not get his estimates very far on with very much facility.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Who is giving the lecture now?

Mr. STEVENS: Since the minister has been in this House, last session and this, he has been treated with kindness and courtesy. Personally, I am desirous of continuing this attitude; but when he intimates that this information is in any degree satisfactory, he is insulting the intelligence of this committee. I want again to request the Minister of Finance, who is leading the committee to-night, and whose department is very largely responsible for the final assembly of the estimates, if he would do this side of the committee at least the courtesy of having brought down, before these Civil Government estimates are up again, simply a reprint of last year. The forms, I venture to say, are in the Printing bureau to-day. I know something about arranging documents of this kind for printing. I know and I invite the attention of the Minister of Finance to this—it costs a great deal more in time and money to rearrange these estimates in this obscure fashion than to have them reprinted in the fashion of last year. I cannot conceive of any reason whatever for presenting them in this form, if there was a desire to give the information in a clear and frank manner. I will repeat, if the Minister of Finance would agree to bring down these details simply in the form in which we had them last year, this would facilitate very much the passing of these estimates.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not mind taking my little curtain lecture from my hon. friend, but I think he tried to pick me up before I fell. I started to make a statement and before I could say anything he interjected that that was no answer. Well, I was taking my breath about that time and was coming to the point that if it was the wish of the committee we could stop and take the matter up on another occasion; and that is interpreted by my hon. friend as being not quite courteous. I do not pretend to be an authority on the proprieties or on the question of what constitutes courtesy, but I do not see anything the matter with the suggestion that we could stop now and bring down later exactly what my hon. friend wants. As a matter of fact we got along nicely all evening so long as we were on strictly agricultural questions. Now, I understand, this is a matter of bookkeeping. I do not claim to be an expert on that subject, but I do know that when the government adopted this system they thought they were improving on the old method. It is possible that we may not have done so; that is a matter of opinion. It is true, as my hon. friend opposite pointed out, that the members of the committee have not this information before them. But all evening I have been reading information from documents which the members of the committee have not before them but which apparently they had no reluctance in accepting as correct.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) rather put me in the position of blaming somebody else in this matter. I wish to say that this is a matter in which the Finance department is responsible, and I desire to share the responsibility with my colleagues in regard to the whole subject. The suggestion as to the form the information will take will receive due consideration.

Item stands.

VACANCY—MOOSE JAW

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ of election for the electoral district of Moose Jaw, which is now vacant in consequence of the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, which I tabled yesterday.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Monday, February 26, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the name of Mr. Power be substituted for that of Mr. Walsh on the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce; that the name of Mr. Lovett be substituted for that of Mr. Putnam on the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries; and that the name of Mr. Putnam be substituted for that of M. Lovett on the joint committee of both Houses on the Library of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their Honours that this House has substituted the name of Mr. Putnam for that of Mr. Lovett on the joint committee of both Houses on the Library of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

RETURN TICKETS

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28 to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

He said: This bill is similar to one which I introduced into the House last year but which met with an untimely end in the Railway committee. I hope to have better luck with the bill this time. The bill seeks to amend the Railway Act to provide that a return ticket issued by any railway company between any two points in Canada shall be accepted by any other railway company whose line runs between the same termini.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

REGISTRATION OF DECLARATION OF OWNERSHIP BY PROPRIETORS OF NEWSPAPERS

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 29 to amend the Criminal Code.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. JACOBS: The amendment which the bill embodies will be known as 329A of the

Criminal Code. It provides that the proprietor of any newspaper who fails to register in the office of the Secretary of State for Canada a declaration as to the ownership of such newspaper shall be guilty of an indictable offence and be liable to two years imprisonment or a fine of $1,000, or both.

Mr. STEVENS: Soon it will be a crime to walk across the street.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SEDITION

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 30 to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: This bill, except for a change in form, is the same as that introduced last year and reported to the House, but which did not reach the stage of discussion. It proposes to amend the Criminal Code in some points relating to sedition and also to re-enact the safeguards to the individual which existed before the amendments of 1919.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 25, respecting a certain patent of Arthur R. Wilfley.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 26, to amend the act incorporating "La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Français". —Mr. Seguin.

Bill No. 27, respecting a patent of Hans M. Olson and Esther Maud Butcher.—Sir Henry Drayton.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MARKING IMPORTED GOODS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Have any applications been made under the statutory provisions relating to the marking of imported goods with the name of the country of origin? If so, by whom has application been made and in respect of what goods?

2. Has the government made any orders in council regarding such marking of goods?

3. If so, (a) what are the names and addresses of those requesting such action, and (b) what is the nature of the goods affected by such orders in council?

4. Upon what grounds were such orders in council made?

5. Were other applications made for similar action by the government which have not been acceded to?

[Mr. Jacobs.]

6. If so, (a) what was the character of the goods in respect of which such action was desired and what are the grounds which constrained the government not to issue orders in council as applied for?

7. Have any general regulations been adopted regarding the issuance of orders in council with reference to marking imported goods, and, if so, what are the regulations?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Yes.

The Ideal Aluminium Products Co. Ltd., Metal Stampings Ltd., and E. T. Wright Company in respect of imported aluminium ware.

The Shoe Manufacturers Association of Canada, Montreal, in respect of imported boots and shoes.

Lawson & Jones, Limited, London, Ont., in respect of imported boxes used by druggists and jewellers.

The Thos. Davidson Manufacturing Co., Montreal, P.Q.; Sheet Metal Products Co., Toronto; and McClary Manufacturing Co., London, Ont., in respect of imported enamelled ware, lithographed metal signs, boxes and other metal receptacles.

Canadian Lithographers Association, Montreal; Rolph-Clark-Stone, Ltd., Toronto; Howell Litho Co., Hamilton; Murray Printing Co., Toronto; Graphic Arts Section, Canadian Manufacturers Association, Montreal, P.Q.; Mortimer Co., Ottawa; The Quebec Typothetae; Vancouver Typothetae; Winnipeg Typothetae; Dominion Press Limited, Montreal; and United Typothetae, Toronto, in respect of printed and lithographed matter.

Other applications were made verbally to the Minister of Customs and Excise.

2. Order in Council Sept. 21, 1922.

3. (a) The Thos. Davidson Manufacturing Co., Montreal, P.Q.; Sheet Metal Products Co., Toronto; McClary Manufacturing Co., London, Ont.; Canadian Lithographers Association, Montreal; Rolph-Clark-Stone, Ltd., Toronto, Ont.; Howell Litho. Co., Hamilton, Ont.; Murray Printing Co., Toronto; Graphic Arts Section, Canadian Manufacturers Association, Montreal, P.Q.; Mortimer Co., Ottawa, Ont.; The Quebec Typothetae, Quebec; Vancouver Typothetae, Vancouver; Winnipeg Typothetae, Winnipeg; Dominion Press Ltd., Montreal, P.Q.; United Typothetae, Toronto, Ont., and other applications verbally. (b) Printed or lithographed matter of all kinds, including books and pictures, and wooden or fibre lead pencils.

4. Public interest.

5. Yes.

6. (a) Aluminium ware, boots and shoes, enamelled ware, boxes used by druggists and jewellers, and boxes and other metal receptacles. (b) Not deemed expedient.

7. No.

FUEL SUPPLY

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a special committee of the House to consider the whole problem of Canada's future fuel supply with a view to the adoption of a national and British coal policy for Canada?

2. Will the government endeavour to secure an all-British and Canadian supply such as Welsh and Nova Scotia and Western coal supply for next winter to take the place of twelve million tons of anthracite imported from the United States, developing such a national fuel policy so as not to leave the country depending entirely on an American supply, and so provide a profitable revenue producer for the National Railways and Merchant Marine?

3. What has been done by the government since their reply on May 15 and May 22 last, in the House, to solve the coal and fuel problem?

4. What is being done to further develop power and utilizing further oil, wood and other substitutes for coal in Canada and what co-operation or co-ordination is there with the provinces as to coal supply?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. The government feel that no good purpose would be served by the appointment of a committee.

2. Answered by No. 3.

3. By Order in Council of 25th November, 1922 (P.C. 2381), created the Dominion Fuel Board to investigate the recurrent unsatisfactory fuel situation, with a view to arriving at such solutions as may be in the public interest and to report the results of such investigations. (The Federal Advisory Fuel Committee was created to handle the situation for the winter of 1922-23).

4. The Dominion Fuel Board has expedited the issue by the Mines Department (in English and French) of a pamphlet of instructions for burning bituminous coal and other substitutes for anthracite coal and if funds are provided by parliament, as proposed in the Estimates for the fiscal year 1923-24, will initiate various investigations with a view to finding satisfactory substitutes for anthracite coal and to suggesting means to alleviate the inconveniences arising from the frequently recurring unsatisfactory fuel situation. Co-operation of all agencies that may be able to assist in the solution of the fuel problem will be aimed by the Dominion Fuel Board.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

What quantity and value of each of the following commodities have been imported into Canada during the past year, and what amount of duty was collected on each: (a) agricultural machinery or farm equipments; (b) meats; (c) animal grease, oils or fats; (d) milk and milk products; (e) cattle, calf and sheep skins, green or salted; (f) wool; (g) eggs; (h) apples, green; (i) potatoes; (j) fish and fishery products.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

VALUE OF IMPORTS, AS SPECIFIED, ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN CANADA, AND CUSTOMS DUTY COLLECTED THEREON, DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1922.

Item	Value	Customs Duty
	$	$
(*a*) Agricultural machinery	7,732,215	660,464 16
(*b*) Meats	9,286,552	1,815,609 42
(*c*) Animal grease, oils or fats	2,977,100	311,817 93
(*d*) Milk and milk products	2,325,897	267,184 52
(*e*) Cattle, calf and sheep skins, green or salted	6,747,824	–
(*f*) Wool	3,883,433	651 72
(*g*) Eggs	2,476,906	244,216 22
(*h*) Apples, green	914,862	153,525 60
(*i*) Potatoes	450,909	69,487 60
(*j*) Fish and fishery products	2,800,980	315,509 79

IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION CALENDAR YEAR 1922

Items	Unit	Quantity	Value	Duty
			$	$ cts.
(*a*) *Agricultural Machinery or Farm Equipment*—				
Binding attachments	$	.....	13,713	1,379 70
Steel bowls for cream separators	$	.....	9,412	Free
Cream separators	No.	5,484	216,134	Free
Cultivators and weeders, and parts	$	.....	46,228	6,584 72

IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION CALENDAR YEAR 1922—*Continued*

Items	Unit	Quantity	Value	Duty
			$	$ cts.
Agricultural Machinery or Farm Equipment—Con.				
Traction ditching machines not more than $3,000 value and parts	No.	11	30,286	Free
Drills, seed	No.	811	32,219	4,806 58
Portable engines for farm purposes	No.	1	506	88 56
Repairs for traction engines	$	.....	734,961	Free
Traction engines not more than $1,400 for farm purposes	No.	4,592	2,411,653	Free
Traction engines, n.o.p., for farm purposes and repairs	No.	88	312,617	54,689 33
Fanning mills	No.	297	9,487	1,610 30
Fodder or feed cutters	No.	885	67,621	10,342 2ç
Forks, pronged	No.	4,344	3,276	675 45
Grain crushers	No.	85	4,658	801 05
Harrows and parts	$	.....	71,508	9,904 62
Harvesters, self binding	No.	1,582	253,694	25,450 96
Hay loaders	No.	3	870	130 50
Hay presses	No.	148	41,347	11,370 49
Hay tedders	No.	1	29	4 35
Hoes	No.	3,584	1,755	378 37
Horse rakes	No.	180	5,585	737 39
Knives, hay or straw	No.	2,115	1,738	261 90
Knives, edging	No.	197	208	42 91
Mowing machines	No.	409	23,188	2,447 84
Manure spreaders	No.	60	5,567	766 86
Ploughs, and parts	$	.....	571,680	93,265 50
Post hole diggers	No.	1,111	1,424	250 65
Potato diggers	No.	928	69,664	10,904 25
Rakes, n.o.p	No.	3,638	2,112	464 67
Reapers	No.	30	2,220	222 20
Rollers, farm, road or field	No.	26	8,137	1,572 75
Scythes	Doz.	530	6,200	1,286 92
Sickles, or reaping hooks	Doz.	336	834	149 87
Spades and shovels	Doz.	2,852	15,646	4,248 85
Threshing machine separators	No.	1,922	1,631,115	245,750 65
Threshing machine separator parts	$	.....	621,704	97,259 62
Windmills and parts	$	.....	34,046	5,958 46
Parts of agricultural implements	$	.....	266,943	31,486 80
All other agricultural implements	$	.....	192,834	33,759 44
Milk machines and attachments, centrifugal machines for testing butter, fat, milk, etc. (From May 24, 1922)	$	.....	6,515	977 25
Grading machines, fruit or vegetable. (From May 24, 1922)	No.	30	2,881	432 15
Total agricultural machinery	.....	.....	7,732,215	660,464 16
(*b*) *Meats*—				
Beef, fresh	Lbs.	110,566	32,250	3,316 98
Beef, pickled, in barrels	Lbs.	858,900	53,465	17,176 00
Mutton and lamb, fresh	Lbs.	2,061,025	344,014	58,160 15
Pork, fresh	Lbs.	34,708,132	5,321,788	1,041,243 96
Bacons and hams, etc., cured	Lbs.	4,544,009	672,349	90,876 37
Pork, barrelled in brime	Lbs.	11,560,950	1,226,744	231,217 00
Pork, dry salted	Lbs.	1,536,363	196,348	30,727 26
Poultry and game, n.o.p	$	.....	67,449	13,297 31
Sausage	Lbs.	349,966	108,081	6,999 32
Other meats, fresh	Lbs.	275,418	29,684	8,258 39
Other meats, salted	Lbs.	88,785	18,619	1,775 70
Dried or smoked meats and meats preserved, n.o.p	Lbs.	140,563	32,822	2,811 26
Canned meats	Lbs.	1,569,812	282,481	71,420 65
Extracts of meats	$	.....	110,694	21,586 58
Soups	$	.....	789,764	216,742 49
Total meats	.....	.....	9,286,552	1,815,609 42
(*c*) *Animal Oils and Fats*—				
Grease rough for manufacture of soap and oil	Lbs.	15,973,504	1,077,938	Free
Grease and degras for stuffing leather	Lbs.	1,515,844	70,227	Free
Lard	Lbs.	10,232,095	1,105,854	204,641 90
Lard compound, animal stearine, etc	Lbs.	2,739,658	268,960	53,732 41
Lard oil	Gal.	20,633	19,329	4,726 55

[Mr. Bureau.]

IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION CALENDAR YEAR 1922—*Continued*

Items	Unit	Quantity	Value	Duty
			$	$ cts.
(c) *Animal Oils and Fats*—Con.				
Oleomargarine	Lbs.	1,032,405	172,738	Free
Oleo oil	Gal.	8,833	7,827	1,369 72
Neat's-foot oil	Gal.	6,232	7,005	1,751 25
Other animal oil, n.o.p.	Gal.	56,509	42,373	7,397 20
Tallow	Lbs.	876,458	65,537	13,107 40
Candles, n.o.p.	Lbs.	458,895	80,309	19,809 35
Beeswax	Lbs.	221,352	59,003	5,282 15
Total animal oils, fats, etc	.....	.....	2,977,100	311,817 93
(d) *Milk and Milk Products*—				
Milk and cream, fresh	$	.....	33,841	5,922 59
Milk, condensed	Lbs.	232,285	51,823	7,635 72
Butter	Lbs.	6,396,836	1,912,519	216,399 31
Casein	Lbs.	535,703	61,185	16,826 02
Cheese	Lbs.	686,754	266,529	20,400 88
Total milk and milk products	.....	.....	2,325,897	267,184 52
(e) *Cattle, Calf and Sheep Skins*—				
Calf skins, raw	Lbs.	5,466,304	1,289,548	Free
Cattle skins, raw	Lbs.	32,847,294	5,114,662	Free
Sheep skins, raw	Lbs.	2,764,390	343,614	Free
Total calf, cattle and sheep skins	.....	.....	6,747,824	.....
(f) *Wool*—				
Wool, etc., not further prepared than washed, n.o.p.	Lbs.	15,885,150	3,877,036	Free
Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, South Down combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools such as are grown in Canada	Lbs.	21,724	6,397	651 72
Total wool	.....	.....	3,883,433	651 72
(g) *Eggs*	Doz.	8,140,547	2,476,906	244,216 22
(h) *Apples, green*	Brl.	170,584	914,862	153,525 60
(i) *Potatoes, n.o.p.*	Bush.	347,453	450,909	69,487 60
(j) *Fish and Fishery Products*—				
Cod, haddock an pollock, fresh	Lbs.	1,186,761	44,026	6,757 11
Cod, haddock and pollock, pickled	Lbs.	261,114	10,005	96 00
Cod, haddock and pollock, smoked	Lbs.	590	44	2 15
Cod, haddock and pollock, dried	Lbs.	7,563,857	449,538	703 37
Halibut, fresh	Lbs.	2,746,009	220,638	24,517 41
Herring, fresh	Lbs.	237,942	6,038	259 14
Herring, canned	Lbs.	326,015	49,865	13,225 99
Herring, smoked	Lbs.	1,360	257	8 61
Herring, pickled	Lbs.	10,167,744	297,100	8,201 42
Mackerel, fresh	Lbs.	52,254	5,154	522 54
Sardines, anchovies, etc., in tins	Boxes	4,021,992	384,993	84,648 38
Salmon, fresh	Lbs.	2,792,977	179,601	25,226 00
Salmon, canned	Lbs.	518,463	28,838	19,921 18
Salmon, smoked	Lbs.	21,285	6,489	210 45
Salmon, pickled	Lbs.	455,777	27,984	37 52
Squid	$	.....	24,134	Free
Lobsters, fresh	$	.....	4,220	562 50
Lobsters, canned	Lbs.	59,231	40,239	113 40
Oysters, seed and breeding	$	.....	4,240	Free
Oysters, fresh, in shell	Brls.	2,499	20,197	5,049 25
Oysters, shelled, in bulk	Gals.	133,390	282,065	13,339 00
Oysters, canned	Cans	150,345	27,225	4,561 63
Oysters, prepared, n.o.p.	Lbs.	13,008	7,941	2,382 30
Bait, fish, fresh	Lbs.	1,800	24	18 00

IMPORTS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION CALENDAR YEAR 1922—*Concluded*

Items	Unit	Quantity	Value	Duty
			$	$ cts.
(j) *Fish and Fishery Products*—Con.				
Fish, smoked or boneless	Lbs.	25,274	4,380	222 96
Fish, preserved in oil, n.o.p	$	.....	43,040	14,705 00
Fish, all other, fresh	Lbs.	1,128,560	96,959	10,892 28
Fish, all other, pickled	Lbs.	786,245	64,593	1,645 83
Fish, dried, n.o.p	Lbs.	336,610	78,862	3,069 87
Fish, preserved, n.o.p	$	.....	139,848	38,716 41
Live fish and fish eggs for propagating purposes	$	.....	3,299	Free
Fish oil, cod liver	Gal.	113,938	67,984	2,906 24
Fish oil, other, n.o.p	Gals.	28,357	16,362	3,616 77
Seal oil	Gals.	13,010	8,133	Free
Whale oil	Gals.	13,914	9,288	2,041 27
Ambergris	$	.....	251	Free
Sponges, marine	$	.....	82,436	13,501 41
Fish offal or refuse	$	.....	7,961	Free
Other articles, fisheries	$	.....	56,729	13,828 40
Total fish and products	.....	.....	2,800,980	315,509 79

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT—ONTARIO

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What was the original amount appropriated to the province of Ontario by the Dominion government under the Dominion Highways Act?
2. What amount has been paid to the Province of Ontario out of this appropriation to date?
3. In what counties has this money been spent, and how much in each county by the Department of Highways of the province of Ontario?
4. Has there been a request from government officials or any member of the government of Ontario for a further appropriation of money for good roads?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $5,877,275.00.
2. $3,374,247.29.
3. Ontario, $123,154.27; Durham, $71,662.46; Northumberland, $149,771.25; Hastings, $191,052.04; Lennox and Addington, $131,907.75; Frontenac, $273,794.83; Leeds, $209,387.05; Grenville, $206,640.57; Carleton, $378,371.32; Wentworth, $256,534.46; Lincoln, $194,091.24; Brant, $101,864.10; Oxford, $99,078.55; Middlesex, $44,522.86; Elgin, $35,787.79; Kent, $11,261.17; Haldimand, $179,239.44; Wellington, $40,916.80; Lambton, $35,822.50; Perth, $95,088.37; York, $47,426.56; Peel, $118,134.76; Halton, $81,488.44; Simcoe, $107,719.86; Russell, $132,640.84; Prescott, $56,888.01.

Accounts for 1922 operations have not yet been presented to the Federal Highways branch for audit by the Ontario Department of Highways.

4. No.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE SEIZURES

Mr. IRVINE:

1. What number of customs and excise seizures were made at the ports of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver, for the period of six years ending December 31, 1922?
2. What are the names of the informers?
3. What are the names of the officers who made such seizures?
4. What amounts were paid to informers?
5. What amounts were paid to officers who made seizures?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

	Customs Seizures	Excise Seizures
Montreal	952	413
Toronto	215	279
Hamilton	31	57
Winnipeg	293	114
Calgary	113	20
Vancouver	569	102

2, 3 and 4. This information is regarded as confidential.

5.

	Amounts paid to Informers		Amounts paid to Seizing Officers	
	Customs	Excise	Customs	Excise
Montreal	$15,364 32	$20,367 84	$38,099 14	$26,280 65
Toronto	5,524 25	14,503 92	10,119 83	9,771 56
Hamilton	307 08	6,011 61	1,713 19	5,639 45
Winnipeg	10,272 56	11,740 92	11,435 76	15,223 50
Calgary	4,584 23	1,902 00	5,907 87	1,091 40
Vancouver	3,770 21	9,359 49	18,090 57	8,751 04

GEORGIAN BAY GRAIN MOVEMENT

Mr. LAPIERRE:

1. How much American grain did Georgian Bay elevators handle during the year 1922?
2. How much Canadian grain did Georgian Bay elevators handle during the year 1922?
3. How much money has parliament voted up to present time for the improvements to the French river in Nipissing?
4. How much of the money voted by parliament for the improvement of the French river is there remaining unspent?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

	Bushels
1. Carry-over from 1921 (including Goderich)	1,942,600
Receipts	55,976,089
Shipments	56,141,428
In store	1,777,272

	Bushels
2. Carry-over from 1921 (including Goderich)	10,373,322
Receipts	68,990,212
Shipments	69,348,125
In store	9,915,291

3. $1,903,500.00 as follows:—

Fiscal year	Voted	Expended
1910-1911	$ 12,000.00	$ 296.96
1911-1912	12,000.00	6,282.35
1912-1913	11,200.00	4,327.08
1913-1914	12,500.00	.....
1913-1914	500,000.00 cap.	33,597.89
1914-1915	500,000.00 cap.	68,354.43
1915-1916	450,000.00 cap.	45,697.04
1916-1917	400,000.00 cap.	45,083.95
1918-1919	5,800.00	5,779.64
	$1,903,500.00	$209,419.34

4. $1,694,080.66 lapsed, nothing at present available.

POTATO EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES

*Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Has the hounourable Minister of Agriculture or any other member of the government received any official confirmation of the recent Washington despatch intending that all contemplated instructions upon the export of Canadian potatoes into the United States after February 1, 1923, have been withdrawn?

2. If so, will such be made public for the benefit of the Canadian potato growers who are much perplexed and alarmed at the prospect of being shut out of the United States market altogether as the imposition of the proposed instructions referred to would undoubtedly have resulted in?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Federal Horticultural Board of the United States Department of Agriculture recently passed an amendment to their regulations governing potato importations, to come into effect February 1, 1923. Under this amendment, shipments of Canadian potatoes could be imported only when accompanied by a certificate from an officer of the Canadian Department to the effect that they were free from injurious diseases or insect pests.

As it was at once apparent that considerable difficulty would be involved, and considerable expense incurred if the Canadian department were required to furnish this additional inspection service, an officer of the department was sent to Washington to interview the Federal Horticultural Board, and endeavour to have the matter reconsidered. He received a sympathetic hearing, and the members of the board intimated that in view of the cordial relations that have existed between the Federal and United States departments in efforts to prevent the introduction into the continent of North America of plant diseases and insect pests from abroad, they would withdraw their action towards Canada in connection with this particular amendment to their regulations.

The following press notice has just been received from the official press service of the United States department:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, office of the Secretary.
Withdraws restrictions on import of potatoes from Canada and Bermuda

Washington, February 13: The United States Department of Agriculture to-day issued the following notice of the withdrawal of restrictions on the importation of potatoes from Canada and Bermuda other than such inspection as shall be deemed necessary from time to time:

Amendment No. 2 to regulations governing the importation of potatoes into the United States withdrawn.

Notice is hereby given of the withdrawal of amendment No. 2 revising the paragraph governing the entry of potatoes into the United States from Canada and Bermuda in regulation 7 of the regulations governing the importation of potatoes into the United States. This amendment was promulgated January 17, 1923, and was to become effective February 1st, 1923, and provided for official certification of the potatoes as to district of origin and as to freedom from injurious diseases and insect pests. The withdrawal of this amendment leaves without restriction the entry of potatoes from Canada and Bermuda other than such inspection as shall be deemed to be necessary from time to time to determine the freedom of such imports from injurious diseases and insect pests. The Federal Horticultural Board recommends this action after further consultation with the experts of the department and with the Dominion authorities, and in view of a general plan now under consideration to control under permit and inspection, the entry of all fruits and vegetables from foreign countries.

HENRY C. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

This notice indicates that the entry of Canadian potatoes into the United States may be carried on just as in the past, so far as inspection is concerned, but shippers should certainly, in their own interests, avoid the shipment of potatoes not of superior quality in every respect.

STORAGE ELEVATORS

Mr. SALES:

1. In view of the fact that an extension is to be Built to the terminal elevator at Vancouver, of 500,000 bushels capacity, to cost $400,000 or 80 cents per bushel: Is the government aware that storage of a similar character is being constructed at the head of the Lake at a cost of 22 cents per bushel?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No definite estimate has yet been submitted of the cost of providing additional storage capacity of 500,000 bushels to the present elevator at Vancouver. The amount of $400,000 tentatively suggested in this connection contemplates not only the construction of the additional storage capacity but also the additional connections with the conveyor system necessary for the larger operations.

The government is not aware that storage of a similar character is being constructed at the head of the lakes for 22 cents per bushel but the contractors who are building for that figure will have ample opportunity of bidding on the proposed work at Vancouver.

DIVORCES

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

How many divorces were granted in Canada, by provinces, in each of the years from 1913 to 1922, inclusive?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Divorces granted by the Parliament of Canada
1913 to 1922
To applicants residing in the provinces of:—

Year	Ontario	Quebec	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	P.E.I.	Total
1913..	21	4	5	1	4	1	36
1914..	18	7	2	2	4	..	33
1915..	11	3	2	1	1	..	18
1916..	18	1	1	3	1	..	24
1917..	10	4	..	1	2	..	17
1918..	10	2	..	1	2	..	15
1919..	48	5	1	..	1	..	55
1920..	91	9	..	..	..	..	100
1921..	101	10	..	..	..	..	111
1922..	96	6	..	..	..	..	102
Totals..	424	51	11	9	15	1	511

Divorces granted by Provincial Courts
1913 to 1921
(From Canada Year Book 1921)

Year	New Brunswick	Nova Scotia	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Total.
1913..	4	..	..	..	..	20	24
1914..	12	10	..	..	..	15	37
1915..	6	13	..	..	..	16	35
1916..	11	14	..	..	..	18	43
1917..	6	8	..	..	..	23	37
1918..	10	..	..	..	..	65	75
1919..	13	36	87	3	35	147	321
1920..	15	45	42	26	65	136	329
1921..	13	41	122	50	84	128	438
Totals..	90	167	251	79	184	568	1,339

[Mr. Motherwell.]

RIDEAU CANAL WATER-POWER

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Are there any lessees or licensees of water-power rights on the Rideau canal or river between Jones Falls and Kingston?
2. If so, what are the dates of such leases or licenses?
3. What are the terms or duration of such leases or licenses respectively?
4. Do such leases or licenses provide for any definite quantity or supply of water or power? If so, what are the particulars?
5. What rentals are stipulated in each case?
6. To whom were such leases or licenses granted?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. At Upper Brewers Mills, Februrary 11, 1895; at Lower Brewers Mills, March 14, 1896; last renewal, August 27, 1920; at Kingston Mills, February 18, 1908.

3. Upper Brewers Mills, during pleasure after six months' notice; Lower Brewers Mills, renewable every ten years forever; Kingston Mills, three terms of twenty-one years each.

4. Leases cover surplus water not required for navigation, if available, as follows: Upper Brewers Mills, 25 h.p.; Lower Brewers Mills, 40 h.p.; Kingston Mills, all surplus water.

5. Upper Brewers Mills, $1 per h.p. and $5 for land per annum; Lower Brewers Mills, $1.50 per h.p. and $5 for land per annum; Kingston Mills, $191 per annum for water, $16 for land lessee to furnish electric current for 30 incandescent and 6 arc lamps free of cost to the Department.

6. Upper Brewers Mills, to Robert Anglin; Lower Brewers Mills, to Wm. F. McBroom; Kingston Mills, to Kingston Milling Company.

RAILWAY GRADES, RATES, ETC.

On Question No. 18, Mr. McBRIDE:

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, this is another very long question that will take months of time and many pages of paper to completely answer. I doubt if the department is in a position to give all the details asked for, as some portions of the questions relate in large measure to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the provincial governments. I would suggest that this question stand as an order for return, but I would point out that it will be some time before the order can be complied with, and I am afraid it will not be nearly so complete in detailed information as the question calls for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands as an order for return.

May I call the attention of the hon. members to the unusual length of some questions that are now on the order paper? All the authorities on parliamentary practice both in England and in Canada are adverse to the very

lengthy questions, and I must discourage as much as possible their appearance on the order paper. Let me read from Bourinot, Fourth Edition at page 314:

Questions of excessive length with numerous or lengthy quotations have been ruled out.

And a series of precedents are given at the foot of the page. So, without questioning the necessity of the information required by hon. members, if we are to live up to the best parliamentary traditions and precedents, such a mass of information when required should not come under one head, and notice of motion should be given in each case.

ROUMANIAN AND GREEK LOANS

Mr. JACOBS:

1. Has any arrangement been arrived at between Canada and Roumania, and between Canada and Greece, respecting the indebtedness due this government by these countries?

2. What is the present indebtedness due Canada by: (a) Roumania; and (b) Greece?

3. Has any interest been paid by Roumania and Greece arising out of the credits given to these countries or has any portion of the original principal been paid?

4. Is it a fact that the Canadian High Commissioner in London has arranged for conversion of the indebtedness due Canada by a funding of the obligations?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The government of Canada has accepted a proposal from the government of Roumania for the funding of its debt. With respect to Greece, the original agreement, entered into in 1919, stands.

2. (a) Principal, $20,449,104.49; (b) Principal, $7,520,473.17.

3. By Roumania, no; by Greece, a portion of the interest only.

4. See answer to No. 1. The arrangements for the conversion are being made through the High Commissioner in London.

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. What amount has been advanced to Greece on the credit or loan that was authorized by the Canadian government in April, 1919, and what rate of interest does this loan bear: (a) for foodstuffs; (b) for commodities other than foodstuffs?

2. Has any repayment been made by Greece: (a) on interest of above loan; (b) on the principal of the above loan?

3. If so, on what dates were such payments made?

4. What amount has been advanced to Roumania on the credit or loan that was authorized by the Canadian government in April, 1919, and what rate of interest does this loan bear: (a) for foodstuffs; (b) for commodities other than foodstuffs?

5. Has any repayment been made by Roumania: (a) on interest of above loan; (b) on the principal of the above loan?

6. If so, on what dates were such payments made?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Principal amount of credit, $7,520,473.17; (a) and (b) 5½ per cent per annum.

2. (a) yes; (b) no.

3. August 24, 1920, $7,834.79; October 8, 1920, $53,160.61; January 15, 1922, $273,949.14; February 22, 1922, $141,327.75.

4. Principal amount of credit, $20,449,104.49; (a) and (b) 5½ per cent per annum.

5. (a) no; (b) no.

6. Answered by No. 5.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is it the intention of the government during the present session to introduce further legislation providing for grants to aid in construction of highways in co-operation with the provincial governments?

2. In cases where provincial authorities have failed to fully spend the amount allocated to them out of the previous highway appropriation bill, is it the intention of the government to provide extension of time permitting such provinces to use the amount of their appropriation?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. The question has not yet been fully considered.

MIDLAND POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How long has the postmastership at Midland, Ontario, been vacant, owing to the death of the late postmaster?

2. Who has been in charge of the office since his death?

3. Has the postmastership received any recommendation from the Civil Service Commission of a person to fill the said position?

4. Has any person been selected for the position?

5. If so, what is his name?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. Since 13th May, 1922.

2. Miss Mary Berry, assistant to the late postmaster.

3. No.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

POSTAL STATION G, MONTREAL

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What is the name of the employee whose care is to open the Postal Station G, at Montreal?

2. What was his occupation before his appointment to Postal Station G?

3. Did he pass any competitive examinations?

4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. Mr. Harry Vechsler, postal clerk, temporarily in charge.

2. Postal clerk in city delivery section, general post office, Montreal.

3. Yes, the usual examination on entering the service.

4. Answered by No. 3.

TROOP REQUISITION FOR SYDNEY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Was a troop train held in readiness on February 17 or 19, 1923, for despatch by Canadian National Railway to Sydney, Cape Breton, or any point in Nova Scotia?

2. If so, by whose orders was said troop train held in readiness?

3. Was the Department of Militia and Defence requested to furnish troops for special duty at the mines of the British Empire Steel Company?

4. If so, by whose request were said troops so requisitioned?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

FIVE PER CENT EXCISE TAX

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What amount of revenue has been collected up to the end of the last accounting period under the five per cent excise tax provided for by the legislation of last session on: (a) confectionery; (b) beverages (derived wholly or in part from cereals or substitutes therefor, unfermented fruit juices and imitations thereof, carbonated beverages or aerated waters, all other compounded or mixed soft drinks, sold by a person conducting a soda fountain, ice cream parlour, or other similar place of business)?

2. What amount of revenue has been collected up to the end of the last accounting period under the excise tax of five cents per gallon provided for by the legislation of last session on beverages (derived wholly or in part from cereals or substitutes therefor; unfermented fruit juices and imitations thereof; carbonated beverages or aerated waters; all other compounded or mixed soft drinks)?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Excise taxes collected May 24, 1922, to January 31, 1923.

1. (a) Confectionery, $328,491.94; (b) Beverages (five per cent), $23,576.55.

2. Beverages (five cents per gallon), $307,175.46.

HAMILTON—BRANTFORD HIGHWAY

Mr. WILSON:

1. What has been the cost of the Hamilton-Brantford highway, and what is the mileage of same?

2. What was the cost of the Hamilton-Brantford highway between the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway bridge and the village of Ancaster, and what is the mileage of this section?

3. Does the total cost of the said highway include amounts paid for properties purchased in order to widen the roadway?

4. What was the amount paid for such properties between Hamilton and Brantford on the above-mentioned highway?

5. What will 40 per cent of the reasonable and actual cost amount to?

6. What amount has been paid to the Ontario Department of Public Works by the Dominion government on the said highway?

[Mr. Graham.]

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Cost for federal aid purposes to date of last audit, 31st December, 1921, $596,230 mileage, 19.18.

2. There are two crossings of the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo railway, one 3.1 miles east and the other 16.5 miles west of the village of Ancaster. The department has no information from which the cost of either of these sections can be separated from the whole.

3 and 4. The federal grant does not cover cost of right-of-way, consequently cost of property is not included in the answer to question No. 1.

5. Forty per cent of actual, reasonable and necessary cost of the work under agreement with the federal government, estimated at $276,350.

6. $238,492.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY

Mr. KELLNER:

What settlement, if any, was made between the government and those interested in the Calgary and Edmonton railway in respect of subsidy granted years ago for carrying mail for the Calgary and Edmonton line?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Under order in council of March 11, 1918, settlement was authorized on the basis of the company paying the balance of the principal plus the interest from July 25, 1911.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

Mr. KELLNER:

What amount was paid to each commissioner in connection with the arbitration respecting the value of the junior securities of the Grand Trunk and subsidiary companies?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Sir Thomas White, $29,000; Sir Walter Cassels (in addition to amount paid by Grand Trunk), $25,000; Hon. W. H. Taft, paid by Grand Trunk shareholders.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ROAD PROJECTS

Mr. WILSON:

1. What road projects have been submitted to the Dominion government by the Ontario department of Public Works for approval, under the Canada Highways Act?

2. What projects have been approved?

3. What is the estimated cost of these road projects and the mileage as submitted by the Ontario Department of Public Works.

4. What amounts have been paid by the Dominion government on these approved road projects?

5. What is the amount payable to the province of Ontario under the Canada Highways Act?

6. Of the estimated cost of projects submitted, what would 40 per cent of the reasonable cost amount to?

7. Has any request been made by the Ontario government for further cash assistance, other than that contained in the Dominion Highways Act?

RAILWAY GRADES, RATES, ETC.

Mr. McBRIDE:

1. What are the ruling grades on the Canadian National Railways against east and west bound traffic between the following points:—(a) Vancouver and the eastern boundary of British Columbia; (*b*) the easterly boundary of British Columbia to Fort William; (*c*) Fort William to North Bay; (*d*) North Bay to Toronto; (*e*) North Bay to Montreal?

2. What are the ruling grades on the Canadian Pacific railway between:—(*a*) Vancouver and Revelstoke; (*b*) Revelstoke and Canmore; (*c*) Canmore and Fort William; (*d*) Fort William and Montreal; (*e*) Montreal and West St. John?

3. Was the section of the Canadian National railway through the Fraser River Canyon, viz.: section between Kamloops and Hope, British Columbia, the most costly section of the said railway to construct west of Fort William?

4. What was the cost of construction per mile of line of section of said railway through the Fraser River Canyon between Kamloops and Hope?

5. What was the cost of construction per mile of line of the Canadian National railway between Ottawa and Montreal, including the Montreal tunnel?

6. What was the cost of construction of the Canadian National railway per mile of line between the following points:—(*a*) between Montreal and Winnipeg, including the Montreal tunnel; (*b*) between Winnipeg and Vancouver?

7. Does it cost more to haul freight over the C.P.R. between Vancouver and the prairies than it does to haul the same freight between Vancouver and the prairies over the C.N.R. or between Prince Rupert and the prairies over the Grand Trunk Pacific?

8. When the C.N.R. Company and the G.T.P. Company commenced operations between the prairies and Pacific coast points, were the said railway companies allowed by the Board of Railway Commissioners to adopt the scale of rates applied by the C.P.R., and based on the cost of operation of the C.P.R. through the mountains, and which said scale of rates was known as the mountain scale?

9. Does the same scale of rates, viz.: the mountain scale now in application apply to the C.P.R. on the movement of all goods in, to, from, or through British Columbia in the same way that the said mountain scale applies to the movement of goods over the C.N.R.?

10. Is it the intention of the government to see that the rates on the C.N.R., where the said railways move through British Columbia on grades equally favourable to those obtaining on the prairies, are no higher than the prairie scale of rates?

11. Does the winter weather increase the cost of operating railways in the prairies and in eastern Canada over and above the cost of operating the same railways during the summer season?

12. Is the C.P.R. divided into eight operating divisions, and are the operating expenses of the said railway kept by divisions, viz.: the divisions of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Algoma, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia?

13. What is the mileage of the C.P.R. in each division?

14. What are main line boundaries of such divisions?

15. Is the C.N.R. system divided into operating divisions, viz.: lines east and lines west with the dividing point at Fort William?

16. Are there any other divisions of the Canadian National Railways system for which accounts of operating expenses or revenues are kept? If so, what are they, and when were the same established?

17. What were the total operating expenses of the C.P.R. per mile of line for the years 1917, 1920, and 1921 for the following divisions, viz.: British Columbia, Manitoba, Quebec, New Brunswick?

18. What was the total cost of operation of C.P.R. as expressed in the cost per mile of line in the said 1917, 1920 and 1921 in the following of the said divisions: British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick?

19. What was the total cost of operation of the C.P.R. as expressed in the cost per car mile in the following of the said divisions, viz.: British Columbia, New Brunswick, Quebec?

20. What was the cost of operation of the C.P.R. as expressed in the cost per mile of line in the said divisions of Alberta and British Columbia taken together, and in the said divisions of New Brunswick and Quebec taken together for the years 1917, 1920 and 1921?

21. What was the density of traffic as shown in car miles per the mile of line, and in gross ton miles per mile of line, for the years 1917, 1920 and 1921, in the following of the said divisions: (a) British Columbia; (b) New Brunswick; New Brunswick and Quebec taken together; (c) Britsih Columbia and Alberta, taken together?

22. Is the C.P.R. Company divided into two main divisions for accounting purposes, viz.; lines east and lines west, and is the divisional point of the said system of railways Fort William, Ontario?

23. What were the net revenues per mile of line, and per train mile produced by the C.P.R. Company on lines east, and lines west for the years 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920?

24. What were the net earnings of the C.P.R. per mile of line ,and per train mile for the years 1912 to 1916, both inclusive, in the following of the said divisions, viz.: New Brunswick or Atlantic, British Columbia?

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

Mr. LUCAS:

1. What is the total value of the assets of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

2. What is the total amount of issued capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

3. What is the bonded indebtedness of the said company?

4. What are all the other obligations of the said company excepting current accounts?

5. What are the total cash reserves of the said company as at the date of the 31st December, 1922, including loans of money made by the said company?

6. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway any other reserves than cash? If so, what are they, and what is their total value?

7. What is the value of the assets of the said railway created out of earnings or created from the receipts secured from the sale or other disposal of the company's assets?

8. Did the Dominion government extend any assistance to any railway which was acquired subsequent to the granting of such assistance, by the C.P.R.?

9. If so, what were the names of the railway or railways, and what was the extent of the assistance given in the following detail: (a) grant of land in acreage; (b) amount of money; (c) other assistance and its value?

10. Did the provinces of Canada extend any assistance to the C.P.R.?

11. If so, what was the nature and extent of the assistance divided as follows: (a) name of railway; (b) name of province; (c) the amount of land granted in acreage; (d) the amount of money; (e) the nature and extent and value of all other assistance; (f) bond guarantees?

12. Did any of the provinces of the Dominion extend any aid or assistance to the C.P.R. or to any company subsequently acquired by the C.P.R.?

13. If so, what was the nature and extent of the said assistance given them, in the following detail: (a) name of company; (b) name of province; (c) extent of land in acreage and in value; (d) rights the grant of land contained; (e) amount of money; (f) the nature and extent of all other assistance; (g) bond guarantees amount?

Mr. KELLNER:

1. Was the C.P.R. between Kamloops and Port Moody constructed by the Dominion government and turned over to the C.P.R. without cost to the said company?

2. If not, what portion of the C.P.R. in British Columbia was constructed by the Dominion government?

3. What was the actual cost of the C.P.R. lines built in British Columbia by the Dominion government, and turned over to the C.P.R.?

4. Did the Dominion government build or pay for the construction of any portion of the C.P.R.? If so, what were the portions so constructed or paid for, and what was their value?

5. What was the total value of the lines turned over to the C.P.R. either fully or partially constructed and paid for by the Dominion government?

6. What was the total amount of cash given to the C.P.R. Company to aid the construction of the company's railway?

7. What was the total number of acres of land given to the C.P.R. to aid in the construction of the company's railway?

8. What are the total receipts received by the C.P.R. Co. from the sale or disposal of said lands to date?

9. How many acres of said lands remain in the C.P.R, to-day, or its subsidiary companies, and what is the value thereof per acre and total?

10. What are amounts of dividends paid by the C.P.R. Co. during the following years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921 in per cents and annual totals?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CLAIM OF ORIN CAMPBELL

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE (for Mr. Clifford):

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and memoranda, relative to the claim of Orin Campbell against the Department of Railways and Canals, in respect to his claim for damages arising out of the work at Nassau, near Peterborough.

WHEAT BOARD

Mr. CALDWELL (For Mr. McConica).

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, other correspondence, and documents exchanged between the government, or any department thereof, and governments or any of the departments thereof of the various provinces in Canada, relative to the appointment of a Wheat Board for the handling of the 1922 crop; also for a copy of all letters, telegrams, other correspondence or documents exchanged between the government or any department thereof, and James Stewart, W. F. Ridell, or any other person or persons resident of Canada or elsewhere relative to their accepting a position upon such board; also all letters, telegrams, correspondence, or other documents received by the government, or any of the departments thereof from such persons respecting said board.

[Mr. Lucas.]

NICOMEN ISLAND

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE (for Hon. Mr. Stevens):

For a return of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, documents, reports, etc., between the Minister of Public Works or any official of his department, or any other minister or official of the government and the Minister of Public Works in the province of British Columbia, or any official, or other minister or official of the provincial government of British Columbia, regarding the problem of protection for Nicomen Island against high water flooding by the Fraser river.

RATES ON APPLES AND VEGETABLES

Mr. MARTELL:

For a return showing the freight and express rates charged on apples and vegetables shipped from Windsor, in the county of Hants, Nova Scotia, to the city of Montreal, Quebec, and the cities of Ottawa and Toronto, Ontario, together with a complete statement as to the reason for the fixing of said rates or charges, and including a copy of all evidence upon which the same has been determined.

SYDENHAM HOSPITAL

Mr. SHEARD (for Mr. Ross, Kingston):

For a copy of all communications, papers and documents relating to the dismissal of certain medical officers employed by D.S.C.R. and the appointments to positions so vacated following the closing of Sydenham Hospital, Kingston.

EASTERN LAND COMPANY

Mr. FOURNIER (for Mr. Lapierre):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents exchanged between the government or any department thereof and The Eastern Land Company, of Capreol, Ontario, relative to the purchase of land adjoining the town of Capreol from the Canadian National Railways by said The Eastern Land Company.

PURE-BRED CATTLE—ACCREDITED HERDS

Mr. CALDWELL:

For a return showing all accredited herds of pure-bred cattle, and all herds under process of accreditation, by provinces, giving the names of owners of those fully accredited, and also names of owners of herds under accreditation.

CREDIT AND INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East) moved;

That, in the opinion of this House, a representative parliamentary committee should be appointed to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks for an investigation into the basis and function of credit, either by a parliamentary committee or by some other committee which parliament might see fit to appoint. The resolution calls for a parliamentary committee, but the main point before us is the consideration of the advisability of getting the information on the basis and function of credit and the relation

of credit to industry. It is my duty, then, to show the necessity for such information. Hon. members of the House will recall that last year on two occasions I laid the basis for this resolution,—in the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and in the debate on the budget. I set forth what credit was; how it was controlled; its indispensability to modern society; how inflation and deflation is controlled by the banks; that the present industrial paralysis is due largely to a lack of purchasing power; that the development of our home market should be sought by increasing the purchasing power of the country. I showed further the relation of credit control to war, and indicated the danger of collapse of the present financial system; and also gave an analysis of substitute proposals by a number of students of finance.

I was rather interested, Mr. Speaker, last year, to observe the effect which my discussion of this question produced on some hon. members of the House, and particularly was I interested in the remarks which it called forth from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). I notice that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat at the moment, but on that occasion the discussion tempted him into an unusual outburst of humour. Either he did not think the subject as I presented it was worthy of serious consideration or he was not in a position to answer the argument. Be that as it may, he replied by indulging in sarcasm at my expense. He even went so far as to be willing to break the bonds of the Empire, to place upon my head a golden crown, if I could instruct people of Canada how to pay the national debt, or how to get rid of interest, and so forth. Now I notice by a report in the daily press that the hon. member for Halifax is slated as the next Minister of Finance for this Dominion. If that is true I venture to say that this House and the people of Canada will require a better answer to the question of finance and credit from the hon. gentleman than the sarcasm which he gave to the House last year. I trust that to-day he will take the opportunity to go into the matter in greater detail and with more seriousness than he bestowed upon it on that occasion.

I want to point out that the contention of last year has been substantiated by financiers of world repute. I would mention first Col. Armstrong. In referring to the Cunliff committee that was appointed by the British government to make recommendations as to industry and finance shortly after the war, he points out:

> It is now generally agreed that the policy of deflation which the government adopted in accordance with the recommendations of the Cunliff committee has proceeded too far and produced results which were not anticipated at the time it was instituted.

In that connection also I would refer the House to the utterances of Lord Milner, who happens to be himself a bank director in England. He refers to this question more from the point of view of labour, and goes on to show how labouring people were induced to increase production after the war. Their wages were cut and deflation in finance was brought about, with the result that the storehouses of the nation were filled with goods. The people had no money with which to purchase these goods, and the inevitable results followed—unemployment. But more than that—Lord Milner says:

> Labour is more and more inclined to question the competence of the bigwigs of industry and finance. There is a loss of confidence in the management.

Continuing he says:

> For months and months after the close of the war he—the labour man—had it dinned into his ears that the world was suffering from a shortage of goods, and he was overwhelmed with exhortations to him and the men of his class not to spare themselves, but to work with intensified energy to make up the deficiency. That, he was vehemently assured, was their duty to their country and the world, and at the same time the one sure road to the improvement of their own condition. Such was the unanimous appeal made to him by all the highest authorities in the world of industry and finance. And he obeyed it to the best of his ability, but only to find, a year or two later, that the ware houses of his employers were choked with goods which they could not sell, and that his services were no longer required. And then, when, stung by disappointment, he began to probe for himself into the causes of this strange contradiction, he was told that there had unfortunately been a mistake, that the activity to which he had been so fervently exhorted to contribute was "feverish", that he ought to have known, we ought all to have known, that after the war there was bound to be a big slump, because "the pool of capital had been depleted" and we had no money for making things and nobody else had any money for buying them.

It would therefore seem that my contentions of last year were not matters for humour as the hon. member for Halifax seemed to think. Rather, these matters, have been taken very seriously indeed by some of the foremost financiers of the world. If generations of pyramiding debts and the control of credit by a select few financiers, with its inevitable under consumption and unemployment be made matters for mirth, then all I have to say is that some hon. members have a rather peculiar idea of what constitutes humour. Is the present situation as referred to by Lord Milner—and it is obvious in Canada, and, indeed, all over the world—is the present situation the best that the present financiers and their advocates can give us. If so, I submit that these **ad-**

vocates ought to be willing to listen to other people, however ignorant they may seem to be.

What, let us ask first, are the industrial conditions in Canada at the present time? In this regard I would refer in the first place, to the evidence that has been given in this House by the representatives of agriculture in the Dominion. Nobody will deny that their speeches have reflected the protest of the agricultural population against an industrial situation which is becoming intolerable. In this connection I would quote a very short extract from Dr. Henrik Shipstead, a senator from Minnesota who says:

> The farmers of Minnesota left thousands of acres of potatoes in the fields to rot—thousands upon thousands of acres, and the country needing cheap food. They could not afford to dig them for there was no market for them—think of that, no market for them!

That is the situation in Canada to a large extent. There is no market for wheat—prices are low; there is no market for cattle—prices are below the margin where it is possible to raise cattle economically. So from the point of view of agriculture, the industrial situation in Canada is indeed very serious.

I would also refer to the business depression which set in shortly after the close of the war, and which still persists. It stands to reason that business must be depressed when there is no market for the farmers' produce and no employment for the working people; under such conditions business must of necessity be depressed. In this connection it is well to refer to the depletion of our population which is going on because of the economic conditions in agriculture, in industry and in business, and I could not do better than quote a short passage from an article from the pen of Mr. John A. Stevenson in MacLean's magazine. The heading of this article is: "Is Canada an Immigration Sieve?" I quote from it briefly:

> From the Maritime provinces fifty families per week are said to be moving to the New England states, and at the other end of the country Col. W. B. Forster, of Vancouver, declares that the province has lost 177,000 people by emigration in the last decade, although the Vancouver Province challenges his figures.
>
> But, perhaps the most deadly evidence of all comes from the customs returns, which show that in the year ending December 31, whereas the value of imports under the head of "settlers effects" total $6,195,569, the parallel exports reached $7,832,052. This clear loss on the balance is a most disconcerting novelty.
>
> But little further proof of the existence of a steady exodus is needed beyond the latest census figures. In 1911, the population was officially estimated at 7,206,463. In the succeeding decade, 1,975,000 people entered our gates, and the natural increment should normally have been 1,800,000. Making the fullest allowance for losses of the war, the census of 1921, if Canada had retained all her native-born increment and her immigrants, should have reached a total of 10,500,000. But the actual figures, as given by the Bureau of Statistics, are 8,769,489.

So, it will be seen that the economic conditions which have been brought to the attention of this House by hon. members representing the agricultural industry, and also the statistics with regard to the exodus from Canada of our people, prove that our economic conditions are very serious.

Next, I would refer to unemployment, which is still a grave problem in Canada. To make that point clear, I will quote from a telegram just received:

> I am acting on behalf of the unemployed of Halifax. There are fifteen hundred of them. This situation has been with us for the past two years. I have wired Prime Minister and Minister of Labour on the subject urging the government to open up public works or give a greater measure of relief on account of a long period. The situation is acute.

I have in my hand a copy of a resolution sent from Sydney Mines to the Prime Minister with regard to the same situation, stating that "two hundred and upwards have been out of employment and are now suffering on account of said unemployment." I mention those just because they are fresh in this morning. The situation throughout all Canada is similar, and I would refer hon. members to the statement which was given by the leader of the Labour party (Mr. Woodsworth) in this House on a previous occasion with regard to the unemployment situation.

These industrial conditions are not, as many people contend, caused by the war. Let me give the evidence in support of this contention. In the first place, we had similar conditions in 1914. We had similar unemployment, similar business depression, arising out of the same economic conditions, which are producing the industrial paralysis from which we are at present suffering. War could not have caused that—the war had not yet begun. Again, we are better equipped at this time for production, and increased production if required, than we were prior to the war. I pointed that out at some length in the debate on this question last session. I showed that during the war we had increased our productive facilities; that we had brought home our men from the front, thus having more people to work, and so forth. I showed that we were in a better position for production after the war than we were before. In view of this, there cannot be any claim that we ought to suffer for lack of goods. Moreover, it must be said that if the stock of consumable goods has been depleted in Canada owing to war activities—and let me add that that is the only sane reason why anybody in Canada should be lacking for anything of necessity—

would it not be natural that every man and woman in this country who can work, would be working overtime to make up the shortage? On the contrary, not only are we not working to make up the shortage, we are feeding our people by a dole system, municipal or provincial or Dominion doles as the case may be and keeping them in idleness. When that is the situation, who will argue that Canada is in need of producing more goods? No, the problem of production has been solved. What we are sticking at is distribution of the goods. When you stop distributing, naturally you block up the whole industrial machine and it stops. What we want is not more production; we can produce more very speedily. What we want is more distribution; and that leads us, as I shall show later, to a consideration of the purchasing power of the people.

But let me come to the next point. If there was a shortage, which there is not, that shortage could not be explained by saying that we lack raw material, for obviously, Canada, with her boasted natural resources, can supply us with all the raw material required for production. The present situation has not arisen through a lack of plant equipment, as I have demonstrated; it has not arisen through a lack of willing workers, for they are walking the streets now looking for work. It has arisen because of the shortage of a real demand owing to a lack of purchasing power. Let me illustrate this. In the city of Calgary we require a new post office, not a political post office, but a real post office. Political parties have, for some time, as an election talk, been promising to build a post office at Calgary. But let us leave this aside and point to the fact that we have the spot of ground on which we want to set the post office. We have in Calgary, or can secure, the material out of which the post office would have to be built. We have in Calgary the labour, walking the streets, doing nothing, looking for an opportunity to build the post office. We are renting from private institutions offices for public purposes to the extent of $50,000 yearly. We, therefore, need the post office; but although we have the place upon which the post office would rest very solidly, the material out of which to build it, the men doing nothing that want to go to work at building it, and the need which would save us $50,000 a year in rent alone, we cannot build the post office because, it is said: "We have no money." Let me give you a parallel illustration. I will take you out to a river bank and I will show you a tribe of Indians sitting on the river bank disconsolate and distressed. I approach them and I ask the chief: "What is the matter?" "Oh," he says, "We cannot fish and we cannot hunt because we have no money." I say: "Man, you have lots of fishing tackle, and I see there are fish in the stream. You have lots of guns and ammunition, and I see there is plenty of game in the bush. Why do you not fish and hunt?" "Oh, yes," says the chief, with tears in his eyes; we have lots of fishing material and there are lots of fish; we have lots of ammunition and there is plenty of game; but, you know, we cannot fish and we cannot hunt because we have no money." We would promptly send that whole tribe to the asylum; but when we are sending that tribe to the asylum, let us all go along with them, because we are doing precisely the same thing in Canada as that hypothetical tribe of Indians would be doing by taking such a stupid attitude as that.

The present industrial situation, as I have briefly outlined it, marks the bankruptcy of statesmanship in Canada. With our natural resources tremendous in extent, with the need on the part of the people for goods, with the men walking the streets seeking work—we cannot give them, I say that situation is indeed ridiculous. In support of the contention that this condition is brought about through lack of purchasing power, let me quote a few brief extracts from others that may be taken as greater authorities than myself. Let me quote first from an article in the Manchester Guardian. This article has the significant heading, "A Year of Disastrous Plenty." Note that heading. The article says:

> As we sing our psalms of thanksgiving for one of the most bountiful fruit harvests within memory, that the great part of the harvest is rotting beneath the trees that bore it, and we add to our thanks a prayer for economic enlightenment:

It concludes " The fruit trade has met its Waterloo."

Here is another short extract from the Bulletin of the International City Bank of New York:

> It is however a familiar fact that the chief cause of depression during the past year was the unbalanced state of industry, great numbers of would-be customers being unable to buy freely because their own product did not give them the required purchasing power over other products held at a higher level of values.

To conclude the quotations on this point, I will refer to Mr. Babson on purchasing power. He says:

> The purchasing power of the people is ultimately determined by the total payroll of the nation. No matter what one's attitude is on the matters of labour and capital, in the final analysis it must be realized that the spending power, the purchasing power of a nation, of a community, is merely the sum total of the payroll of that nation or community.

For this reason then, that the deflation practised in Canada and in all countries has

resulted in unemployment through the curtailing of the purchasing power of the people, I urge that the investigation of this matter should be taken up by a committee of this parliament to see how this condition has been brought about. Under this heading let me further point out that we are recognizing that we cannot sell our goods when we send hon. ministers to foreign countries to look for markets. If we could sell our own goods here, we would not need to go to the expense of hunting for markets. I very much regret to say that in my opinion the expenditure of the hunt will exceed the products of the chase. But let me ask: Did the beaming smiles of our hon. ministers increase the purchasing power of those countries
4 p.m. whom they were soliciting for trade? I do not see the connection. I scarcely imagine that they did, by their smiles, increase the purchasing power of France or of Australia. Indeed they may have discovered that the purchasing power of those countries was limited, just as is the purchasing power of Canada, and that they could not, merely by passing a resolution, increase the purchasing power of the people of other countries. But unless they can increase the purchasing power of people of other countries we cannot get a foreign market. These people are not buying from us now because they cannot. Will any arranging of treaties increase their purchasing power? Let me rather turn to the apostles of the full dinner pail and of home markets that sit to the left of the Speaker, these gentlemen who have fought many elections on the ground that we should increase our own home markets and build it up. True, they advocated building it up—on the rotten foundation of an old tariff policy; will they not assist my endeavour to obtain a home market on the principles I am enunciating? Here is the opportunity, by developing a credit system that will increase the purchasing power of our people, and start industries, and keep our people busy, so that afterwards, if we have unemployment, it will not be forced unemployment, but will be because we have actually produced more than we can possibly consume. That would be a very excellent condition and much more healthy, economically considered, than the unemployment at the present time. I want, therefore, an investigation that will reveal why there is a lack of financial credit in Canada at the present time. That is a reasonable and modest request. If it can be shown there are sound reasons for the prevailing shortage in financial credit, then I and other members of the House will be content. Let us hold the investigation and have the proof. Nothing short of the proof will satisfy us.

My next point is that Canada has to borrow money. We borrowed hundreds of millions last year. I do not know how much we shall have to borrow this year, but I know that the Dominion government alone has to pay an annual interest on our borrowings of $138,223,000. Now, we have some advocates of economy. Here is an excellent place to practise economy. Can we save the interest on $138,000,000 to the people of Canada? That would certainly be a worthy accomplishment and would be good economy. Have we the chance of practising economy in this way? We borrow a great deal of our money from the United States. In the process of borrowing we have to pay brokers high rates for handling our business. We have to pay high rates of interest to somebody for permitting us to use our own credit—it is a well-known fact that we cannot borrow from anybody unless we already have a basis of borrowing. If you go to a bank to borrow money, the banker will ask you what you have got, and when you have demonstrated that you have assets equal and more than equal to what you want to borrow, he will consider your loan; in other words, you can only borrow from the banker what you already have. If we go to the United States and tell them that we are bankrupt as a nation, that we have no natural resources, no industries, and that we are all dying, how much would we be able to borrow? Nothing. We can only borrow from the United States because we already have the credit which merits the loan which we solicit. If that be true, I want to know why Canada cannot use her own credit. Why should we have to go to Wall street to get permission to use what we already have? Is the credit of Canada which is good enough for the Wall street banker not good enough for the Canadian manufacturer or the Canadian banker? Is it not good enough for the Canadian farmers? On this ground also then, I want an investigation to show how it is that we are forced to go into a foreign country to borrow money, why we cannot use our own credit and escape the burden of interest, and at the same time increase the people's purchasing power and start all the industries of Canada?

Next, I want to show that credit is a social asset, and, being social in character, and of supreme importance to the life of the nation, it must not be allowed to be controlled by any clique, no matter how wise or efficient its members may be. I do not need to tell the House that one of the chief factors of any nation's credit is its consumers, for the con-

sumer starts the plough, sinks the shaft, opens the factory and gives acceleration to business; indeed the consumer's demand is back of all industrial enterprise. If there were no consumers, there would be no farmers growing wheat, if there were no bare feet in Canada there would be no boot manufacturers; these industries exist for the purpose of satisfying human needs or the needs of the consumer. If a boot manufacturer went to borrow money the chances are that he could easily obtain it, the market being good. But if he should try to establish a factory to produce a commodity which no one ever heard about, and the uses of which people were not aware of, it is not very likely that he would succeed in raising a loan.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have been listening carefully to my hon. friend although I hardly expect to take part in the discussion. I should like to know, however, on what system he is basing his argument. Is he advocating state socialism, or guild socialism, or is it the doctrine he propounded last year and which I believe he referred to in his opening remarks? It would be very interesting to know to which port my hon. friend is drifting.

Mr. IRVINE: I know my hon. friend from Halifax is anxious to draw a herring across the trail of my speech,—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Oh, no, I beg your pardon.

Mr. IRVINE: —but I would refuse to follow it even if it were a whale instead of a herring. I am not trying to advocate any particular school of finance, nor am I advocating any mode of socialism whatsoever. I am merely asking for an investigation into the credit system of the country.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But my hon. friend has been clearly arguing for some system of financial credit, and the only system I know of comparable to that which he is endeavouring to set up is the Douglas system, so-called. I simply want my hon. friend to be good enough to say whether that is what he has in mind, or whether he intends to develop some financial credit system under what is known as state socialism, or guild socialism, or something of that nature. It would help a lot if we know what he was aiming at.

Mr. IRVINE: I concede that it would help if I could tag myself on to some socialistic scheme and by so doing immediately raise the ire of the whole House. I am not going to propound any socialistic theory of credit control. I am asking, however, that this committee which the resolution calls for shall state what it thinks ought to be done. If I knew now what should be done I would not be making this speech, but would rather be trying to educate the hon. gentleman up to my system. Now, the Douglas system to which the hon. member refers is one scheme out of many; and I am sorry that he has not heard of some of the others. I could mention half a dozen others that have been propounded by as able men as Major Douglas. If the committee for which I ask find weaknesses in the present system let them submit to the House all the information they can possibly get. That is all I want; and I think that if the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) will have a little more patience he will perceive my main contention. I am not advocating any one particular school of financial thought; what I insist upon is that we investigate the subject. My speech of last year with regard to this matter merely indicated that new proposals were being thought of; and to say that I advocated that any one of them should be adopted in toto would be to misrepresent me entirely, and to misunderstand my motives. If the hon. member will look up Hansard he will see that I analyzed these proposals merely to show that there were people who were thinking about them, and that we were not hopelessly left to die in the state in which we found ourselves.

When I was interrupted, I was dealing with the point that credit is a social asset, that the consumer is one of the main factors of a nation, and that, every person being a consumer, credit was necessarily of a social character. If that is so then it is surely a dangerous thing to permit a few monopolists to control social credit. Credit is the lifeblood of industry; and we want an investigation to show who are the individuals that control the flow of the lifeblood of Canadian industry, and to find out if there be any possible way by which society can control the system. If there be then we must ascertain what is necessary to be done. And this investigation would serve to throw light upon this question.

My next point is that those who control the finances of any country control the government and, as well, the policy of industry. It must be clear to any hon. member who gives the matter a moment's consideration that a government that must borrow $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 or more from financiers cannot be absolutely independent of those financiers. When a government has already given them carte blanche with regard to the credit of the country, and given them a ten-year right to the use of it, then that government must come cap in hand to those financiers, the

government already having given away its own power. In support of this contention, which I cannot take the time to develop as fully as I should like, let me point to the situation in Alberta at the present time. We have in that province a Farmers' government, so-called, and we have had an investigation by a royal commission into the banking conditions there. Simply because of that circumstance, we find that the financiers are taking a very hostile attitude. In a recent issue of the Calgary Daily Herald you will find a very interesting editorial on this point. The Herald declares that the Alberta government and the critics of finance in that province had better be careful because the financiers might take umbrage, and that if they did they could, if they so choose, shut off the credit of the whole province. Now, that is proof, at least to some extent, that financiers may, and very likely do, control governments. It must be just as evident that he who controls finance controls the policy of industry. He who has the right to say whether a loan shall or shall not be secured, says, in very many instances, what sort of industry shall be established, and what sort shall not be allowed. Let me cite an illustration, the supposed case of a farmer and a moving picture showman going to a banker each soliciting the loan of, say, $1,000. In reply to the question concerning his assets, the farmer tells the banker that he has a mortgage on his farm already, in fact, two or three; that his wheat crop has been a failure; that he finds himself with a large quantity of stock, for which there is no market and for which he has no feed. However, if he could borrow $1,000 and secure feed to keep his cattle over the winter he might possibly come out all right the next year. That is his story. Then the banker turns to the other man and asks for his story. This man says he is going to establish a picture show in the town. He has rented such-and-such a building and wants to install the necessary machinery. He requires enough money to pay his help for the first month perhaps; and as regards the question of assets, he says he has a fine line of films which have been popular everywhere else and which he knows the people of this town will like. His patrons are in the community and he knows that they will come to see his pictures. He will make so much per night or per week and, he can give a reasonable promise that in a given time the money will be paid back. Well, the banker has nothing to do but to choose in favour of the picture showman. The banker is handling money that must make more money and he cannot lend to the farmer because he has no assurance that the cattle market will improve or that the farmer will be able to pay back the amount lent him. And so the banker, without designing it, decides that instead of building up a cattle industry we shall build up a picture show business. I am not speaking against the picture show business; it is all right—but we shall not live very long on picture shows. We must first of all establish the basic industries that supply the necessities of life, and whatever is in the nature of a luxury can come later. From that illustration it will be seen that the man who controls the finance of a country controls also the policy of its industry. I therefore urge an inquiry into credit control. I want an investigation to see how it is that banks do control credit, and to see why we should continue to give carte blanche to a number of gentlemen to do what they please with Canada's credit.

Next let me show briefly that money is not performing its proper function in society. Normally the function that it should perform industrially would be analogous to that which the blood performs in its circulation through our bodies. The discovery of the circulation of the blood was of great moment to a proper understanding of the control of our bodily health. The discovery of the circulation of money as the life blood of industry to-day is a discovery of equally great importance to economics. One of the symptoms of a defective circulation of the blood in the body is cold feet, and I think perhaps we are suffering from that trouble to some extent to-day. Cold feet is something like greatness: Some are born with cold feet, some acquire cold feet, and some have cold feet thrust upon them. I do not know whether the present administration has been born with cold feet, or has acquired them, or has had cold feet thrust upon it. Nor do I know whether our present industrial monopolists have been born with that affliction or whether the financial situation has developed it in them, but the fact is that they have cold feet to-day. We need an investigation, then, to find out how it is that the circulation of finance is being arrested.

What is Canada suffering from at the present time? Is it fatty degeneration of the heart, or is it arterio-sclerosis that is impeding the circulation of finance? Whatever the disease, it is gnawing at the vitals of Canada, and this arrested circulation is making serious inroads upon the economic life of the nation. Therefore, if we are to effect a cure we must have the necessary information on which to act.

Perhaps I can illustrate this from another point of view. The lack of purchasing power

is somewhat akin to the lack of electric power in a street railway system. Purchasing power makes the wheels go round in the industrial system, just as the electric current makes the wheels turn in a street car system. For want of the necessary electric power the most skilled workmen provided with the very best equipment are powerless to function. We have no shortage of plant or equipment in our industrial system, for during the war years great factories were equipped with the most modern machinery. Neither is there any lack of skilled operators, as I have already shown. But our industrial plants are standing idle and our operatives are unemployed periodically because something called "contraction of credit" cuts off the supply of currency. Now, surely the community should do something more than wait around at street corners and starve during these interruptions until the "current" comes on again. What is the matter with our industrial system that it is not running? Has something happened to the machinery? Is there power enough? What is the matter? We want an investigation in order that we may find out where the trouble lies.

Now, in connection with the function of money, in our economic system, let me quote Delmar. He says:

> When the principles that underlie it are thoroughly understood, money is perhaps the mightiest engine to which man can lend an intelligent guidance. Unheard, unfelt, unseen, it has the power so to distribute the burdens, gratifications and opportunities of life that each individual shall enjoy that share of them to which his merits or good fortune may entitle him or contrariwise to dispense them with so partial a hand as to violate every principle of justice and perpetuate a succession of social slaveries to the end of time.

What, then, is this thing that has so much power? Why was it invented? What function did it originally perform? Why and how did banks arise and get control? Let me go back for a minute or two to the origin of money. We find early society doing its trading in commodities—they exchanged real goods for real goods. But by and by, as social integration went on, this was found too cumbersome a method. For instance, supposing one of the hon. members of the Farmer party in this House wanted to go to New York for a trip, and his only wealth consisted of cattle. We will suppose he has a lot of steers, but there is no market for them, so he takes them down to New York, paying the freight charges with a certain number of them, also his railway fare and his hotel expenses. When he wants to go to a picture show he slices off a hind quarter and passes it through the ticket wicket. Such would be the cumbersome process if there was no money in use; in a word, it would be impossible under present day conditions, to do any trading without a medium of exchange. It is easily conceivable how necessary it was for our early ancestors to invent some means to facilitate business. They invented money. Sometimes it was made out of little pieces of wood, at other times of leather, skins, iron, brass, copper, until finally it reached its present form—paper. Anything will do for money as long as we give it legal sanction. But the point is that money is a shadow of the reality; that is, its real meaning and its function is to facilitate business, because, as I have pointed out, it is easier to take the shadow of a carload of steers to New York than the steers themselves.

But how did the shadow become a reality? It is easy for us to see how subsequent generations would lose the meaning of the function of money, and they would discover that whoever possessed money could do whatever he wanted. If he needed potatoes he could buy them with money, and would not need to raise them, and so on with other commodities. So, gradually people began to acquire money for the power it gave them; they began to hoard it; and eventually to guard against robbers it was found necessary to have strong-boxes in which to keep their money and to appoint keepers to guard their boxes. By and by those strong-box keepers began to develop a notion of becoming bankers. One morning when one of these keepers was guarding a strong-box a sad looking farmer came along, and on being asked why he looked so downcast he exclaimed that he had his land all ready for crops but was without money to buy the necessary seed. Immediately the strong-box keeper, the embryo banker, conceived the brilliant idea of lending some of the money confided to his keeping to the farmer, who could pay him back the principal with interest in the fall when he had harvested his crops. But then he was assailed by the doubt: Supposing I lend Jones' money to this farmer and Jones wants it in the meantime, what shall I do? He soon settled this difficulty by recollecting that he could satisfy Jones by paying him out of Smith's money. So he took the chance, made the loan to the farmer, and everything worked out so well that after a time instead of continuing as a strong-box keeper and paid for his services as such, he made an offer to pay hoarders interest on any money they would deposit with him. And lo and behold! all the old socks were turned inside out, the hoarders of money flocked to him, and he very soon was in control of the whole financial situation. That is how the bankers got their power.

That is what banks came for: first of all to guard money, and then later to control it. It is the function of money, as I have pointed out, to facilitate trade, and as I have shown money is the shadow of the reality.

I understand that the Bank Act will come up for revision this session. Once that is done, ten years more will elapse before we shall be in a position to discuss this financial question with any hope of having alterations made. It is very important, therefore, that we should get more information. Indeed, I doubt whether anyone in this House outside of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself and the late Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) really understands the present system of finance. Last year some hon. members objected to the new proposals of Major Douglas then put forward on the ground that they did not understand them; but those hon. gentlemen do not understand the system that is in vogue now. I say we do not understand it, but we are going to revise and confirm an act that passes all financial and credit power into the hands of a few men for ten years. I submit that in view of the complex nature of this subject it is imperatively necessary that we should have more information in regard to it before we are called upon to vote on the Bank Act. If we do not, what will happen? The experts of the banks on the committee dealing with the bill will tell us what kind of bill they want, and we shall not be in a position to challenge them; their information will be expert information and the result will be that we shall have a banking act for bankers instead of a banking act that will secure a free flow of the life blood of industry through Canada for the next ten years. For this, another reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge the necessity of an investigation into the subject matter of the resolution.

Moreover, the banking system, the finance system, of the world is in real danger of collapse. We have continued to pyramid our debts, and the pyramid has been inverted; it is standing on its apex, and we are building out and out to such an extent that if we keep on the whole thing will ultimately collapse around us. To change the illustration, let us imagine that a snake starts to eat its own tail. It keeps on eating and eating and by and by it comes to the back of its neck and can go no further. The financial system of the world is just about in that position now. One of the expert students of this subject whom I interviewed in London last summer told me that the system could not possibly go on longer than 1925, and he based his prophecy on the ratio of average overhead charges in the great staple industries to the direct labour charges involved in connection with those industries. So there is a danger to civilization in this connection. If hon. members of this House found it necessary to put up at a hotel that was not fireproof, they would be pardoned for looking around for the fire escape. There is, I say, this possibility of catastrophe in the present world situation, and I want to know where the fire escape is. I want to know what this government will do in the event of the financial system of the world collapsing through the present invasion of the Ruhr by France. Indeed, that is a danger that the Prime Minister of England feared when he dissociated himself from the action of the Premier of France; that is what is feared by all students of finance. What will our government do in that event? Shall we not have an investigation into this matter so that we may know what course to pursue in the case of a collapse taking place?

We need a fundamental change in our banking system. When our Bank Act comes up for revision I shall not be interested in crossing its t's and dotting its i's, I do not think we can get much improvement from that. Indeed, the present Bank Act is a good act; it has been said that it is a good measure—for the bankers. It is one of the best acts in North America, or in the civilized world for that matter, for the bankers; and we might make it a little better for them by tinkering with it—I am not sure. At any rate, that is all I expect out of the procedure involved in a revision of the present act. Shall we not now take a new step; is there a chance of a fundamental change which will give us greater circulation of currency, which will stir up our industries, increase our home markets, solve the problem of distribution, prevent the paying of huge sums of interest?

There is a demand among the people for such information as this resolution seeks to obtain. Even the Liberal Association of Vancouver passed a fairly strong resolution demanding certain investigations and asking for changes in conection with the banking system of this country. The organized farmers and the organized labour people of this country have made similar demands. For the reasons I have given, therefore, I urge the adoption of this resolution in order that we may get the information that is so badly needed and that is so necessary before we can deal properly with any present or proposed banking legislation.

Mr. HENRY E. SPENCER (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolu-

tion, I wish to say that it deals with one of the most important subjects that has come before this House. The hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) has stated the amount of interest that this country has to pay annually,—$138,223,000. It is interesting to note how our forefathers tried for many generations to get away from this tax. I might mention that King Alfred, about the year 900 A.D., forfeited goods of money-lenders, for usury. Edward the Confessor banished them from England. Henry II claimed usurers' property at death. Richard I and John punished them. Edward III made it a capital crime. Henry VIII allowed money to be loaned, and Elizabeth allowed a modified interest to be charged. For generations there was an effort to get away from the charge which to-day is piling up debts the world over. Efforts have been made from time to time to issue credit without this charge being attached to it. I am going to direct attention to two cases, one of which was referred to last year in a speech delivered by the member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) which will be found on page 2505 of Hansard. "Market House Notes" were issued on the authority of Governor de L'Isle Brock of Guernsey, on the credit of the community, and no interest was charged. In the other case, in 1862, the American people had gone through a very expensive war and they needed a great deal of money to pay their soldiers and sailors, and to purchase foodstuffs. It was decided, therefore, to issue what were known as greenbacks, and practically $450,000,000 were issued. In case hon. members of the House are not fully aware of the nature of the greenback, I wish to recite what one is. I quote from a former Secretary of the United States Treasury, Mr. Salmon P. Chase, who says:

> What is a greenback? Did you ever think what it was? Why it is simply the credit of this great American people put into the form of money to circulate among the very people whose credit makes it good. When I was secretary of the treasury, the question arose, how should these vast armies and navies be supplied, how should the boys be fed in the field, the sailors in ships, and provision made for their support and clothing, food and transportation? I found the banks of the country had suspended specie payment. What was I to do? The banks wanted me to borrow their credit. They did not pay me gold or propose to pay any themselves, but they wanted me to borrow their notes. I said "No, gentlemen, this great American people is worth all of you put together. I will take the credit of the people and cut it up in the form of little bits of paper and we will circulate that paper." This is the true idea of the greenback. It is the credit and property of the American people.

I do not wish the House to think for a minute that I am advocating the use of paper money without taking care of price regulation. We have always to guard against the unnatural inflation, but it is worthy of note that the great American people after going through their severe struggle saw fit to make use of their own credit without charge. In our own case we did not do anything of the sort. After our great struggle we saw fit to borrow money on which we shall be paying a tax for generations to come to those who have loaned us the money, which we borrowed on our own credit.

Referring further to the issue of paper money in the United States, it was only natural that those who made their living by making loans or giving credit to individuals or the nation should fight such an innovation as this, and they kept up a running fight along the following lines. In 1877 a circular was issued by the authority of the Associated Bank of New York, Philadelphia and Boston, signed by one James Buell, Secretary, who issued it from 247 Broadway. I am quoting now from information given by Senator C. A. Lindbergh of the United States. This circular was sent to the Bankers in all the States and read:

> Dear Sir,—It is advisable to do all in your power to sustain such prominent daily and weekly newspapers, especially the agricultural and religious press, as will oppose the greenback issue of paper money, and that you also withhold patronage from all applicants who are not willing to oppose the government issue of money. Let government issue the coin and the banks issue the paper money of the country, then we can better protect each other. To repeal the Act creating bank notes, or to restore to circulation the government issue of money, will be to provide the people with money, and will therefore, seriously affect our individual profits as bankers and lenders. See your Congressman at once and engage him to support our interests that we may control legislation.

That, I must admit, is rather an interesting letter to obtain, and I think it is of particular interest at this time because we shall no doubt find that those who have the privilege of the control of credit in this country will, as efforts are made to take away that privilege, put forward similar propaganda.

One hardly realizes the power of what is known as interest. It is hard to believe that one dollar, at ten per cent compound interest will amount in a hundred years to the huge sum of $13,809.

During last session the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) came down to this House and informed the members that he had been fortunate in floating a loan in New York to the amount of $100,000,000, at five per cent, for thirty years, and most of the hon. members applauded that statement. They applauded, I suppose, because they realized that Canada's name was so good that they were able to raise that loan in another country, but how

many members realized that when the people of Canada meet that note, when it comes due in thirty years' time, they will have to pay back not only the $100,000,000, but the sum of $150,000,000 besides on account of interest. Study for a moment what this means in certain parts of Canada where high interest rates are being charged; I refer particularly to the western provinces. Interest is high there, and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that when you consider the short term for which the loans are issued and the high rate of interest that is charged and compounded, the interest rate will easily equal ten per cent. Imagine, therefore, that for every hundred million dollars that are borrowed by the farmers of western Canada—on their own credit, mind you—when they come to pay that back in thirty years' time—if the renewal loan runs that long—they will pay no less a sum than $400,000,000. These figures, I think, are staggering.

As time has gone on, those who have controlled the money system of the country have gradually strengthened their hold, have organized themselves stronger and stronger until to-day we find that only a few men control the destinies of this country through finance. Going back just as far as 1904 I find that we had then thirty-four banks with some 1,100 branches, and in 1920 these banks had been reduced to eighteen with nearly 5,000 branches, and now as you well know, the number of banks is down to seventeen. One weakness in our present system appears to be that the banks are trying to carry on the business of this country on too little paid-up capital. In 1904 I notice that the relation of paid-up capital to assets equalled 11 per cent, but sixteen years afterwards it was only four per cent. It appears to me that the banks are trying to handle the country's business on too small a capital.

Credit when all is said and done is a community thing, but under the control we have at the present time, the credit of the country is entirely at the mercy of seventeen institutions. I would like to quote from a statement made by a banker of twenty years' standing. The figures are rather staggering. A layman, when he first comes across this, can hardly believe it is true. He says:

> Banks are quasi-public institutions. The public must use them as they constitute a monopoly. These joint stock companies have invested of their own money $129,000,000 and have accumulated from profits $135,000,000. Therefore, they have $264,000,000 of their own money in the business. This amount would not equal loans outside of Canada, which on June 30, 1921, were $321,000,000. Total assets on the same date were $2,879,000,000. All but $264,000,000 was the people's money. In other words the public has ten times as much interest in the banking business of our country as the shareholders of the banks and all the money is being controlled by eighteen groups of men. Over half of it is controlled by four groups. Two-thirds is controlled by seven banks. Seven men actually control over seventy per cent of the savings of nearly nine million people by the operation of seven machines, which gather their savings from towns, villages and hamlets, consolidating them in seven depositories, and then the seven men have the power to place this huge sum wherever it may suit them.

I would like to quote a few words by Sir Edmund Walker, who, in speaking to the shareholders of the Bank of Commerce, on January 13, 1920, said:

> We cannot adjust prices without also bringing about a contraction in the volume of paper money and other instruments of credit, and so far as it is possible to enforce contraction without interfering with the production of what is really necessary, the reduction of prices will be facilitated.

This is the way in which it was facilitated. In October, 1920, circulation amounted to $249,000,000. In three months this was reduced by $43,000,000, and by June 30, 1921, the banks had taken another $10,000,000 out of circulation. Had the decrease in circulation been less rapid, the results would not have been so disastrous. The sudden deflation was certainly appalling.

Banking monopoly naturally leads to industrial monopoly, and this reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a very interesting debate which was held in this House last session and which you will find, in part, on page 1087 in Hansard. In reference to the debate on interlocking directorates, we had these astounding figures given us. We found that in one case fifteen men with interlocking directorates, with sixteen corporations, controlled a capital of no less than $4,285,000,000. To quote a few more figures along the same line, I should like to refer to the answer to a question which I put on the order paper during last session. The answer gave me the number of people, plus corporations, paying income tax as being 194,257. This, comparatively speaking, small number control an aggregate wealth of no less than $912,410,428. I cannot help, after quoting these few figures, but beg leave to draw your attention to how very closely a prophecy of the great President Lincoln has come true. President Lincoln, in his second letter to Congress, made this statement:

> In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against the approach of returning despotism. It is the effort to place capital above labour in the structure of the government.
>
> As a result of the war corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavour to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my

country than ever before, even in the midst of the war. God grant that my suspicions may prove groundless.

What are conditions in Canada at the present time? We all admit that we have one of the finest countries in the world; that as an agricultural country, Canada takes a great deal of beating. We all admit that we can grow the finest grain and raise the best of stock. We all admit the vast potential wealth which we have in our minerals. We have a people with energy, perseverance and initiative second to none. We have huge manufacturing plants which have been bolstered up in legislative ways through a protective tariff. But, because of the large quantities we are turning out from our factories not being able to find a market,—under the present system,—in our own country, we are looking for a market abroad. But what is the present state of affairs? Our basic industry is in such a disastrous state that, with all the encouragement that people get to go on to the land, there is a steady drift going from the rural districts. An hon. member from this side of the House stated the other day that 113 people had left his little local town. Another one stated that fourteen families had left his particular district, and that not a single family had taken their place. This seems difficult to understand, when we consider the fact that in western Canada we have taken quantities of international prizes in the matter of grain and stock. The reason for this is not that the country is no good; it is not that the people are no good. The present state of affairs must be due to some other reason. We find Premier Bracken of Manitoba, stating the other day that in that province they have in arrears of taxes no less than $14,000,000, and this after a very successful crop. Word comes from Alberta that out of 80,000 farmers, 20,000 are insolvent, and I am told by members of this House that Saskatchewan is in a like plight. I do not know conditions so well in the East. We have been informed, during this session, of the large number of unemployed still in Canada, and one feels inclined to ask the reason why? It is just possible that we find one reason in the fact that we are carrying such a colossal debt. I found it rather interesting the other day to look up the indebtedness which the United States had when they had a population of some 30,000,000. If we compare that with our own nearly 9,000,000 people, and our national debt of some $2,500,000,000, we find that the United States, in the year 1860, with a population of 30,000,000, had a debt of only $65,000,000. Otherwise Canada, with one-third the population, has not less than thirty-eight times as much debt. That may be one of the reasons why conditions are bad in Canada. We are informed in the address by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) that the total production of this country was no less than $6,000,000,000 and the total consumption was some $2,000,000,000. These figures are confirmed by the Dominion Statistician. In the ordinary walks of life anyone would think they were very well off if they only spent one-third of their income, but Canada seems to be the reverse. Quoting again from the prominent banker in Canada, he says:

> Some people find it too easy to blame the war for all conditions, whereas the facts are that the banks could tell, if they would, that in some directions matters had assumed a very serious aspect, and a crisis which many expected was avoided by the conflict.

We all recognize something is wrong. Each member, in any part of the House, has his own opinion as to what should be done, and although we differ, in our opinions, there is no need for any enmity to be shown between any members, because I believe every member in this House is actuated by the very highest motives in bringing forward what he considers the best suggestions for a way out of this dilemma. The orthodox remedies for this condition are the three following: immigration, greater production and foreign markets. We have seen only too recently from various speakers that immigration has not increased population because of the emigration. We are not able to keep up our population. The matter of greater production is a false cry. All industrial countries have solved that problem long ago. It is not a question of greater production. It is a question of transportation and consumption. Look after the consumer and the producer will look after himself. As far as the foreign market goes, we have to realize that our foreign markets are the other people's home markets and their foreign markets are often our home markets. It is not a matter of finding foreign markets, but a matter of giving the people a purchasing power. All countries in my humble opinion should try and provide for their own needs first. How can a country buy foreign goods, if they cannot buy their own? As a proof that the question of production has been solved long ago, I might state that a fact has been mentioned by various eminent men, that the United States alone, if working at one hundred per cent capacity, could supply the needs of the whole world. The economists of Great Britain have often stated that ten per cent of the population of great Britain could supply her needs, if working at one hundred per cent efficiency. It is interest-

ing to note that with all the money the States has, with 52 per cent of the gold supply of the world that she is credited with, she is also on the horns of a dilemma in regard to this financial question. It is well
5. p.m. known that monopoly oppression produces discontent. I think it would be perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker, if I give to the House a resolution passed in my own constituency at a very representative convention. This resolution was passed unanimously:

> Whereas the Canadian Bank Act expires in 1923;
> And whereas money and credit are public utilities;
> And whereas in our platform we advocate public ownership of public utilities;
> Therefore, be it resolved that we urge our member to use his utmost endeavours to have the issue and control of money taken out of private hands and controlled in the interest of all the people.

I have made the statement that the matter of production has been solved. What is wrong is that we are producing too much for those who are able to buy. In my opinion the more machinery for production we invent the greater will be the number of unemployed under the present system. This statement may be considered rather rash, but I would like to verify it by an instance. Hon. members are well aware that we have thousands of people brought out to our western country every year for harvesting. Their main work is stooking. It is the hope of everybody who is grain farming that some day a stooking machine will be invented, and many people have used their intellect to try and invent such a machine. There is no doubt, in my opinion, that a machine will eventually be invented, and will be attached to the binder, and probably with an extra horse or two the stooking will be done without the aid of the stookers. When that time comes we shall not need those thousands of men to stook the western harvests. I only point this out to show that the matter of invention of productive machinery is liable to create unemployment. To back up my statement I am going to read a quotation from Mr. Arthur Kitson, manufacturer and authority on financial questions in England. He says:

> It is quite certain that the need for labour must become less and less with the growth of inventions and the increase in industrial efficiency. Indeed the real problem we have to solve is not so much that of finding constant employment for our people as our supplying them with life's necessities and comforts out of the abundance of goods created. Even to-day the labour of less than 10 per cent of the population will readily suffice to maintain the entire inhabitants of this country in a high state of comfort. Suppose discoveries and inventions during the next half-century result in the displacement of all manual labour by machinery, must the bulk of the world's inhabitants then perish?

[Mr. Spencer.]

Then, Sir Charles Sykes, a Yorkshire manufacturer, says:

> The problem of unemployment or its cause is not due to a defective system of production, but to a defective system of distribution.

The hon. member (Mr. Irvine) who introduced the resolution before the House dealt very well with the inability of the people to purchase because they had not the purchasing power. He said that in 1914 conditions were very bad although there was a surplus of goods the world over. The war came in 1914 and saved the situation because, when all is said and done, war is the greatest market and destroys the greatest number of goods in a given time. We are to-day getting back to where we were in the spring of 1914, but we are so much the worse off because we have a beggared Europe to sell our goods to. I cannot do better—to bring the subject of foreign markets before this House—than to quote from Mr. W. Bell, an associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects, in an address delivered by him before the Rotary Club of Wakefield, England. He says:

> But the reason for this persistent desire to concentrate attention on the foreign markets is not far to seek. For so long as credit is controlled by private individuals for personal profit, instead of by the community, for the public good of the home consumer, so long must the financier look to foreign markets for an outlet for the goods the manufacture of which he controls.
>
> Unless some scientific scheme of credit reform be adopted, whereby credit shall be taken out of private hands and restored to its rightful owners, the community, there can be no permanent return even to the 1914 conditions. Indeed, the more unemployment increases, the sooner the next war will be upon us; and until the root—credit—of the industrial problem is tackled, the great industrial people will flounder out of one war into another, with ever increasing velocity.

Before I conclude I might refer to an incident that took place in western Canada a short time ago. One of the western members was speaking before a certain club on the matter of credit, and in conversation with him a few days afterwards a banker said, "What surprised me was the fact that you dared". I can only say that any member who knows of an injustice and does not dare to speak out in the proper place has no right on the floor of this House. I have spoken in support of the resolution, but I realize that as the Bank Act is coming up for revision this session, it might, in the opinion of probably the majority of hon. members, be but proper for an amendment to be moved. Having regard to this fact, I therefore beg to move the following amendment:

> That the resolution be amended by adding the following words:

"And that the bank charters be extended for twelve months subject to such amendments to the Bank Act as may be passed during this session, but that the final revision of the Bank Act be reserved until after the report of any committee that may be appointed under this resolution".

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): I find myself in the delightful position of being able to rise in support of the principle of the resolution. I am not certain that I can go so far as to say that I will support all the arguments brought forward in behalf of the motion. I must confess that my ignorance of this subject is most appalling. But I am somewhat consoled by the fact that in looking over the House, as the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) was speaking, I saw that the great majority of hon. members were also evidently unable to follow him throughout the ramifications of his argument. I felt therefore that I was not alone in that unhappy position. There are two classes of speakers, one like the hon. member for Calgary East, who can soar on eagle wings and take a bird's eye view of conditions throughout the world; and the other—with which class I am afraid I must associate myself—who resemble the badger, not because the badger is a particularly useful animal, but because he is of the short-legged type and keeps close to the ground. And I understand, from some writings of Sir Clifford Sifton, that that is the desirable type of immigrant for the west country. As this subject deals with a matter which after all has its foundations on solid ground, perhaps it is as well to speak of it from that point of view.

I do not think that anyone in this House underestimates the immense importance of the subject of credit, because it is upon credit that all our business institutions are built. It is through credit that our whole industrial life is carried on; and by industrial life I mean all forms of useful activity, including the basic industries, such as agriculture, farming, forestry, etc., and the secondary industries built upon those. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that credit supplies the life-blood to these industries, and upon the proper distribution and functioning of that credit depends their success. As has been said, we have gone far past the stage when commerce was simply an exchange of one commodity for another, and we must recognize that fact and forget about that ancient system. At the present time all industries depend for their successful and satisfactory operation upon a proper system of credit.

As I have already humbly confessed, I am somewhat ignorant of the functions of the control of credit. But I am called upon, in common with all other hon. members of this House, to raise my voice for legislation which shall control this credit. And I have the old-fashioned idea that I would prefer to know something about the subject before either speaking upon it or voting for or against it. I like to be sure of my ground and know what I am doing, because I do not believe there is any more dangerous animal at large than the man who will blindly vote for something which he does not in the least comprehend. That is my position at the present time with regard to the Bank Act and the great issues connected therewith. I came down here looking for knowledge. I realized in coming here that I was coming to school, and it was impossible, by reason of the environment surrounding me in my youth, for me to understand one-tenth of the important questions which I must assist in solving and for which I am, to the extent of my vote, responsible.

During this session I endeavoured to confer with other men who, I thought, would know more about the subject, and again I found very few had given it serious thought, and those who had confessed their inability to solve the problem and admitted their lack of information. I think every hon. member will agree that I am not overstating the case. That being so, what could be more logical and more sensible than in some way to provide the information necessary before we deal finally with the subject itself?

Now, as I stated before, my connection with the ground has been very close, and I shall in a very few words deal with the point of view of the ground worker—the agriculturist—and confine myself to one phase of this vast subject. I am led to do that partly from the fact that it is amongst our agriculturists that the greatest discontent now prevails As I understand from conversations with hon. gentlemen in other lines of industry, they are pretty well satisfied in many respects with the present system. Well, I am not going to attempt to decry any system which satisfies a large class of our community, and if our present system suits their needs I am perfectly well content that it should continue. But I contend, Mr. Speaker, that this system is in its essence a commercial system and is not suited in the fullest degree to the industry of agriculture.

What is the condition of agriculture at the present time from the credit point of view? I am not going to be led into a long review of this subject. We have been accused many times in this House of painting a somewhat too gloomy picture of agricultural conditions in the West. Perhaps we have. But after all, hon. members must bear in mind that we have

come directly from those conditions and have for many years been subject to them. We believe the statements we make are absolutely true, for they are borne out by the facts as we know them where we live, and consequently we would be derelict in our duty if we did not try to lay before the House the true facts regarding a large and important part of Canada. I believe that one of the most unfortunate conditions in this House is that we know so little concerning one another. In the West we know little about the people in the East, we know little about those who are engaged in farm and industrial activities, and they know about as little regarding ourselves. If we could have a true picture drawn of conditions in every part of the country, drawn by those who live there, I believe we could understand those various conditions and deal intelligently with them, and in that way discharge a very important function of parliament. I believe that the fuller and truer knowledge would lead to a greater sympathy, not only of industrial and commercial men for farmers, but of farmers for industrial and commercial men, and of farmers in one line of agriculture with farmers in other lines. From that greater sympathy might spring a spirit of co-operation without which we cannot hope that Canada ever will become the country she should become with her great natural endowments. With that end in view I should like to portray credit conditions as I have seen them in western Canada.

We have spoken in this House of the excessive cost of production being one of what we might term the greatest menaces with which agriculture is faced to-day, due to the fact that we have to sell our products in competition with the world, and that our whole salvation lies in lowering this excessive cost, a very important element of which at the present time is the cost of the credit we have to use in production. There are other elements which will have to be treated in due time. Throughout my district, perhaps one of the best in Alberta, we have suffered least from depression, from the very fact that long before the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) took office we followed his advice and adopted mixed farming, thus escaping those periods of deflation and expansion to which our wheat growing districts have been subject. We have been producing various products that we could sell every year, and therefore conditions there are not so deplorable as they are in some other parts. But even there we find the debt of our farmers has grown to very large proportions.

It may be said, and I think with justice, that the farmers themselves are to a large extent responsible for that condition. I am not going to shirk that question. We have been through the optimistic boom years which preceded the post-war deflation, and naturally we were tempted into extravagant expenditures. But what other industries were exempt? We were tempted perhaps to buy beyond our means, as were those engaged in other industries. But the fact remains that we now have to bear the burden of that debt. In spite of what has been said there are very few farmers throughout the country who wish to shirk the responsibility of paying their just debts; but unfortunately there are some who feel that no matter how prosperous conditions may become again they will never be able to pay off their indebtedness. Tied hand and foot as they are financially, no matter whether their unfortunate condition be attributable to their own fault or to circumstances over which they have no control, when they fail to see the slightest gleam of hope in the future and are inclined to leave the country which they feel has not been just to them, we cannot altogether blame them. But the great majority of our farmers have sufficient faith in the productive ability of our country that, given a fair chance, they are determined to pay their debts. The question is, can they do it? And that brings me to my next point.

As I have stated, one of the main reasons for our excessive cost of production is our over-burden of debt. But is there any way of getting out of debt? I believe it is well worth the time of this House to consider if there is not some better method of financing our agriculturists and so enable them to carry on and produce. This is not only a plea for our farmers, it is a plea for the whole country, for I believe that our people are gradually beginning to realize that upon agriculture our national prosperity depends to a large extent. Recently I read a very well written paragraph in a book entitled "The Federal Farm Loan System in Operation". It is the work of Mr. A. C. Wiprud, and he epitomizes my argument so much better than I can hope to do it myself that I shall quote his words. He says:

> The present importance of agriculture to civilization lies in the number of people it supports; its ultimate importance lies in the fact that it must continue to provide supplies for an ever-increasing population. The problems of our agricultural industry concern every member of society, and it behooves us to give them our earnest consideration.

It is from that point of view I desire to speak of the problem as a national problem. Since I came to this country thirty years ago as a boy from the Old Land and since becoming a member of this House, it has been my ex-

perience that agriculture has been largely neglected. I am not blaming hon. gentlemen over much for that neglect, for the importance of agriculture has never been sufficiently realized, and it is only of late years since our economic foundation has begun to crumble that the secondary industries based on that foundation are becoming aware of their danger and of the intimate connection that exists, and must exist, between those industries. We have gone on year by year building up the superstructure of our industrial life by taking stone after stone from the foundation, until now our tall chimneys are beginning to rock and it is realized that if the foundation fails the superstructure must fail too. This neglect has not been confined to our own country. Let me just read what Mr. McAdoo says—and I think he will be recognized as a fairly good financial authority throughout this or any other country. He says:

> It is a strange thing that throughout American history so little constructive and comprehensive work has been done to conserve the agricultural industry of the country. This industry is absolutely vital to the existence and prosperity of the people. Farmers as a class—

Mark this, because he expresses my thought in far better words than I myself can command.

> —do not want superior advantages or benefits conferred upon them by legislation. They do want equal opportunity, and to get that equal opportunity they must have sufficient credit facilities at all times, and they must be available to them on as reasonable terms and at as low rates of interest as are allowed to our business men and manufacturers, due regard being had, of course, to the security offered and to the conditions applicable to each. In other words, agricultural credit should be as available as commercial credit, and upon equally favourable terms all things considered.

Now, I am speaking very briefly, because I recognize that the subject may become wearisome to some hon. members, and I realize also that time is passing. However, I will endeavour to show why the present system has not been thoroughly satisfactory from the point of view of agriculture. You will understand that I am not at this time attacking our present banking system, because I have not in my own mind a satisfactory system which can take its place. That is one point upon which I wish to have additional information, and it is another reason for the formation of a committee of inquiry. I do not believe, however, that we can have a system which will be not antagonistic but supplementary to our present banking system and will make it more adequate to agricultural needs.

What are the facts? The facts are—and I think I am stating them fairly—that owing to the nature of the funds at the disposal of our banks, funds which are liable to be called upon at almost a moment's notice, they cannot and should not, in justice to their depositors, let any large portion of those funds out on any long-term credits. I think that can be taken as a statement of incontrovertible fact. But due to the nature of agriculture, due to the fact that the turnover of the farmer is very slow, short-term credits are not suitable to his purposes. When the farmer borrows money on what may be a twelve months turnover in the case of grain or a three years turnover in the case of cattle, a loan for a period of three months is useless unless it is renewed from time to time, with consequent accumulation of interest. Now, that is the unsatisfactory part. Any farmer whose business is on a proper basis is willing to pay fair interest on proper terms for the credit he receives—credit which at the present time is simply the savings of the people. But the banks, I contend, are not in a position under their present system to extend credit on such terms that it is of value to us. It is a most peculiar thing that when one thinks along certain lines he almost invariably finds that someone else has also been thinking along that line and has expressed the view more concisely and in better language than you can yourself. This is what the authority that I have been quoting says on this subject:

> In considering what constitutes the source of money supply, we should, of course, direct our attention to the commercial banks, for it is to them that a large part of the money of the nation is intrusted. The cash deposits which they receive, and which are the basis of their loans, they must at all times be prepared to restore either on demand or within a comparatively short time. For this reason they cannot properly invest in other than short-term mortgages or thirty to ninety days' personal credits. In other words, deposits must be invested so that a steady stream of payments is flowing into the banks, giving them a chance to expand or contract their loans in response to the rise and fall in the supply of deposits.

In ordinary commerce, as I understand it—and I admit that my knowledge is limited—the turnover is comparatively rapid, and a credit of from three to six months is usually sufficient to cover ordinary commercial transactions. But that is not the case with agriculture, because the present financial system has failed as a system of credit so far as its application to agriculture is concerned. This situation has been recognized, I think, in all civilized countries. It was recognized in the United States; it has been recognized in Europe.

I am not going to speak of Europe, because the conditions of farming there are not applicable to our conditions here. A different style of farming is carried on; the sizes of the farms are different; there are different marketing conditions, different transportation problems—everything is different. But I think it is fair to regard as analogous the con-

ditions in the United States, where the farming carried on is very similar to that which is carried on in this county. In 1732 an attempt was made in the state of Connecticut to finance agriculture on terms that could be obtained from ordinary commercial banks, but the attempt failed. A few men got together and tried to establish a species of farmers' bank, but that attempt also was a failure, largely through the antagonistic attitude adopted by the government of the then colony, and the matter was allowed to rest. But as time went on it became more and more evident to the statesmen of that country that if they were to save their agriculture an adequate supply of credit would have to be supplied on reasonable terms.

In March, 1912, President Wilson instructed the embassies and legations of the United States in Europe to inquire into the systems as applied in different European countries, and their replies contained information of such importance that in 1913 a United States commission was appointed and sent through the countries of Europe to investigate the systems in force there. But more than that was done; the conditions pertaining to agriculture in their own country were inquired into, the farmers being heard in different places with a view of ascertaining what their credit needs were and how far the then existing system of finance supplied those needs. They also investigated the methods of the banks themselves to see how far those institutions could supply the necessary funds for agriculture. I may say that associated with that commission were a number of provincial representatives from Canada, who accompanied them and studied the conditions with them.

As a result of that investigation, in 1916, an act was passed in the United States Congress known as the Federal Farm Loan Act. I shall not go into the details of the workings of that act; the point I wish to make is that conditions were found to prevail in that country such as we find to prevail in Canada to-day; that active steps were taken to inquire into those conditions and into possible remedies; that when remedies were found they were adopted and applied. They built up a system of co-operation from the bottom, culminating, through the twelve federal banks, into a farm loan board—a system of co-operation backed in the first instance by the government itself. They took the ground we have taken right along: that the matter had ceased to be a purely agricultural matter; that it was of interest to the country as a whole that agriculture should prosper and should be able to carry on in the best possible manner; that it was a national problem that would have to be solved in a national way.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Attempts were made in Canada, with varying success, to establish provincial associations or organizations with somewhat similar ends in view. I say, with varying success, because in some provinces the attempt was successful, and in others not so much so. However, the experience derived from the efforts made in that direction points to the fact that this is a national problem rather than a provincial one and should be approached from the national point of view.

The Farm Loan Board have loaned out a great deal of money to the farmers, very largely by selling bonds, and the work has being exceedingly successful. It has assisted in the upbuilding of a great many successful and prosperous agricultural communities where before the men were, as we are in the West at the present time, discouraged and downhearted. The Farm Loan Board provided for a term of credit of about thirty-five years on the amortization plan. But this was not found to wholly fill the bill; it did not meet the situation fully, so they are bringing forward another suggestion for filling the gap between this thirty-five year term and the short term credit given by the banks with farm credits which will run from six months to five years.

It has been said, and there is a great deal of weight to be attached to the view, that we are suffering, not from a lack of credit, but from too much credit in the past, and that what we should do is to pay our debts and not be looking for further credit to be advanced to us. But one of the chief reasons for the establishment of a better system of credit amongst the farmers is to enable them to pay off their existing debts on better terms. I repeat, that is one of the chief reasons why we want a better system of credit established. It is not so much for the expansion of credit so that the farmer may purchase more land, more live stock, more machinery; we have been through that and a lot of us have learned our lesson, but it is to enable us to pay off the present encumbrances laid upon us in a better way as they become due. That is just what they do in the United States. I looked over the percentage of money borrowed in that way that was applied to different objects, and I found that thirteen per cent of the money borrowed was applied to the purchase of more land, nine per cent to buildings and improvements, two per cent to the purchase of implements and equipment, three per cent for live stock, and sixty-eight per cent for the liquidation of present indebted-

ness, and I contend that that is largely what would happen if we could establish a system along similar lines in this country. A large portion of the credit would be devoted to the object of liquidating our present encumbrances. And what would that mean? It would mean that instead of being antagonistic to the present banking system, the scheme would be of the greatest help to the banks because it would mean more money in circulation, and that people, being able to pay their debts as they became due, without pressure, would be able to buy the things they require, and industry, which is now at a standstill more or less, would begin to move again.

I am making no plea that this is a universal panacea, that this by itself will place the western provinces or the agricultural industry in Canada on a proper footing. But I do claim that this is one of the ways in which the subject might be approached. It would be one of the remedies which taken together with other remedies would put us on a proper footing and enable us to play our part worthily in the shipbuilding of our nation. For that reason I would not have moved this as a resolution for the government to establish such a system. That is not my purpose at all, but I do think it is worthy of consideration as to whether we should not inquire into the possibilities of this or other methods of finance. That, I believe, is worthy of the government's consideration. If that is a practical suggestion—and it has precedent behind it, it has proved successful in other countries, then I think it is well worth the while of the government of this country to make inquiry as to how far it might be adapted to our needs here. I think that is a very fair request.

As the time is getting on, I have no intention of developing this argument further. I knew when I started I had no great contribution to make to this debate. I simply wish to throw out a suggestion which might be taken in conjunction with the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Calgary East (Mr. Irvine). I find a good deal of merit in what he said, even though I cannot understand all of it. I think his statement of conditions was a fair statement, not overdrawn. His ideas of a remedy may not coincide with the ideas prevailing in this House, may not coincide altogether with the ideas in my own mind, but the resolution itself and the principle underlying it, that of obtaining information to enable us to deal intelligently with one of the most important subjects in this country, that resolution and that principle is worthy, I think, of the consideration of any body of men.

In conclusion, I would like to say this. The farmers of this country, as I have endeavoured to point out, are not looking to the government for something for nothing. They are not looking for some special benefit which will accrue to them at the expense of the rest of the community. As far as I am concerned I would not stand for that one moment, and as far as the men who sent me here are concerned, that is far from their ideas because it has been expressed again and again. The only thing that has been urged on me by my constituents when coming here was this, that I would study conditions as I found them according to the opportunities afforded me in this House, and founding my opinion upon those conditions, speak and vote for what I believed to be for the benefit of the country as a whole, for the building up of a united and prosperous Canada. That is what they sent me here for, and that is my endeavour in this House. I believe this question of credit is one which if not at this session, at some future session will have to be most carefully studied. The time will come when its importance will be recognized on all sides of the House so that when the subject is announced for debate, the benches, instead of emptying, will fill, because we will know that it will mean a discussion of one of the greatest problems of this or any other country. I think it is reasonable, I think it is sane, that all of us should do what we can to understand conditions as they exist now throughout this country, as we do not understand them at the present time, and to understand the remedies provided in other countries, as we do not understand them at the present time, and to use the best judgment that we unitedly have to solve a problem which is advisedly one of the greatest problems of our age.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the debate proceeds any further on this motion, I am obliged to say that in my opinion the amendment is not properly drafted, and is not relevant to the main motion. The main motion has for its object the investigation of the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems. That is the one set principle in the main motion, and the amendment should be consistent with the principle involved in the main motion. What does the amendment state? First, that the bank charters be extended for twelve months subject to such amendments of the Bank Act as may be passed during the session. Now there is nothing in this which is relevant to the

main motion. The second part of the amendment, which recommends that the final revision of the Bank Act be reserved till after the report of any committee that may be appointed under this resolution, is perhaps a little more relevant to the main motion, but it does not come at its proper time. If this main motion should be adopted by the House, a parliamentary committee would be appointed, and then instructions could be given to that committee to the effect that the final revision of the Bank Act should be reserved until after its report. But, as the amendment is drafted here, it is, in my humble judgment, totally inconsistent with the principle involved in the main motion. Let me on this point read what Bourinot, in his fourth edition at page 321, says:

> It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment has been proposed, and this rule has been invariably insisted upon by Canadian speakers.

Bourinot states that the English speakers have also finally adopted that rule, which was followed more closely by Canadian speakers. He goes on to say:

> It is not, therefore, surprising that the latest English decisions are in accord with those of the Canadian speakers. Sir Erskine May—

That great authority.

> —in later editions, however, lays it down "an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed."

In the present instance, I consider that the principle involved in the amendment is foreign to the principle involved in the main motion. There is only one exception to this rule. It is on the motion to go into Supply or Ways and Means where the policy of the government may be challenged. This is the only case in which there can be exceptions to the rule which I have just cited, and which is the rule recognized by all parliamentary authorities. I would, therefore, rule that this amendment is out of order and that the debate shall proceed on the main motion without any further consideration of the amendment. Of course, this does not prevent any other amendment being moved, but the present one is ruled out of order.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have had a very interesting discussion of a very important question. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing or discussing any of the views that have been presented by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) who moved the resolution, the hon member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) who seconded it, and the hon member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) who has supported it in such moderate and eloquent terms. What I want to suggest is that no good purpose would be served by dividing the House upon it. No good purpose can be served by setting up another special committee for this purpose. It has been announced that, in not many days, a revision of the Bank Act will be submitted to the House, and while government bills are not always submitted to committees other than the Committee of the Whole, in this case, for good reasons, it is the intention of the government to submit the bill, as has been done on previous occasions, to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, with the fullest opportunity for considering every question that may be related to it. Almost every one of the questions that have been discussed this afternoon will arise in connection with the Bank Act, as indeed, most of the speakers have discussed the merits of the Bank Act, and, therefore, a special committee appointed to consider this matter would not, I think, serve a good purpose. There are times and occasions when special committees are proper, but I do not think it is wise to multiply them unless for strong and particular reasons.

If the hon. member for Calgary East should succeed in having his motion pass, what will be the situation? We shall have the Bank Act, as I said, before many days; it will go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that committee will be dealing with this very question from a practical standpoint. At the same time, there will be sitting in another room another committee dealing with all the theories that can be advanced on the same question. One is reminded of the small boy going to the circus where the performance takes place in two rings. He wants to watch both rings, and as a result, he comes away with a splitting headache. If we are to have two committees of this House running at the same time, dealing with the same thing, I am sure this will make for confusion.

I do not want to discuss the merits of the resolution. I know the importance of the question, especially as related to agriculture, as was stated by the hon. member for Red Deer. I believe, however, all these questions can be approached when the Bank Act is before the committee, and, therefore, I will earnestly ask my hon. friend not to insist in setting up a second committee. I am sure every object the hon. gentleman can have, can be covered by leaving the matter to come before the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to object at all

to anything the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said. I entirely agree with him that the only way we can make any useful progress in this important matter is to work all together at the same time. But I am not quite sure that everything comes within the scope of the Bank Act. To my mind, a very important question of this whole matter of credit is the one that has been chiefly touched upon by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman). I refer to that kind of credit which, as he himself has pointed out, cannot be given by banks in such a way that agriculturists can well take advantage of it. I do not know that my hon. friend will have that included in any section of the Bank Act. I would like this understanding of the House —and I am quite sure my hon. friend will give it—that outside of the question of the banks themselves, outside of the question of any particular section in the Bank Act or any subject covered by it, that committee may also consider this question of agricultural loans and the kind of institution to put up which would be best adapted to look after them. That is something that, if it is at all practicable, ought to be considered, whether it will be something along the line of the Italian system or the American system or what. I am quite sure that most of the hon. gentlemen would fall in with my hon. friend's suggestion as long as we have that understanding.

Mr. FIELDING: I can only say that so far as I have any opportunity of advising or assisting the Banking and Commerce Committee, my wish will be that they shall not be restricted, but shall give effect to a desire for a full discussion of the whole question. More than that, I cannot say, because the matter will be in the hands of that committee, but at all events, all practical questions involved in this resolution can be brought before the committee, and I feel that if another committee were appointed, confusion and delay would result.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps we can get to our point without any danger by simply referring this resolution to the Banking and Commerce Committee. That would cover everything.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know that there is any objection to the resolution being referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, if the hon. gentleman will be content with that. If this will express the wish of the House, I will readily move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Fielding, seconded by Mr. Graham, that the Committee on Banking and Commerce do investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

Mr. FIELDING: May I say that my motion is that the resolution of the hon. member be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, not with any special instructions, but for such action as they deem best?

Mr. SPEAKER: Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IRVINE: Have I the right to speak on the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member had adopted the reference to Committee on Banking and Commerce. However, if he wishes to speak, we will call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. IRVINE: Before replying, Mr. Speaker, I should like some information on one point. We could not hear the discussion that went on just before six o'clock and I am not quite sure now what is implied in the amendment, or whether it is indeed an amendment, that has been proposed. If I understand it, it is that the Committee on Banking and Commerce will be instructed by this House to act in the same capacity as a committee which might be appointed under this resolution. If that is correct, then I would acquiesce in that proposal; if not, the motion would have to come to a vote and there are a number of hon. gentlemen who wish to speak on the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amendment of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which, of course, would have full power to deal with this as with all other questions pertaining to the banking system. No particular instructions are given to that committee to deal with these matters; the power to consider them inheres in the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment reads:

That this motion be referred to the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. IRVINE: Then, Sir, there are other hon. gentlemen who wish to speak before I reply.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I wish that this point that has ben raised were cleared

up. I had intended to speak to the resolution, but if the purpose of the House is to refer this matter to the Committee on Banking and Commerce with instructions to investigate the subject under consideration to-day, then I think I could postpone anything I have to say until a later occasion. There seems to be, however, still some doubt, particularly since the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) has stated the purpose of the amendment. Personally, I would prefer to have that point cleared up before I speak.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot make it any clearer. The Committee on Banking and Commerce will have full power to deal with everything pertaining to the banking question, and hon. gentlemen will have full opportunity to place their views before that committee.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me that a difficulty arises in connection with that proposal. If this matter were referred to that committee they might simply decline to consider it, and so dispose of it in that way. I would be very much opposed to that sort of treatment because I regard this question as one of paramount importance. The so-called practical man is very fond of airily dismissing new ideas with a wave of the hand and the assertion that they are mere theories, fads, and so forth. Now, we cannot honestly dispose of matters in that way. History shows us that many, if not all, of our established beliefs and practices were at one time assailed on the ground that they were new ideas or mere fancies, and their advocates were very frequently treated not only with levity but with cruelty. It does not do to condemn any new idea merely because it is new or because it is unpopular. Are our conditions at the present time so satisfactory that we need to make no effort to remedy evils that are claimed to exist? Perhaps, for some, conditions are satisfactory. Some may be disposed to say, let well enough alone. I do not doubt that for some, at least, in this country life is easy and pleasant and that there are no very serious problems. But for many others, and for us collectively as a nation, it is not so. It is not so for the wage-earner who is out of a job and is enmeshed in the system as we have it. It is not so for the farmer who finds himself practically compelled to quit his business, to give up his home and to emigrate. It is not so for many of our people as individuals. And it certainly ought not to be so for us collectively. I take it that we here are supposed to consider the welfare of Canada, and I do not think that things are well enough to be let alone. Why, even such a staunch Conservative as Lord Milner, in a recent survey of social and industrial problems, is driven to a degree of radicalism that I think would astonish some hon. members on the government side, not to speak of those to my right. May I read one or two statements from Lord Milner's recent survey? He says in one place:

> The real gravamen of the charge against our present industrial system is not that it involves an unfair distribution of the product, but that it mismanages, misdirects and therefore unduly limits production itself.

Then further on he recalls that before the war there were eleven million people in England living on the verge of starvation. He says:

> It may be true that we do not produce sufficient to meet all their needs. But why don't we?

Speaking as to unemployment, he says:

> We settle down to tolerate it just as we do the vagaries of the weather, and wait until the malady reaches an acute stage, whereupon we get in a flurry and suddenly improvise committees to look out for a palliative. Would it not be better to try and strike at the root of the evil, or at any rate to discover it.

In another place he expresses the following opinion:

> The actual output of industry is far below what it ought to be, and the needs of the great body of the people remain unsatisfied, not because the means of satisfying them do not exist, but because they are not properly made use of. And they will never be properly made use of until the materials and instruments of production are controlled, if not actually owned, by independent and self-governing groups of producers, free to develop their several industries for their own benefit and that of the community, not for the advantage and under the dictation of persons who themselves take no part in the work.

And the Hon. Reginald McKenna, who certainly is not generally considered to be a radical, has recently discussed in a very illuminating way the whole problem of inflation and deflation as affecting British industry at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me again draw attention to the paradox, the anomaly, the tragedy of the present situation. We have abundant resources, we have abundant labour power, and we have abundant equipment—these I think, are world conditions, and they are certainly true of Canada—we have all the powers of nature and science at our disposal, and yet in spite of all these powers and resources we have want, unemployment and misery—a creeping paralysis extending over our industrial structure. Do we confess ourselves baffled by this enigma? Is that the position we wish to take in this House?

I should like to direct your attention also, Mr. Speaker, to the tragic consequences of

price changes as we have seen them operating during the last few years—the awful consequences of inflation and deflation. Is there no way of stabilizing the purchasing power of our money? This, I think, is a legitimate question, and a wider question perhaps than any that is likely to confront us in the revision of the Bank Act, but in my judgment, for the reasons already stated, it is the most important question of all. Do we want to confess ourselves baffled and beaten by that problem also and say "Let well enough alone"?

Then let us look at conditions as they exist in this country. Reference has already been made to the statement that Canada is an immigration sieve, and I believe statistics will prove it to be true. Reference has been made also to our tremendous national debt with its staggering interest charges.

Now, I ask another question: Has credit, as understood in the resolution, no connection at all with these strange enigmas and great problems? If it has even the slightest connection, do you not think we ought to know what that connection is, do you not think we ought to know the facts so that we may be able to devise suitable remedies? When the stress of war came and ordinary methods were found inadequate we devised extraordinary measures to deal with the situation. The need was realized very keenly, and that need was met. Such extraordinary measures were adpoted not only in Canada but in practically all the belligerent countries. Special financial methods were resorted to in order to deal with the needs that arose out of war conditions.

There was a need then, and it was met. But what about now? Is there no corresponding need? I do not say that the need is identical with that which existed during the war years, but I do say that it is a very similar need, and almost equally pressing. And is it not just possible that we might meet it now if we knew more about the basis, the function and the control of credit?

I do not see that it matters very much if in some respects international action should be necessary. Canada at all events could point the way, especially as we have now the germ of an international organization in the League of Nations, through which any fruitful and suggestive ideas might be explored and extended.

I ask again, what about our experts in political economy? Are these men of no value? Is it not possible that we may get some suggestions from them which may assist us in meeting the present need? And what of others not occupying professorial chairs in our seats of learning, but who have given intense and patient study to some of these problems, have written about them and discussed them on the public platform, are we to take no advantage of their studies? The need is great, and consequently many people have attempted to meet it by patient research, followed by suggestions and recommendations. Personally I do not know how much value there is in many of their opinions, but I think we ought to know if there is any, and it seems to me it would be well to bring some of these experts before us and get the benefit of their advice.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution states a real need. I have no objection to its being referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, providing that the committee is instructed to investigate this question. Otherwise I would be opposed to the resolution being so dealt with, because the committee might easily say, "We have enough to do without taking up this question; we will let it stand over for another year." I think we might have some expressions of opinion on a question of this importance from hon. members on the other side of the House and from those in the extreme corner opposite. So far in the course of this debate to-day contributions to it have been confined practically to members in this quarter of the Chamber. I repeat, I certainly would oppose the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Commerce unless it be accompanied by special instructions of the nature I have indicated.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I assure you that it is with some diffidence that I rise to address the House on this question at this time. I have anxiously watched hon. members on the other side to see if any of them would enter this debate and either help it along or try to retard it, and I have looked down here to my right, but there have not been more than five or six members present in that corner at any one time, so that my attention has not been very much diverted in that direction. I must confess I am astonished that there has been no utterance from hon. members opposite on this question. Both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) admit that the question is a vital one and that it requires investigation—but that is all. Do you not think that their attitude is a strong argument for the appointment of a special

committee? If it were for that reason only, I would support the resolution. The Committee on Banking and Commerce will have all its time occupied in dealing with the technical details of the Bank Act; there will be very little time to go into the various proposals now being put forward in every country in the world as a solution of the evils of the banking systems which have developed as parasitic growths on civilization.

May I ask the House to consider for a moment the question of credit itself—what real credit is as compared with financial credit. I will delay the House by reading a definition which will state the matter more concisely than any words of mine could:

> There are two kinds of credit—real credit and financial credit. Real credit is concerned with the probability of the delivery of goods in their various forms; financial credit is concerned with the probability of the delivery of money in its various forms. If we say that real credit concerns the supply of goods while financial credit concerns the supply of money, the distinction may be a little clearer. Real credit is not measured by the actual supply of goods, but by their potential supply. The measure of real credit is, in fact, the correct estimate of ability to produce and deliver goods as and when and where required. A machine has real credit to the amount of the correct estimate formed of its ability to produce goods in demand; so, too, has an industrial plant, an organization of personnel, and, finally, a whole nation. A nation's real credit is the correct estimate of its ability to produce and deliver goods as and when and where required by the potential consumer.

Let us glance for a moment, having decided upon that definition, at the real credit of Canada and see just where we stand. A statement of the aggregate value of the great manufacturing plants, the farms, the mines, the forests, the fisheries, all that potential wealth that lies awaiting a flow of credit for its development, will give us some estimate of the actual credit of Canada. Some little time ago I secured from the Dominion Statistician an estimate of Canada's real wealth. The figure for 1921 was stated to be $17,215,205,639—seventeen and a quarter billions of dollars as the estimate of wealth of Canada, made up of farm values, mines, forests and fisheries, steam and electric railways, canals, shipping, telegraphs and telephones, and all those things that are regarded as being a part of the real credit of a nation. I quote further from this statement respecting the definition of credit:

> It will be seen from this definition that real credit depends upon two factors, on ability to produce and a need to be satisfied. Either is useless without the other; for the producer of goods that nobody wants is of no more value than a potential consumer of what is not produced. The consumer, in other words, is quite as necessary to the production of real credit as the producer, the real credit being their joint and common creation. Not only, however, is the consumer as such a necessary factor in the production of real credit, but the community at large is even more indispensable. Economically regarded, a nation is an association of people engaged in the production of real credit, and in this sense the state, as the custodian of the real credit of the community, may be said to represent the interests of producer and consumer equally, since both are equally necessary to the creation of real credit. Since, however, producers and consumers between them make up the whole community, we may conclude that real credit has its origin in society; that it belongs neither to the producer nor to the consumer, but to their common element, the community, of which they each form a part.

Is it not a pity that we should look complacently upon the growth in this country, as in other countries, of a monopoly controlling that which is admittedly the common property of the community? Yet that is exactly what most people are doing to-day, and that is why we who see in this an evil want this investigation. May I, in this connection, cite an article which quotes the words of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, leader of the Labour party in the British House of Commons, who, speaking in that assembly not long ago, said:

> The war, for whatever purpose it may have been fought, has left mankind at the mercy of material wealth and the financial machine. Every government is at their mercy. They alone hold the power of making "direct action" effective. A meeting of half a dozen men in the city can thwart any parliamentary majority. Our communal life depends more and more on the goodwill and self-interest of a group that could hold an executive meeting on the back seat of a Rolls-Royce car.
>
> As a result of the domination of this financial machine, governments in the great countries of the world appear to be helpless to aid the great mass of the people to a proper standard of existence.

The hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) who introduced this resolution; the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) and the others who have spoken on this question, specifically referred to the depression prevailing througout Canada to-day—not agricultural depression alone, not depression in retail business, but depression in every industry, in every occupation, except the banking business and the mortgage and trust fund business. The latter are still prosperous and healthy; they still issue substantial dividends, while almost every other industry is in a condition of collapse. Let us look for a moment at the number of bankruptcies that have occurred in Canada during the last three years. According to Dun's records, the figures are as follows: 1920, 1,078; 1921, 2,451; 1922, 3,695—an enormous total in a land of unlimited resources, a land whose people are willing workers, a land as the hon. member for Calgary East points out which offers every possible stimulus to progress. Yet, as we see, we have that monopoly. Last year when Canada wanted some money

what did we do? We went over to the United States and arranged through the J. P. Morgan Company a loan of $100,000,000 and we got $97,500,000 for it, at 5 per cent.

The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) has dealt with the outcome of that, but let us look at just what it means. The ex-Minister of Finance, speaking in this House shortly after the war, declared that it was greatly to Canada's credit and to her pride that she owed the larger part of her national debt to her own citizens; yet year after year we are virtually handing that national debt over to the United States. This administration is doing the very thing which, at any rate according to the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Finance, is the wrong thing to do. What do we find? Last year $100,000,000 was borrowed there, and probably this year the Minister of Finanee will borrow some more, and in 1924 borrow some more again, and so on. Now, in 1933, $483,081,000 comes due. Are we going to borrow that also in the United States? In 1934 we will have to raise $488,-360,000. Are we going to raise that there too? After all, what do we get for it? All we get is Canada's credit back again. We pledge our credit to the United States financiers; we pledge our ability to produce and deliver goods, and we pay them the enormous sum in thirty years of $150,000,000 for the use of $97,500,000 of our own credit.

Have we looked at it from this point of view? The soldiers who went overseas were paid. They fought for freedom in Europe, and came back here and are taxed along with the rest of the people to pay the cost of the war. The workers in this country who produced the goods that enabled the war to be prosecuted to a successful conclusion were all paid, every one of them was paid in full, and yet we owe them money. Everybody that did work during the war was paid in full, yet we owe them money. We are told by the Minister of Finance that we owe the national debt to ourselves. Well, I wish I had some of it coming to me, but unfortunately there is none that I know of. There is one question I would like to put directly to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and also the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton): Why is it not possible to sell our own credit to ourselves? Why must we go to foreign countries to sell it? Why must we pledge it away and pay interest in the form of goods that flow from us continually?—for that is the only form in which it can be paid. Why are we so fearsome of touching this question of credit? What is the reason for the silence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it because they are afraid to touch it? I cannot attribute it to the fact that they do not know anything about the question, because many of them are surely interested in it and have read something about it. I cannot for the life of me see why they are afraid of it. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) quoted a very eminent Conservative in regard to this question, and I would also like to quote another, Sir Alfred Mond, who speaking in the British House of Commons—and by the way he was formerly chairman of the Free Trade Union—said:

> Our national credit ought to be used more boldly. We can materially help the situation by pledging credit to the extent of £100,000,000 sterling." According to the report Mr. Lloyd George constantly nodded approval during Sir Alfred's speech.

Why are we then so fearsome of touching this question? Is it because, as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald suggested, governments are afraid of the power of the financial interests, afraid to come out and say "These things are wrong and need a remedy, and we must investigate." If there is one thing that requires investigation in Canada to-day more than anything else, and for the investigation of which the people are steadily increasing their demands, it is this question of the basis and function of credit.

I do not think I need go further into this matter. I had thought of saying something with regard to the gold standard and the remarks of some speakers upon this question, particularly of Sir Herbert Hambling. I would recommend to the attention of hon. gentlemen who are interested in this question, a speech he made recently in London, England, before the Y.M.C.A., dealing with the possibility of devaluation, which meant, in other words, inflation. His whole speech led me to the conclusion that he was absolutely opposed to any further deflation of the currency in England, and he gave his reasons for it.

In conclusion, I say that we have a reason for demanding an investigation into this subject. In all countries there is a demand for such an investigation, and not only a demand for an investigation, but innumerable proposals are being put forward and receiving hearty support from large bodies of citizens, such as the proposal put forward by Mr. Bevington in Alberta, who suggests a federal rediscounting department at Ottawa with provincial banks in each province, the rediscounting department to take the bonds and issue therefor notes and other currency. Then we have Major Douglas' proposals in England dealing with the whole question of credit itself, and suggesting that there should be an

issue of credit based on the potential capacity of the country to produce and deliver goods, that the credit should be controlled by industrial banks applying to the particular industries concerned. Then we have advocated in Nova Scotia the decentralization of the banks and the increasing of their capitalization to meet the necessity of this country for currency. We have the Australian Commonwealth bank favoured and supported by a large number of people in this country. We have the United States system of banking, with decentralization, doing away with the big monopoly, and having a string of small banks all over the country. In view of all these proposals and the support they are receiving, does not the House think the time has come for a full and impartial investigation? No banking committee would have time to go into the question of credit; that is utterly out of the question, and the Minister of Finance knows that, I am sure. What we do require is a special committee appointed for the purpose, and if it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to give that committee permission to sit through the whole year, we should do so, because no committee can sift all these proposals in a few months and arrive at a conclusion. What we want is a committee which would sit a whole year, or longer, if necessary, until a solution has been found.

Mr. IRVINE: It has struck me as singular that not one member has advanced an argument in opposition to my argument for an investigation of the credit system. It is also very singular that hon. gentlemen opposite have been silent on the matter entirely. When I compare the enthusiasm with which they discussed patronage, a paltry question, almost unworthy of being discussed on the floor of the House, with the interest they display on the great question of credit and finance, admitted by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to be great and important, it will appear that the silence is not complimentary to hon. members on the government side of the House.

The hon. Minister of Finance offered the following objections. He said that no good purpose could be served by bringing this thing up at this time. I should like to know when the proper time is to bring anything in here. No matter when a resolution comes from this side of the House and no matter what is proposed, the objection always is that it is the wrong time, some other time would be better. The plea of the government always is, we might possibly on some other occasion consider it, but we must not consider now. That is becoming rather a popular though tiresome objection to proposals.

Another of his objections was that no good purpose could be gained by dividing the House. I am not anxious to divide the House. I hope the House will be unanimous in supporting this resolution.

His next objection was that a special committee would not be required seeing that there is a banking committee. The Minister of Finance knows very well that the purpose for which the banking committee exists is to deal with legislation. They will be dealing with bills, and it will take them practically all session to deal with the Bank Act revision, which is a gigantic task. The Minister of Finance knows very well that there is a distinction between the work of an investigational committee such as we desire, and the work of a select standing committee We want a committee to investigate the basis, and the function of credit and the relation of credit to the industrial paralysis that obtains in Canada at the present time. But if this parliament will instruct the select standing Committee on Banking and Commerce to act in the same capacity as the committee that we are advocating the appointment of, then there will be no objection. I believe, however, to refer this resolution to that committee in the manner proposed by the amendment is, not only not giving the resolution a decent burial, but digging a little hole for it and packing it in. If we are going to bury it, let us bury it properly, with that pomp which becomes this House.

In conclusion, let me point out what this parliament has admitted by its silence. If I may assume that silence gives consent, then hon. members of the government side have admitted that our industrial conditions are due directly to the lack of financial credit; that Canada can use her own credit if she so desires, without going to the United States to borrow it; that those who control finances do control governments and the policies of industry; that money is not performing the original function for which it was designed; that the financial system is in danger of collapse; that a fundamental change in our credit system is required, and that there is a great need for more information. Only, they have said: "This is not the time to get information; this is not the time for the financial system to collapse. We will ask it to collapse when we are ready for that; we will not bother about its collapsing just now. This is not the time for us to inquire into the functions of a thing that is not functioning." They have also said that this is not the time to do all the other things that they

have silently admitted to be facts. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) answers all these arguments with a little circus story; but if that little circus story in the mouth of the Minister of Finance, speaking for the government, be a sufficient answer for this government to my argument, it is not a good enough answer for me.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that this question should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce seems to me, not only reasonable, but very practical. The hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) has introduced a resolution which, all will admit, has a relation to the banking and credit of this country. Let us not forget that the Committee on Banking and Commerce is a committee of this House and a committee representing, not only supporters of the government, but all groups in this House. It is interesting to note that my hon. friend who moved the resolution is himself a member of the Banking and Commerce Committee, and that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) are also members of the Banking and Commerce Committee. In short, nineteen or twenty members of the group opposite who are supporting this resolution are members of the Banking and Commerce Committee. Therefore, when the Minister of Finance suggested that we should refer this matter to the Banking and Commerce Committee, he did so with the idea, not of burying it, but of getting the best information possible before the committee specially selected under our constitution to deal with this matter. Let us assume, for a moment, that the government would accept the idea of the hon. member who moved this resolution. What would that mean? It would mean that we would be referring the question to another committee that might possibly keep the hon. member for Calgary East busy at a time when he should be before the Banking and Commerce Committee bringing out the information which members of this House all desire. Therefore, the suggestion of the Minister of Finance is with the idea, not of burying this resolution, but of getting more information and bringing it before the Banking and Commerce Committee, so that the House may be in a position to deal intelligently with the matter. If the Banking and Commerce Committee reports that it is not satisfactory, then hon. gentlemen opposite will have an opportunity to debate the question when the report of that committee is taken into consideration. The government have but one desire, and that is to obtain the fullest information possible, so that Canada may deal intelligently with her banking and commerce laws as presented to parliament this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Irvine moves, seconded by Mr. Good:

That, in the opinion of this House, a representative Parliamentary committee should be appointed to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

To this Mr. Fielding moves, seconded by Mr. Graham, in amendment:

That the words:

'a representative parliamentary committee should be appointed' should be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: 'the question of appointing a representative parliamentary committee'

And that the following words be added to the main motion:

'be referred to the standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.'

For the information of the House, I shall read the motion as it would stand, if amended:

That, in the opinion of this House, the question of appointing a representative parliamentary committee to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems, be referred to the standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

WEST UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie) moved:

Whereas Eastern Galicia and Northern Bukowina were constituted on November 9. 1918, as an independent state under the name of West Ukrainian Republic;

And whereas the integrity of this state is guaranteed by the League of Nations of which League Canada is a member; therefore be it resolved that this House urge upon the government the desirability of making representations through its accredited representatives, to the Councils of the League of Nations, the necessity of early, complete and final settlement of the Ukrainian question.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in presenting the case in support of the resolution before the House, perhaps it is essential that I should give a brief resume of the history of the Ukraine and of the Ukrainian people in order that we may arrive at a better understanding of the question. From the dawn of history, there has been a distinct Ukrainian race with a language of its own and possessing a literature that is a thousand years old. The early history of the Ukraine is one series of bloody wars with the Poles and Lithuanians on the west, the Muscovites on the north, and the Turks and Tartars on the east. These wars

gave rise to the organization of the renowned Cossacks or free warriors to defend the Ukraine against these invaders. Their early institutions appear to have been very democratic and their Hetman or President was elected by popular vote of the fighting men, and all authority lay in the hands of a general assembly whose decisions were enforced by elective officers.

In 1854, for mutual protection against the Poles on the one side and the Turks on the other, the independent Ukrainian state signed a Treaty of Union with Russia. This union gradually developed into subjugation of the state to Russia. The Cossacks were given many privileges, and became part of Russia's best fighting force. By a treaty with Poland, Russia conceded Galicia, the western part of the Ukraine, to Poland. On the dismemberment of the latter country in 1772 Galicia or west Ukraine became Austrian territory, and remained so unitl 1918. On the breaking up of that Empire, the members of the Austrian diet representing the eastern part of Galicia met and formed a national government and proclaimed the independent state of West Ukraine. This country has a population of about 6,000,000, seventy-four per cent of which is Ukrainian, about twelve per cent Poles, the balance German and Jews. It is a rich country with oil wells, forests and productive land.

Poland, remembering that this had been a part of her ancient kingdom, invaded the infant state in November 1918, and a bloody war ensued with varying success for several months. The Poles made insistent demands on the Allies for assistance in repelling the supposed Bolsheviks from East Galicia. Fearing the spread of the Bolshevik movement west, the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference consented to military occupation of the country by the Poles with the understanding that the right of self-determination was eventually to prevail. Later, the army commanded by General Haller was placed at the disposal of Poland. General Haller was a former Austrian officer and his army was composed of Poles recruited from the Allied armies, principally from the army of the United States. This army was well trained, equipped and provisioned and against it the poorly armed fighting force of the Ukrainian state made desperate but ineffectual resistance. Attacked by the Bolsheviki on the one side and by the Poles on the other, the greater part of the army was destroyed, the remnant taking refuge in Czecho-Slovakia. Since then Poland has been in control of the state and is using her military power to stamp out the national and intellectual life of the Ukrainian people. She has taken measures towards incorporating East Galicia into the Polish state. This action the people are fiercely resisting, and are daily coming into bloody conflict with the Polish officers. These conflicts are resulting in a destruction of life and property almost as bad as actual warfare. It is estimated that during the past season over $100,000,000 worth of grain and other farm produce has been destroyed by the peasants rather than have it confiscated by their oppressors. Some idea of the sufferings endured by the people of this little state may be understood from the fact that it is estimated that upwards of 100,000 of its soldiers and civilians have died in Polish prisons and detention camps. I have here a mass of evidence dealing with this, but it is too lengthy to give here. I will confine myself to a quotation, not from a Ukrainian but from a Polish paper. The "Robotnik" published in Warsaw in its issue of October 16, 1919, has this to say of the conditions accorded the Ukrainian prisoners in Polish prisons and detention camps:

> The conditions prevailing in the camps for war prisoners in Modlin and Brest are horrible. That at Brest is disgusting and a disgrace to the Polish State.

Then follows a long description of the living quarters and the conditions under which these men are obliged to live.

> Two months ago from 50 to 100 dead were daily taken out of this camp in which about 6,000 prisoners of war were confined. When the interned come out of the camp and stand in line to receive their rations—a veritable procession of death presents itself. All are famished and half frozen. They scramble and fight for the sparce food and the bits left over by the soldiers in the kitchen. They eat wild berries, and even grass.

Then follows a description of the rather brutal treatment meted out to the prisoners by the soldiers.

> In the night they shiver with cold, since they are covered only with rags. Once they tried to light a fire in the camp, but they were chased away by the soldiers with musket butts and the fire extinguished "for fear many might be suffocated by the smoke". They are so enfeebled that they are scarcely able to walk, and give this in excuse when commanded to a more rapid gait. For this they are treated with blows from the butts of muskets, the soldiers deal these out generously, because the "men will die anyhow".
>
> Some of them beg "make an end of it soldier, I have starved enough". In consequence of these blows many really died, they were too weak to stand them. A soldier from Posen goes about constantly with a stick, strikes at random, hitting a head here, a face there and so on; some have even had their eyes knocked out. In despair many have jumped into the river and were drowned, others cut their throats with their knives. Terrible!
>
> Some committees were sent there by the Polish Diet, matters were to be improved. Some of the evil-doers were arrested, and when for a second time enquiries were instituted, order was quickly established. Never-

theless these awful conditions continue and will grow still worse in the coming winter.

It is high time that the guilty be held responsible, it is time to expose this terrible state of affairs to the public.

By the Treaty of St. Germain September 10, 1919, Austria surrendered all interest in East Galicia in favour of the allied governments, who by thus accepting this territory from Austria have become responsible for its final disposal, and morally liable for the protection and welfare of its people. The Supreme Council on December 8th, 1919, drew up Poland's frontier known to-day as the Curzon line between Poland and East Galicia, confirming the fact that East Galicia is outside Polish territory. This is an indication that the action of Poland is illegal, unwarranted and immoral. In the Treaty of Sevres, June 10, 1920, East Galicia appears as a distinct contracting party, recognized as such by the representatives of the allied governments. Again in the Treaty of Spa, July 10, 1920, between Poland and the Allies, Poland stated implicitly that East Galicia was the property of the Allies and promised to evacuate the state on the demand of the allied governments. United States Secretary of State Colby, in a note of August 10, 1920, to the Italian Ambassador and in a statement to the press on October 10, 1920, stated emphatically that Poland must be an ethnographic state and that she must accept the Curzon line as her extreme eastern boundary. He also declared that the government of the United States advised Poland to withdraw her forces from all territory lying to the east of the Curzon line. On this occasion Mr. Colby made mention of East Galicia. He expressed his regret over the fact that Poland led by Imperialism, occupied Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, in the same arbitrary and lawless manner in which she prevously had occupied East Galicia. On December 15, 1920 the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Society of London passed a resolution calling upon the British government to take action with a vew to establishing the national independence of East Galicia. Similarly on March 20, 1922 the Council of the French League of Nations Society called upon the French government to take action. The Council of the League of Nations at its meeting February 23rd, 1921, reported to the Council of Ambassadors at Paris impressing upon them the necessity of settling the political status of East Galicia. At a meeting of the League of Nations at Geneva on September 23rd, 1921, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, one of the Canadian representatives, moved the following resolution:

That the Assembly of the League of Nations draw the attention of the Supreme Council to the desirability of determining at an early date the legal status of East Galicia.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the league. I have here the report of the Canadian delegate to the third assembly of the League of Nations whose conferences were held between the 3rd and the 30th of September, 1922. On page 4 I find the following:

At the second assembly, on the motion of a Canadian delegate, a resolution was adopted expressing hope of an early setlement of the question of the status of Eastern Galicia. That matter being still unsettled, Mr. Fielding moved a renewal of the expression of last year in the following terms:

"The Assembly of the League of Nations renews its wish, expressed in the resolution adopted by the second assembly on September 27, 1921, that the council of the league draw the attention of the principal allied and associated powers to the desirability of determining at an early date the status of Eastern Galicia."

I beg leave to place upon Hansard a resolution passed at a public meeting held in the city of Winnipeg in May last and which resolution deals fully with this matter. This is signed by the chairman, Rev. Dr. Gordon, the mover, Mr. J. W. Arsenych; and the seconder, Mr. W. R. Wood.

Resolution re Ukraine

Whereas, Eastern Galicia and Northern Bukowina were constituted on November 9th, 1918, as an independent state under the name of Eastern Ukrainian Republic;

Whereas, a government of this state was formed by the duly elected representatives of the population of the state and the government under presidency of Dr. Eugene Perushevich still exists—in exile:

Whereas, Poland made an aggressive war upon the Western Ukrainian Republic in order to gain possession of her rich oil-fields, forests and lands:

Whereas, on June 25th, 1919, upon Polish representations, Poland was authorized by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference to occupy Eastern Galicia by military force, the future of the territory to be decided by the Peace Conference, Rumania in the meantime occupying Northern Bukowina:

Whereas, the territory of Western Ukrainian Republic was described as an entirely separate entity by the Treaty of St. Germain (September 10th, 1919), by the settlement of Spa (July 10, 1920), by the Treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920) and by the declaration of British government (by Mr. Harmsworth, Under-Secretry to the Minister of Foreign Affairs), in the British House of Commons (July 6th, 1921):

Whereas, the Assembly of the League of Nations September 23rd, 1921, upon Motion of the Canadian Representative, Hon. Charles D. Doherty, unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That the Assembly of the League of Nations draw the attention of the Supreme Council to the desirability of determining at an early date the legal status of Eastern Galicia."

Whereas, up to the present date the legal status of the territory of Western Ukrainian Republic has not been determined:

Whereas, since occupation of the Western Ukrainian territory until present moment, Poland assumes right of sovereignty over this territory and exercises same:

Whereas, this undertermined legal status of the Western Ukrainian Republic and Polish pretensions create abnormal conditions there; and

Whereas, according to press reports, private letters and testimony of eye-witnesses arriving in Canada, the following state of affairs obtains in Galicia: Poland forces Ukrainians to accept Polish allegiance and change of religion: Poland suppresses Ukrainian language on Ukrainian territory; Polish authorities have suppressed Ukrainian public schools, high schools and higher educational institutions and do not allow to establish private schools; thousands of Ukrainian youth are deprived of educational facilities: Ukrainian lectures at the University of Lemberg are abolished; when a private Ukrainian University was established in Lemberg, its president, some professors and many students were imprisoned; practically all Ukrainian cultural, social and benevolent institutions were crippled, hampered and ultimatily suppressed and prohibited, and Ukrainian Citizens' Relief Committee at Lemberg, which was handling the Ukrainian Red Cross moneys collected in Canada for the relief of Ukrainians, was deliberately disorganized and prevented from working by the Polish government: Ukrainian economic organizations are prevented to engage in reconstruction of the country: Ukrainian public men are being persecuted, imprisoned, slain or starved without reasonable cause: Ukrainian press is hampered, confiscated and suppressed; with the aid of military forces, a census of population was instituted by Polish authorities, and Ukrainians under pain of imprisonment and maltreatment and heavy fines were forced to declare allegiance to Poland; Eastern Galicia is being colonized by Polish immigrants while the Ukrainians are not alowed to buy land; Polish authorities make requisitions of grain and cattle without payments; the Polish Diet in Warsaw imposed upon Eastern Galicia an extraordinary levy of 20,000,000,000 Polish marks for the upkeep of the large Polish army of occupation; the populations of Eastern Galicia, impoverished by the continuous war of eight years' duration will be brought to utter ruin by this levy:

Now therefore be it resolved, that we the Canadian citizens in mass meeting assembled in the Convention Hall, City of Winnipeg, this 22nd day of April, 1922, hereby urge the Dominion government and Imperial British government:—

1. To cause a searching investigation of the conditions existing in Eastern Galicia, and to see that justice is done.

2. To see that the claims of the Ukrainian people to an independent state within their ethnographical boundaries and the political status of Eastern Galicia be finally determined.

And that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Dominion government, with the request that the same be forwarded to the Imperial government and to the Delegation of the British Empire at the Economic Conference at Genoa.

Chairman, Dr. C. W. GORDON;
Mover, J. W. ARSENYCH,
Seconder, W. R. WOOD.

I also wish to quote briefly from an address delivered at this meeting by the Rev. Dr. Hunter:

The Ukrainians are the third largest national group in Canada. They number in this country at the lowest estimate 350,000 people. It is time the English-speaking people were getting better acquainted with them. . . People of the British races have always believed in fair play and in justice. When nearly half a million of our Canadian population are kept in distress and agitation by reports of hideous cruelty to their friends and relatives in Europe, it is a matter that concerns Canada.

And further, from the Rev. J. M. Shaver's address on the same occasion:

[Mr. Campbell.]

I am here, in the second place, because I believe that your helping your people at home does not make you less valuable Canadians but on the other hand makes you more valuable. The man who can easily forget the land which gave him his mother, his basic moral principles, his early loves and hates and hopes and fears, is a dangerous man. I am always expecting such a man to be a "crook" of some sort. It is the strongest characters who do not change so easily.

Further on Mr. Shaver states:

This brings me the expression of some reasons why you have a right to ask for our sympathy. First of all, because we know what freedom is and we know that the only way to keep our freedom is to help others to get it.

Second, because your sacrifice to save Europe from the invading Tartar and Turk was a sacrifice for us, for which we have never been able to pay.

Third, because you are largest non-English speaking group of fellow-citizens in western Canada to-day.

The occupation of East Galicia by the military forces of Poland remains in force to the present day. But this occupation is provisional and will cease just as soon as the Supreme Council determines the political relationship of this country. In other words the ultimate international status of East Galicia remains as yet to be defined, and the duty of determining this status devolves upon the allied and associated powers or their representative body, the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, because by article 91 of the Treaty of Saint Germain, the allied and associated powers are the sovereigns of East Galicia.

Until recently, settlers in this country from East Galicia were described on their naturalization certificates as "Citizens of Poland." During the past session, I had frequent interviews with the Under Secretary of State about this matter; and in my letter to him of June 22nd, I dealt with the legal status of these people and pointed out that in reality they were wards of the allied governments. The department, I understand, referred the subject of my letter to the British authorities, and I have here a letter from the department, which in part reads as follows:

Adverting to Mr. Mulvey's letter to you of June 22, 1922, with respect to applicants for naturalization of Ukrainian origin, I beg to inform you that this department is now describing such persons as "subjects of allied powers" and any applicants who received certificates describing them as "Poles" may have their certificates changed by returning them to this department.

The action of the under-secretary of State in this matter of naturalization is greatly appreciated by my constituents as well as by all the people of Ukrainian origin in Canada. If anything further were necessary to prove to this House that Poland has no legal status in East Galicia, it is the fact that our own Department of Secretary of State now legally

describes people from that country as "subjects of the allied powers." To-day, 350,000 Canadians of Ukrainian origin beseech the Canadian parliament to hearken to the agonized appeal of 4,000,000 of their suffering and oppressed countrymen in Central Europe. Do not fail them in this the hour of their need. Show them that the great heart of the Canadian people goes out to them in this, their country's darkest hour. Tell them that the country that laid 60,000 of her best and bravest sons on the altar of sacrifice that one small country might be free, has a sympathy as deep as her mighty lakes, as wide as her noble prairies, as vast as her natural heritage; and that this appeal in the interest of justice and right shall not go unheeded by the representatives of the people of Canada.

Mr. L. P. BANCROFT (Selkirk): I desire to say a few words in reference to this important resolution brought forward by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell), who stated that it might be well for the people of Canada to cultivate the acquaintance of our Ukrainian settlers. We have in Canada to-day about 350,000 of these people who have been settled in the western part of the country for about twenty years. In that time they have developed perhaps more rapidly than any other non-English speaking class of immigrants who have come to this country. So great has been their development that to-day there are hundreds of their young men and women teaching English in our public schools in Manitoba. Quite a number of their women are graduate nurses, while there are several lawyers among them. You will find these people in the high schools and universities of western Canada. There are a large number of successful merchants among them carrying on business according to the standards that are recognized and pursued in this country. They also include a large body of farmers, and they are a people that lean naturally towards mixed farming. Possibly one reason for this is the fact that they produce large families and in this way provide that free labour without which mixed farming cannot be carried on in Canada. Recently they elected four of their nationality as members of the local legislature of Manitoba and these men hold their own with our own people very well. The young Ukrainian men and women who have grown up in this country in the last twenty years and who have been educated in our schools speak English as fluently and as correctly as our own people. In fact their whole record in Canada is one of which any people might be proud. Now, it may be suggested that these people, now that they have made their homes in this country, should forget their troubles in the old land and settle down to business here. But we must remember that they have relatives back in their native country who are being persecuted and if they neglected to look after the welfare of their relatives in any part of the world, they would, I think, be neglecting one of the first duties of citizenship.

In presenting this resolution we are not asking that Canada should interfere in European questions. We are merely asking that Canada take an interest in these new Canadians and so help to make them better citizens, because I believe, Sir, that the best way to make an immigrant take an interest in his country is for the country to take an interest in him. In a word, we are merely asking the government to request the League of Nations to look fully into this question and see that justice is done in Eastern Galicia.

Mr. A. L. BEAUBIEN (Provencher): I do not intend to speak at length on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because the mover (Mr. Campbell) presented the case in a manner so complete and convincing that it was apparent he had made a study of it. I had the pleasure last year in this House to defend these people when they were being ridiculed by some hon. members for wearing sheepskin coats. Now I am here to urge on the government the desirability of making representations to the League of Nations so that these Ukrainians will be freed from further oppression at the hands of the Poles. I know very well these Ukrainians who have made their homes in western Canada, and I can endorse everything that my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft) has said about their good qualities as Canadian citizens. As he stated, they generally have large families, and if we had more of these people in the prairies there would be no need for the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) to encourage child immigration from the British Isles. These people are working hard and making a success of their farms, although their land is more or less inferior in quality, but they are dogged and persevering and will stand the bumps and succeed where we would fail.

We are very proud of that British fair play which we hear so much about. Well, this is a good time to exercise it. When the friends and relatives of these citizens of Canada are being oppressed in Europe, it is the duty of the government to prove to them that we actually practise British fair play, that it is not a mere expression, but means something that can be invoked for the succour of the oppres-

sed. Therefore I think this resolution should receive the unanimous support of this House and that the government should thereupon make representations to the League of Nations urging upon it the desirability and necessity of an early and final settlement of the Ukrainian boundaries, and so relieve the friends and relatives of our Ukrainian fellow citizens from the sufferings they are now enduring at the hands of Poland.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): I wish to speak very briefly in suport of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I happen to have a great many of these people in my constituency, and I can vouch for their good qualities—given a fair chance they are among the best immigrants we have and develop into very good Canadian citizens. I think we cannot do better than ask the government to bring the request of these people before the League of Nations, so that they may realize the value of their Canadian citizenship and its effectiveness in relieving the distress of their friends and relatives in the west Ukrainian Republic.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, it is a far cry from Canada to the Ukraine. However, I happen to have a certain number of Ukrainians in my constituency, and I feel a great deal of interest in them for I find them to be admirable settlers who invariably develop into good Canadians. But I am not exactly clear about the situation that is involved in this resolution. When we contemplate the troubled state of Europe and the chaotic conditions brought about by the warring and hatred that prevail there, we may be pardoned for wondering just exactly what can be done in the present situation. I have no doubt that the arrangement referred to was made by the League of Nations, and that it was agreed that the boundary line separating the new state from Poland should be definitely ascertained. But while the hon. gentlemen were discussing the resolution I had been thinking that perhaps some member of the government who understands the situation might explain it to us so that we could act intelligently. I repeat, I am not at all clear on the situation. Naturally we would all wish to see peace restored in Europe, and personally I desire to show every sympathy for the friends and relatives of our fellow citizens from the Ukraine, but until we know the situation it is difficult to act effectively. Perhaps we may get the required information from the government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): If there was any question as to the character of these Ukrainian fellow citizens of ours in the West, I am sure we would all appreciate the information we have received from hon. members who have spoken in praise of them. I do not understand, however, that there is any such question.

I am inclined to think that the preamble of this resolution is based upon a misapprehension of one or two important points. It states that the integrity of the West Ukrainian Republic has been guaranteed by the League of Nations. I think that is a mistake. To the best of my knowledge and belief the Western Ukrainian Republic was never recognized by the League of Nations. I am afraid some of us will have to confess that our knowledge of eastern European politics is not sufficient to warrant us going very deeply into this question, but so far as we would appear to be justified in attempting to deal with it I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that that which he is asking to be done by this resolution has already been done. In the session of the second Assembly of 1921 the representative of Canada, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, introduced a resolution on the subject. Wisely, he did not attempt to decide the merits of the dispute. The Poles have always claimed that Eastern Galicia has been Polish for ages, and it is in their hands now under mandate. Of course, it is desirable that that condition should not remain, that the doubt should be removed and the status of Eastern Galicia determined. Mr. Doherty wisely did not attempt to say how the question should be determined, but he did say, in the name of Canada, that it should be settled. The League of Nations has no power to settle it. All the League can do is to express its opinion as to the desirability of settling this long-standing difficult question. The resolution proposed by Mr. Doherty was accepted.

At the recent sitting of the League of Nations, the third Assembly, attention was drawn to the fact that practically speaking the situation remained unchanged, Poland was still in command and the status of Eastern Galicia had not been determined. Thereupon the Canadian delegates again asked the League of Nations to re-affirm the resolution of the previous year. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, they did not undertake to settle the dispute between the Poles and the Ukrainians. They did, however, recognize that the delay was objectionable and that the matter should be settled, and thereupon a resolution was moved to renew that expression of opinion. I think my hon. friend read the resolution to which I refer, and therefore I need not read it again. Let me say that the resolution was

referred to the committee for consideration, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) had the honour of being the reporter to report to the League Assembly the conclusion reached. The resolution adopted under the circumstances I have described is as follows:

> The Assembly of the League of Nations renews its wish, expressed in the resolution adopted by the second Assembly on September 27th, 1921, that the council of the league draw the attention of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to the desirability of determining at an early date the status of Eastern Galicia.

That is exactly what my hon. friend is now asking us to do. The thing which he says we should represent to the League of Nations has already been brought before that body by Canada's delegates, who moved a resolution urging that the status of Eastern Galicia should be determined, and that resolution was adopted unanimously by the League Assembly. So everything that my hon. friend is asking has been done. I think that is a clear and simple statement of the case.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I cannot claim that there are any Ukrainians in my constituency; I do not know whether there are Ukrainians in any of the constituencies represented by this group But the late government did not have to have the question of the wrongs of the Ukrainians brought to its notice, or the wrongs of any other nations of Europe that required assistance; these things were looked after. As the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) points out, attention was given to them at the earliest possible moment—in 1921. I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleague in following the good example that was set by his predecessors; for the present administration did what had been done before—they submitted exactly the same resolutions. I only hope that in some way or other we shall be able to get order out of the turmoil that prevails over there now. I do not know whether the present motion will do anything to assist in that respect; as the Minister of Finance says, what is now asked has already been done. But I am quite sure that the appeals of not only the Ukrainians, but any of the other nations that found themselves in a similar position—yes, the Armenians and many others—received a ready response from the former administration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If any hon. gentleman desires to speak on this subject he should do so now, because when the mover of the resolution speaks his reply will close the debate.

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information that the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has given us. I may say, however, that I was already aware of a good deal of it; in fact, most of it I have given here in speaking on the resolution. It is possible that the resolution is not quite correctly worded in its reference to the guaranteeing of the integrity of the state of West Ukraine. I understood, however, from the nature of its own constitution that the League of Nations practically guaranteed to stand for the self-determination of peoples, and that was really what I based my resolution on. I quite understand that action has been taken by the league in the matter, but I would remind hon. members about the scriptural proverb respecting the unjust judge and the poor widow. Nothing has resulted from these representations, and I would like to see some expression of opinion from this House on the matter. I appreciate and my constituents appreciate the action that has been taken by both the present and the late government in this connection. I say that I would like to have an expression of opinion from this House, but if the resolution is not in proper form of course I shall have to withdraw it. But possibly the Finance Minister could say just how it should be worded or whether I should withdraw it or not. I am quite willing to accede to his request in the matter.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I would ask the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) to withdraw his resolution, in view of what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said, and especially in view of the suggestion in the resolution that the independence of the so-called state of West Ukraine is guaranteed by the League of Nations. That state has never been recognized in fact. The Ukrainians are asking that it should be so recognized. On the other hand, Poland asks that the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers should define what is the real status of Eastern Galicia. Both parties to the issue are asking for a settlement. Then, the final part of the resolution seems to be based on the assumption that it is for the Council of the League of Nations to settle that question. The council cannot settle it. The Supreme Council of the Allied Powers have reserved to themselves by the Treaty of Saint Germain the right to determine and define the status of Eastern Galicia, either in the formation of an independent state or in its becoming part of Poland. The matter has not yet been determined. The result is that chaotic con-

ditions prevail there, and it is certainly desirable that a decision be arrived at and a settlement effected. That is what the representatives of Canada asked in 1921, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has said, and that is what they asked last fall. So that Canada has already declared in favour of an early settlement by the only channel through which it can be done. I think, therefore, that the resolution should be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I beg leave, then, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw the resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, whereas the exportation to the United States of the electric energy of the water powers of Canada, promotes the progress of the United States to the detriment of Canada, it would be desirable that the government place a prohibitive duty on this anti-national commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this question of the exportation of electrical energy, a question which is occupying the minds of our friends the Americans, is one which, for various reasons, should be immediately looked into by the government. In the first place, we cannot get a supply of anthracite coal in any part of Canada; consequently we have to import our requirements from the United States, together with a considerable quantity of bituminous coal. In other words, we have a shortage of black coal and our neighbours to the south have a shortage of "white coal". It is stated in reports of American engineers that if the present rate of domestic consumption and export of United States coal is continued, the resources now available will be completely exhausted in about forty years. Moreover, it is the policy of all countries to prohibit or restrict the exportation of material which is vital to their own welfare, being needed either for motive power, for lighting or heating, or for other uses in industry. It is not only logical, therefore, but easily understood, that the United States, finding its supply of coal becoming exhausted, will sooner or later place an embargo on exports of coal in order to conserve it for the purposes of motive power, metallurgy, lighting and heating. If this action is taken Canada will be placed in a very critical position, and the situation will be intensified if our country has allowed our neighbours to succeed in obtaining control not only of coal in the United States but electric power in Canada as well. It is in the history of all nations that a government will find the necessary information for its administration. History will reveal the events which marked the success or failures of governments, upon which should depend the decision of all legislative bodies.

In the years 1902 and 1903 the United States felt the effects of a coal strike which brought about a scarcity of the fuel, also an inferior quality of coal, and an exorbitant increase in its cost. Our neighbours suffered in consequence, and we in Canada, as the United States acted on the principle that charity begins at home, had our supply of anthracite very much limited; in fact, the scarcity and cost were so great that coal was considered rather as a luxury, and some people lest they should forget the crisis, had particles of anthracite encrusted in their rings. At that time those who were able to procure coal at all had to pay $30 and $35 a ton. Twenty years later, that is this year, another coal strike is declared in the United States in sympathy with Canadian miners, and the same difficult conditions confront us again. We have a scarcity of coal, with poor quality and high cost. The only difference this year is that legislators are advocating in parliament and in the press that an embargo be placed upon the export of coal. Who can tell what may happen to-morrow?

These actual facts and our past experience impose upon us the duty of considering as soon as possible the whole coal problem, for the present and the future of this country will depend on the control of our white coal both as regards motive power, lighting, heating, and industry generally. Let us remember that our neighbours, who possess a considerable quantity of phosphate of lime, upon the recommendation of Mr. James R. Garfield and the late President Roosevelt, one day without warning refused to export abroad this valuable fertilizer, reserving it entirely for American territory. Remembering that according to the reports of the National Commission of Conservation in the United States their coal mines will be exhausted in forty or fifty years, and when we hear some gentlemen like Mr. George Otis Smith, director of the Geological Department of the United States, saying that it is a menace to the country to export every year forty per cent of their coal, that this raw material should be preserved to the United States for the purpose of manufacturing and supplying all the nations of the world with the goods they are in need of, we may expect before a very long time—and there is a persistent rumour to this effect—that they will impose a partial if not a total restriction on the export of American coal.

It is true that the central part of Canada, richly endowed as it is with white coal, could look after the situation provided that her water powers were fully worked and the exportation of our electrical energy controlled. If we export electrical energy to our neighbours to the south, it should be on the basis of a mutual exchange of white coal for black coal, so that the future and the present interests of Canada will be properly protected. Our neighbours whose commercial sense is well known, have anticipated that problem, and that is the reason why a financial group has been formed with the object of monopolizing all the American water powers so that some day they will be able to impose a price in keeping with their greed, and dictate the modus vivendi, and the American people will be compelled to accept their conditions. According to Mr. Charles Edward Wright, Assistant Attorney General at Washington, a dozen small financial groups hold one-third of all the hydraulic power of the United States, that is, 6,300,000 horse power. They have in view the time when scarcity of coal will make its use prohibitive, owing to the high price for supplying motive power, lighting and heating, thus enabling them to ask of future generations such prices as they see fit.

The following will show in what terms ex-President Roosevelt expressed himself on this subject:

> The people of our country are threatened by a monopoly more powerful than has been ever seen, as it affects very closely their domestic and industrial life. Our next generation will witness a shortage of those natural resources, petroleum and gas. The price of coal will be such that hydraulic power turned into electrical energy will, owing to its cost, become the prevailing factor for transport, for manufactures, for lighting and heating our towns. Our hydraulic power alone, entirely and judiciously employed, would be adequate for the present needs of transport, industries, municipalities and private individuals. The major portion of these powers is not developed and remains the national property. It would be madness to part, without conditions, with one of our greatest resources. If we become guilty of this crime, our children will be bound to pay an annual royalty on a capitalization fixed at the highest price that the trade will stand for. They will see themselves struggling with powerful sweaters entrenched behind the doctrine of discharged rights strengthened by all means of protection that money can buy and the cunning of corporations defended by legal men. These ogres of finance will have succeeded long before then to monopolise those resources so as to be able to dictate to the people the management of their affairs and their way of existence. Public opinion will be their least worry.

Even if these monopolists of hydraulic powers and their operations are so scornfully regarded in the United States, we Canadians should take measures to nullify their calculations in regard to using, for their own benefit, hydraulic powers in Canada.

The case of the Cedars rapids worked up by the Aluminium Company of America, with a plant at Massena, New York, drawing 70,000 h.p. from the flanks of the St. Lawrence, is not an example to be followed; it is anti-national. We have also to guard ourselves against our own groups of Canadian financiers who are seeking to forestall the establishment of our own hydraulic powers, having in view exportation to the United States of some of the electric energy for their exclusive gain, holding up the cost of electricity to a prohibitory price, and making ready to act the same part, when opportunity arises, as the American monopolist has done.

If I am well informed, as I believe I am, the Montreal Public Service Company, now the New England Company, intend to work the rapids of Carillon by exporting to Boston 100,000 h.p. for their exclusive gain. The Electric Development Company, under their license granted by the Department of the Interior, turn into the United States at a profit 35,000 kilowatts; the Ontario Power Company, 45,000 kilowatts; the Canadian Niagara Power Company, 55,000 kilowatts; or a total of 135,000 kilowatts, or approximately 181,000 h.p. We should see at work these groups of financiers who are attempting to appropriate to themselves the powers of the Long Sault, which are second to none on the St. Lawrence. It is important that the public should be advised of the danger of allowing these to fall into the hands of these monopolists of electric powers.

Mr. Gifford Pinchot expresses himself in this manner:

> Whosoever possesses the motive power is master of the industries. Have you ever seen a few drops of oil scattered on water spreading until they form a continuous layer, able to calm immediately all surface agitation? Now is the time to discuss this question and to have it known, before the various interests concentrate and forestall all the nation's property. All those that are aware of the situation admit that the time for protesting is very short. If we do not take advantage of it to protect our interests, we will hear but too late that this gathering of interests will pay little attention to the common individuals whose undertakings will be opposed to theirs.

Let us take the cost of electricity in Montreal where the consumers are charged $128 for what actually cost the company $15, prohibiting practically the use of electricity for domestic purposes. This gives an idea of the consideration these monopolists of electric powers will have in future for the consumers.

In the event of a complete shortage of anthracite in the central portion of the Dominion, we must be prepared lest our neighbours to the south take advantage of the situation with an obvious financial object in view.

It is our duty not to permit our hydraulic power to pass, without conditions being laid down, into the hands of wealthy individuals. In connection with this, we should highly praise the policy of the province of Ontario in hydraulic matters, its pronounced policy being to keep for the state its natural wealth. We must always remember that our friends the Americans are actually the masters of the coal, that they have in their own territory white coal in considerable quantity, although insufficient, and we must rest assured that the very day they control our hydraulic powers our national future will have disappeared.

The electric power of the Cedars is laid out to actually produce 100,000 h.p. Its capacity is 56,000 ft. per second and they propose to increase it so as to obtain 180,000 h.p. If we figure that, in 1916, the Toronto Electric Power Co. with 50,000 h.p. were supplying electric lighting and motive power to 40,000 consumers, it is clear that to provide for the wants of the Toronto Tramways, the Toronto Electric Light Co. and the Toronto Electric Power Co., the power at the Cedars would be an essential source of electric power at low cost. There is no doubt that this source of electric power at the Cedars could supply on reasonable terms the electricity to a manufacturing city of 300,000 inhabitants; in other words it could supply the motive power and lighting to 35 Canadian towns of 10,000 population and would fill about one third of the orders that are actually received by the Hydro-electric from 100 municipalities and 100,000 consumers. It is reasonable to believe that if the Aluminium Company of America had been refused electric power at the Cedars, they would have settled on Canadian territory instead of at Massena, New York.

The United States are therefore firmly convinced, and they are very much concerned over the fact, that, assuming their engineers' reports to be well founded, if they do not take possession of these water powers immediately, Canada will later acquire them under the treaty. In doing so Canada would create for herself a great number of industries which otherwise would have been established in the United States.

The Chief Engineer of the United States, Lieutenant Colonel J. C. Sanford, declares without preamble that if it is impossible to have the electric power produced in Canada passed to the American side, the American manufacturers will be drawn to Canada, where they will be able to obtain for their industries electric power at low rates. They feel already, he states, the effect of the restriction imposed on the importation of this power. The manufacturers who buy supplementary motive power in Niagara settle in Canada. Canada exports electricity from New Brunswick to the state of Maine, Quebec to New York, Ontario to the state of New York and Minnesota, British Columbia exports to the state of Washington. It is the duty of the parliament of Canada to make, for the present and future, regulations for the exportation of our electric power, essential for the welfare of the country, on a basis that will maintain with our neighbors friendly relations.

Although my resolution involves a radical embargo on the exportation of all horse-power, it does not cover all my thought. I would, though, keep to the letter of my text, if for reasons which are impossible to foresee, we could not agree without either side, the American government or the Canadian government giving way. If we take into consideration the generous way in which the Americans treated Canada when in 1902-3 a strike rendered their coal supply insufficient, it is reasonable to think that for the present and in the future Canada could exchange, on an equal basis, white coal for black coal as it has done in other natural and manufactured products, thus promoting cordial feeling and the best interests of the two countries.

Yet I strongly share the opinion of the men I have quoted with regard to the American monopolists of hydraulic powers who, for their own personal gain, endeavour to forestall all there is of potential electric energy, as well in the United States as in Canada, with a tendency towards constituting themselves the kings of the coal and of the hydraulic powers, and sooner than we think, compelling the American and Canadian peoples to submit to their demands.

It is Canada's interest to oppose the groups of Canadian individuals who seek to forestall our water powers, taking first those which are the easiest to develop, with a view of trading with our neighbours. They will endeavour to convert this electric power to their exclusive use, thus preventing the sale of electricity at as low a price as it is being sold at present. The result will likely be serious vexation in the future, when possibly circumstances will require the entire consolidation of all our hydraulic powers to meet the situation with regard to motive power, lighting and heating.

I believe, therefore, that it is the duty of the government to consider at once very seriously this problem of to-day and of to-morrow, and to amend and apply more vigorously than heretofore the federal act 6-7 Edward VII Chap. 16, which provides for the regulation of the exportation of electric energy and cer-

tain liquids and gases, and authorizes the government to impose a duty of $10 per horse power sent abroad. This is imperative unless a satisfactory agreement is reached safeguarding the present and future interests of Canada, and assisting on the scrupulous observance of the conditions and terms defined in the licenses, which are supposed to be obligatory in all cases of exportation of electric power. This would invite foreign capital and would be an incentive to the establishment of industries on Canadian soil, thus founding and developing towns like Shawinigan, Grand Mere, Three Rivers, and La Tuque.

It is only fair, however, to impose a tax on a business that pays 100 per cent profit. Such a tax would reduce the national debt to that extent and lower the rate of taxation on the necessaries of life. It is not patriotic to allow our neighbours to acquire enormous quantities of unmanufactured pulpwood, as stressed by the Hon. Mr. Bugeaud in the Quebec House of Assembly. True it is that the practice is forbidden by a Quebec law, but Quebec cannot stop them from taking the unmanufactured pulpwood over the border into New Brunswick. It is, then, the duty of the federal government to impose a tax on every car of unmanufactured pulpwood, no matter what route of conveyance into foreign territory is followed. Thus we shall compel the establishment of the industry at home, to develop business generally and improve our means of transportation. Let us be vigilant and practise economy, and let us on every occasion show in a practical way that we love our country above all.

Mr. E. A. LAPIERRE (Nipissing): During the last session of parliament, when the International Joint Commission was being discussed, I opposed any joint ownership in the development of any of our water-powers. To-day, after one year's observation, I am confirmed in the view I expressed on that occasion. We in Canada to-day possess the largest amount of undeveloped hydraulic power on the American continent, and as was stated by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers), its value is increasing every moment. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have followed the developments in the matter of hydraulic power that there exists at the present time in the United States a powerful ring which is trying to get control of the waterpowers of the St. Lawrence The same group which fifteen years ago tried to grab that power financed the propaganda which advocated the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterways in order to gain the control of this hydraulic power. Having failed to obtain control of this power this ring turned to the state of Maine and endeavoured to get possession of the undeveloped water power in that state. In his inaugural address to the state legislature on January 5th, Governor Percival P. Baxter is reported as having said:

> It is seriously urged, that the time has arrived for Maine to allow its hydro-electricity energy to be transmitted to the other New England states. Those in favor of a change in our policy say that great power developments are about to be undertaken in Canada, the purpose of which is to bring hydro-electricity from that country to Massachusetts and other New England states that are in need of it. I am told that those behind this project prefer to come to Maine and develop some of our great power locations provided they can take the power outside the state where there is a market for it, and those gentlemen say that unless this is permitted the Canadians will build their lines into New England, and once this is done Maine's power will remain idle for a long time to come.
>
> I believe the day will come when Maine will use and need all its water power resources, and once they are taken from us, no matter how we may strive to protect the state's interests, there is grave doubt about our ever being able to recall them. If Canadian power is brought to New England the pressure that is now exerted upon our state to modify its non-transmission policy will be relieved and Maine's water powers will be left for Maine people. All the water power men of Maine are not in accord on this question and some of those who always have favoured taking power out of the state have changed their views and now believe that Maine's policy is sound.

Every word that was uttered by Governor Percival P. Baxter applies more forcibly to the conditions in Canada to-day than they ever did. It is certain that within a short distance of the St. Lawrence in eastern Ontario and in the province of Quebec we have what is to-day the most desirable area for manufacturing that remains on the continent. There is no doubt in the minds of those who are following the tendencies of economic developments that the industries of the future are going to seek low-price hydraulic power.

Roger W. Babson in a report he lately made after a survey of the conditions in the United States has this to say about his visit to the Mohawk valley.

> Every time that I visit the Mohawk valley of New York state I am more impressed with its great activity and its potential resources. I should not be surprised to see the country, lying between Albany and Buffalo, traversed by the New York Central, the West Shore and the Erie canal, become the greatest manufacturing section of the United States. Its climate is ideal; its labour conditions are good; it abounds in agricultural resources, thus assuring a reasonable cost of living; the greatest bituminous coal mines of the country are located to the south and the greatest number of available water powers are located to the north. These conditions are certainly ideal for general manufacturing of all kinds. This valley is close not only to our great American cities, but it is well located for export trade.

Those conditions occur much more favourably on the Canadian side. Of all the waterpower that can be developed between lake

Ontario and Montreal only some 750,000 horse-power will be available to the United States if we develop the power which is within Canada, assuring for us for all time the most desirable area for manufacturing on the American continent. This is one of the reasons why having to-day such potential wealth within our borders we should hesitate before allowing it to be exported to the United States. What is said of conditions in the state of Maine applies much more forcibly to conditions in Canada, for once this power is transmitted to the States it will become very difficult to discontinue its export. If energy from Canada is exported to the United States, it will be with the understanding that these large concerns which are seeking for power will have it under control for a number of years to come. We are aware of what is transpiring at the present time in the textile industry in New England. Within the last ten years for want of cheap power the cotton industry which was in New England has gradually gone south. The reason is that owing to the high cost and the uncertainty of coal deliveries during the last few years the cotton manufacturer in the East has been forced to look for new locations. To-day the number of spindles in operation in the South is almost equal to those in New England. The following figures from the Southern Textile Bulletin are interesting:

> In 1920 there were 19,900,000 northern as against 15,239,000 southern spindles, a northern gain of 300,000 and a southern of 425,000. In 1921 northern gains came to a halt with an increase of 100,000 spindles for the year, placing northern spindles at 20,000,000 at which figure they have since remained stationary. Meantime the south gained 663,000 spindles in 1921 and 248,000 in 1922. Adding to this the 1919 gain of 425,000, the total southern gain for the four years is 1,336,000 spindles. The total northern gain for the interval being 400,000, the total excess of spindle increases in the South over the North is 936,000, for the four years 1919 to 1922 inclusive. This reduces the North's 4,786,000 lead of the year 1919 to a lead of 3,850,000 in 1922.

The New York Herald after quoting these figures says:

> With the South's water-power, unsurpassed anywhere in the North, the logical place for the cotton-mill is in the cotton field.

If the cotton mills are forced by economic conditions to leave New England to-day, those conditions must sooner or later apply to all large manufacturing establishments. There is no doubt that future industrial supremacy is to the country that has the most water-power, and it behooves Canada to see that her water-powers are retained for her own use.

I would call the attention of hon. members to what is happening in northern Ontario at the present moment. In the early days we felt that we had sufficient water-power there to supply all the needs of that section for the next thirty years. Since the opening of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway 184,000 horse-power has been developed, but to-day such institutions as the Hollinger Mining Company and the Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company are forced to reduce their operations for want of electric power. The city of North Bay, with a population of 10,000, situated close to the shores of lake Nipissing, is now organizing a delegation to send to Ottawa in an endeavour to induce the federal government to co-operate with the provincial government in order to develop 35,000 horse-power on the French river, which is the last of the hydraulic powers which remain to us in the Nipissing district. As conditions obtain there now, without more electric power the progress of the country is absolutely halted. The farming people of northern Ontario depend upon the local market for selling their farm products, and of course until we have a larger industrial population the agricultural development of that section must remain stationary.

In view of these facts I have no hesitation in supporting the resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers).

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the thanks of the House are due to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Deslauriers) for bringing this very important question to our notice. I do not know that it is possible for the government at the present moment to give immediate effect to the resolution, but it is perfectly clear that not only the government can, but should, see to it that no further licenses are granted for the export of electric power. We are exporting a good deal of electric power, as the hon. member has shown. It is true that this export has gone on for some considerable length of time, and it is also true that claims are set up to rights under former permits. It is also true that any rights or any permits granted by the Dominion may at any time be cancelled, and that the amount which may be exported is to be fixed each year and new application made for it.

I appreciate the troubles that a government would be in if the motion were passed in its present form. We must not forget that while we have our difficulties, our good neighbours to the south also have theirs. In that connection I noticed the other day that some gentleman in the United States said that coal shipments to Canada should be stopped. He suggested that it was idle to talk about the Canadians stopping the export of electricity, because it had been coming into the United States for so long and because so many im-

portant public utilities and large firms were dependent upon that source for their supply of power. Well, that is all true, but we have been getting coal from the United States much longer than the United States has been getting electricity from us, and while a great deal of inconvenience would no doubt be caused if the export of electricity from Canada to the United States was stopped, there would be great suffering in this country if no further shipments of coal were received here from the United States. We have a pretty fair modus vivendi at the present time. I do not remember the exact figures, but the amount of electricity that we export to the United States is the equivalent of a very large amount of coal. I fancy that the government should be satisfied to let things stand just about as they are, expecting that a proper supply of coal will continue to come in from the United States and on the other hand allowing a modicum of electricity to go there as at present.

But I sincerely hope the government will see to it that the amount of electricity exported is not increased. It has been shown that there is a power shortage. If we had been told a few years ago, just after the close of the war, that there was danger of a power shortage, everyone would have laughed, but I can tell the House that so marked is the present shortage —and not only in the places referred to by the mover of the resolution—that already in Toronto they are using steam to look after their peaks. There is already a necessity for further electrical development. I am confident that my good friend the Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham) will find in his own district a very marked shortage of power in the relatively near future. We have shortages in nearly all the different districts in Ontario from which power is supplied—perhaps not marked in themselves, but decidedly apparent in relation to any reasonable curve upon which the output can fairly be estimated. Unless something is done within the next two or three years it will be impossible to expand business; power will be nowhere available in the province. I urge upon the government, therefore, that no further permits be issued for the export of electricity.

The government should also consider the question of the development of water powers in the streams controlled by the Dominion. They will require no delegations to come here to tell them that that is necessary; if they will take the reports of their own officers they will see that development is required on the St. Lawrence, and that unless that development is soon made, we shall suffer severely. Speaking generally, you cannot contract for power to-day in Ontario; there is no place in the whole Niagara district where you can at the present time arrange a firm contract for any considerable amount of power for the purposes of industry. I do not think the commission have it; I am quite sure they could not give it for any considerable length of time. There must be development in the eastern end of Ontario, with high voltages, because a voltage of 222,000 can be handled over long distances and with practically no loss.

I was surprised to hear the mover of the resolution say that the cost of power in Montreal was $128 per horse-power. Well, that is a tremendous cost; I should not have thought it was anything like that. It is true that the cost of electricity is mounting up, in the way that everything else is mounting up, but not for the same reason. The real reason is the shortage—and that in a country of infinite power possibilities. In the Niagara district you can get water power at from $17 to $45, so that I think the figure given by the hon. member is a little out of line.

The mover of the resolution stated that a company was planning to develop 100,000 horse-power in the neighbourhood of Montreal, and export it, I think he said, to Boston. I would like to know from the government whether any applications have been made for leave so to export. The Minister of Defence shakes his head. If there is any such application, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that a refusal will be given. The House might well ask for a statement from the government as to its position in this matter. In the first place, is the government looking forward to a development of the power that we now have? It ought to be developed by the state; what is the government's attitude? And on the question of export, do they take the position that further amounts should be allowed to go out, or not?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the resolution presented by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) and the speech he made in support of it is evidence of the fact that he is a student of this question. We all remember the very interesting speech he made last year on the electrification of railways. I would like to congratulate him—and I am sure it would be the wish of the House to do so—upon making such an excellent speech in the English language. I believe this is his maiden speech in the House in English.

We all recognize that the prosperity of England was due in large measure to the coal of England, and what black coal was to Eng-

land the white coal that we possess through our water-powers should be to Canada. All the provinces of Canada with perhaps one exception have some water-power and the three provinces with the largest amount are Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia, but there is an immense amount of water-power throughout the country still undeveloped. The last speaker referred to the shortage of power that has developed, and within recent years, I gathered from his speech. That to me is an indication that there must have been a considerable development of activity in manufacturing in this country within the past few years.

The government have nothing before them to show that any person is contemplating developing immense quantities of electrical power for exportation. As was so well said by my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) the export of electrical power is licensed and controlled by the department, and the license must be renewed from year to year. I can assure my hon. friend the government is fully alive to the interests of Canada and if it is demonstrated that the power is required in Canada a license for its export would be very carefully considered before it was granted.

I would also point out to my hon. friend, who spoke in a rather complaining mood as if the government were giving away something they had no right to give away, that one of the first acts of the late government when it came into power in 1912 was to license the export of power, which my hon. friend particularly complains of to-day, from Cedar Rapids to Massena. That contract was given by the friends of my hon. friend, and this government to-day is only carrying out the contracts that we found on file when we came into office.

SIR HENRY DRAYTON: Stick to it.

Mr. ROBB: In so far as it is good for the country, we will try to do that. The records show that there is no great scarcity of power in this country yet. If the power is not developed, there is ample power in this country to be developed. Water-power is not like pulpwood or coal or some other commodity that you can store up and keep until it is required. If you do not harness water-power it simply flows on gently to the sea and is lost, so any revenue you may get from it in the meantime is revenue gained for the country. I submit that it is not sound economics to hold up the development of a product that is being wasted when it can be developed and sold at a profit to Canadians. It is questionable whether the government would be justified in placing, as some hon. gentlemen have suggested, an embargo on the export of power that might lead to very serious complications. Our friends to the south might say: If you are going to put an embargo on water-power, we will put an embargo on coal. Or they might put an em-embargo on some other product that was needed in this country. Embargoes are not good at any time. Control is a good thing, and so far as control is concerned, I repeat that the government will endeavour to preserve the interests of the Canadian people.

As I said in my opening remarks, what coal is to England water-power should be to Canada, and happily we have no scarcity of water-power in our country. The records show that there are still available undeveloped water-powers in Canada aggregating over 15,000,000 horse-power. The water-powers developed in Canada aggregate 2,969,659 horse-power, or about seven per cent of the total water-power available. Then as to exports, the total electrical energy exported to the United States during the calendar year 1922 was a little short of 150,000 horse-power, 149,431 to be exact.

It might interest the House to know—and this will particularly interest my hon. friend from West York, where this electrical energy is exported from—we are told that there is a shortage of electrical power in the province of Ontario, and that province rather prides itself on its control of electrical power for the use of its own people. The records show that the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls exported 45,000 kilowatts; the Canadian Niagara Power Company of Niagara Falls, 45,000 kilowatts; the Electrical Development Company, Limited, of Niagara Falls, 35,000 kilowatts; the International Railway Company of Niagara Falls, 200 kilowatts; the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Fort Frances, Ontario, 2,611 kilowatts. Last year about March the Fort Frances Company had exceeded their license, and they were rounded up by the department and compelled not to exceed the limit that was allowed to them under the license which we found in operation when we came into office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With reference to the minister's remarks on Ontario, which seems to be a sore subject with him, does he not know that that 45,000 kilowatts which he quite properly points out as being exported by the Ontario Power Company, was a matter of contract originally, before we had anything to do with license? Does he not also know, in connection with the Niagara Company, that before we started to license, the whole of that Niagara Company was put in with American capital with the idea of developing power for the American market?

Mr. ROBB: I am not offering any observations on that, but am simply pointing out where the power is being exported from. From New Brunswick 2,500 kilowatts was exported by the Maine and New Brunswick Electric Power Company; from the province of Quebec 100 kilowatts by the Sherbrooks Railway and Power Companny; 75,000 kilowatts by the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company, Soulanges; from British Columbia 10,000 by the Western Canada Power Company, Stave Lake; 1,500 kilowatts by the West Kootenay Power and Light Company, Rossland; 5,000 kilowatts by the British Columbia Electrical Railway Company, Vancouver; and 28,000 kilowatts by the Bridge River Power Company of Vancouver, making a total of 44,500 kilowatts exported from British Columbia. So these three provinces, Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia, which have the largest water-powers, are also the largest exporters of power, and the largest exporter is the province of Ontario.

My hon. friend a few moments ago referred to the moving of the cotton mills from the New England states to down south because of the water-power. I am not prepared to challenge that statement. Water-power may have been the consideration, but I would point out that one of the greatest costs in the manufacture of cotton is labour, and the information I had was that the cotton mills were moving to the South because of the much cheaper labour costs there, and also because they would save the haul on the raw cotton and on part of the finished cotton down.

The hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) having presented this resolution and debated it most intelligently, having been supported by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), it seems to me that, in the best interest of the country, he might well withdraw the resolution. I imagine that he has no desire to press it to a conclusion. The government will keep before them the observations he has made; and may I repeat again, the government, always alive to the interests of this country, will see to it that the licensing of the export of electrical power will be properly controlled and the interests of the people of Canada safeguarded?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Allow me to point out to the minister that he has not answered the question I put, namely, whether the government were considering or had yet started to consider the utilization of water-powers over which they had jurisdiction. I now have in mind the Ontario waterpowers, like the waterpowers at Morrisburg, where we have a shortage.

Mr. ROBB: I should like to point out to my hon. friend that the provinces claim the right to develop water-powers, and we have no ambition to get into a controversy with our good friends from Ontario. If any person is prepared to submit a proposition to the different departments for the development of waterpower, I am sure such a proposition will receive every consideration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand, then, the question of development at Morrisburg would be entirely one for Ontario.

Mr. ROBB: I did not say that. So far as I know, no proposition is before the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly understood the minister to say that it was for Ontario.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the question of power development is, of course, a live one. Any person who has read the Toronto press during the last two weeks will understand that Ontario distinctly claims the ownership of waterpowers in the St. Lawrence. Whatever the Dominion might do in the development of waterpower would be incidental. The federal authority has a right only to deal with navigation. In the Trent canal, the Trent system, the development of water-power was incidental to the improvement of navigation by deepening the canal, and a good deal of litigation took place, in which, I think, the federal authorities won out on account of the legal situation concerning much of the property along the Trent. I know I was interested in that, and our legal representatives, I think, went back a hundred years to get the title cleared of some of the properties along the Trent.

As to the St. Lawrence development, when that takes place, if it does, it will probably be of an international character, and several interests would have to be considered, first, the province of Ontario which claims ownership of the water, and, I think, with some reason. The state of New York is interested as is the province of Ontario. The federal government of the United States is interested, this being an international proposition. The federal government of Canada is likewise interested, this being an international proposition; but, as I understand the matter, whatever the federal government of Canada might do under the circumstances would be in refer-

ence to improvement of navigation, and the handling of water-powers would be in the hands of the province of Ontario.

Mr. DESLAURIERS: On the request of the minister I withdraw my resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS —FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I think I should put a question to the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). I notice in the public press, that there has been a somewhat serious conflict between Sir Henry Thornton and the Board of Railway Commissioners as to the meaning of the railway figures. The question I want to put is whether he has been able to find out who is right.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): I will endeavour to make the right statement when we come to discuss the railway estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should have thought my hon. friend would have given me that to-night.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Tuesday, February 27, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

First report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.—Mr. Tobin.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Alert Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 31, to amend the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1919.

He said: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best explanation I can give is to read the short clause of the bill. It is to amend paragraph 1 of section 2 of the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1919—which is the interpretation clause—by adding thereto these words:

[Mr. Graham.]

but does not mean or include officers, clerks or employees whose tenure of office or employment is only seasonal or temporary and who are appointed at the beginning of each seasonal period.

Hon. members will see that it does not touch permanent employees. A year ago the Civil Service Commission recommended that a large number of employees should be taken from its jurisdiction. I have no doubt the intention was to include the class which is mentioned in this amendment, and I believe the commission will approve of the bill. It simply specifies the class that shall be removed from the jurisdiction of the commission—men whose employment begins early in the summer but lasts only during the summer, and who are appointed at each seasonal period as temporary employees. If this amendment is accepted I think it will do away very largely, if not altogether, with one of the prime objections to the Civil Service Act. The civil service commissioners themselves recognized this when they recommended the withdrawal of a large number of this class of employees from their jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend subsection one of section six of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, chapter seventy-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by section one of chapter seven of the statutes of 1922, and to provide that the words "two hundred dollars for each head of cattle" in the eighteenth line thereof be stricken out and be replaced by the words "one hundred and fifty dollars for each head of cattle"; to further provide that this act come into operation on the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, and that the minister may order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two, but which had been valued and ordered to be slaughtered prior to that date, at the rates authorized by statute before the coming into force of said chapter seven; also to provide that the minister may order compensation for animals which may be slaughtered on or after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, but valued and ordered to be slaughtered from the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-two to the thirtieth June, nineteen hundred and twenty-three, both dates inclusive, at the rates authorized by chapter seven of the statutes of 1922.

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

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION

PRESS STATEMENT CONCERNING WELLAND, LINCOLN AND HALDIMAND

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the special committee appointed by this House to which was referred Bill No. 15, an Act to Readjust the Representation of the House of Commons, introduced by the Prime Minister on the 13th instant, I desire to direct the attention of the leader of the government —I am sorry the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not here—and of the members of this House, to a statement which appeared in the Ottawa press of to-day, alleged to have been made by a prominent supporter of the government, dealing with the question referred to this committee. The statement is as follows—

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon gentlemen not to read any article from the press, but rather to give the House a synopsis of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is really a synopsis that is given in the press. However, I will not read it. The effect of the statement is that at a meeting of the Welland county Liberals yesterday the member for Welland (Mr. German) stated that Thorold would be added to Lincoln and Wainfleet to Haldimand under the redistribution act. I would like to ask the leader of the government, in view of the fact that the committee to which the bill was referred, has not only not met but has not yet been notified to meet, whether the government have already decided upon a plan of redistribution and have worked out the details which were supposed to have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member not to insist on that question. He is anticipating legislation which has already been referred to a committee of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would very respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is one question which is certainly in order, namely; was the hon. gentleman authorized to make the statement?

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): As I am the gentleman referred to, having attended the annual convention of the Liberal Association in the county of Welland yesterday and made the statement, if I have the permission of the House, I will state exactly what I said. I pointed out that the county of Welland had, by reason of its great prosperity, increased in population to such an extent that it nearly equalled the population of the two adjoining counties of Lincoln and Haldimand; that it was possible in the redistribution of constituencies certain sections of the county of Welland might be removed therefrom and added to the counties of Lincoln and Haldimand so as to adjust the representation according to the regular unit of population; and that if such should happen to be the case, the town of Thorold and the township of Wainfleet, adjoining on either side the counties of Lincoln and Haldimand, would be the only municipalities in the county of Welland that could possibly be removed from the county of Welland and added to the counties of Lincoln and Haldimand; that so far as Thorold was concerned I was quite willing that it should go to the county of Lincoln, and that I preferred to retain Wainfleet as an adjunct of the county of Welland.

INQUIRY INTO AGRICULTURE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): In view of the adverse agricultural conditions prevailing and the reference made thereto in the Speech from the Throne, and in view of the fact that this House has on various occasions been given to understand that a special committee would be appointed to inquire into those conditions, I would like to ask the government when this committee will be appointed.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Owing to the illness of the Prime Minister we have not yet decided on the chairmanship of this committee, but we hope in the course of a day or two to have it convene and organize.

EMPIRE SETTLEMENT SCHEME

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I desire to call the attention of the government to an article appearing in the press to the effect that under the Empire Settlement Scheme adopted by the parliament of Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand have received some 11,000 immigrants, while only 130 have gone to Canada. I wish to ask whether these figures are correct, and why Canada as is indicated by the article, is not co-operating with the Mother Country with a view of getting immigrants partly at the Mother Country's expense.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of Immigration): I cannot give my hon. friend the information he seeks with respect to numbers, but I might say that this week the Deputy Minister of Immigration is leaving for the Old Land for the purpose of arranging co-operation with the Overseas Settlement Board for this year. Full explanation will be given when the estimates of the department are brought down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any assurance that the money will not be all gone before the deputy gets there? The system has been in operation for quite a long time.

Mr. JACOBS: Knowing who the deputy is, we would not be surprised.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Civil government—Civil Service Commission—salaries, $188,305; contingencies, $80,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before these estimates are considered, I find on looking at page 87 that the details of this particular vote are in the same form as the details in connection with the vote for Agriculture. When we were considering the estimates last, the government, led at that time by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), promised to furnish the proper details for the Civil Government votes.

The CHAIRMAN: The item we are considering is not the Civil Service Commission vote, but item No. 27, Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries and contingencies.

Mr. GRAHAM: I might say in reply to my hon. friend, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that the Minister of Finance has asked to have the particulars given, so far as Civil Government is concerned, as they were given last year. There has been quite a departure in the last four years, but we will not argue about that now. The Civil Government estimates for any department will not be taken up until such time as the Estimates are placed before the committee in the form desired.

Civil government—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—salaries, $29,200; contingencies, $10,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is Civil Government again.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): In the case of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the civil government vote is very small. It comprises only seven or eight employees. Most of the salaries in this department are usually paid out under another item in the Main Estimates for salaries. In this instance perhaps my hon. friends will not insist upon the details being printed as will be the case with the other departments. The employees are the deputy minister, the assistant deputy minister, supervisor of expenditure, chief clerk and assistant secretary, head clerk, principal clerk, storekeeper, and one librarian; that is all. The total vote for salaries for the next fiscal year is $29,200. That shows a slight reduction as compared with last year, on account of the services of one employee being dispensed with. The draughtsman, who was needed in former years, is no longer required.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was his salary?

Mr. BELAND: It was $2,040. The difference between this year's vote and last year's is not so much as the amount I have just mentioned, on account of statutory increases being granted to some of the employees. I shall be glad to give the salaries of the officials I have named. Deputy minister, $6,000; assistant deputy minister, $5,000; supervisor of expenditure, $5,000. These three are receiving the same salary as last year—no increase. The chief clerk and assistant secretary gets $3,480, which includes a statutory increase of $120; head clerk, $2,880; principal clerk, $2,280; storekeeper, $2,400; librarian, $560. The position of senior draughtsman is done away with, as well as the allowance of $600 for private secretary. That is all that is contained in the civil government list of this department. Hon. gentlemen may say that it is a very small list compared with the amount which is paid out in salaries in this department. That is true, but it has been customary ever since the department was constituted to pay only these few officials under the civil government vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We desire to stand by the principle which was conceded by the government the other evening, but in this case the item is small and we can carry the details in our heads. I think we can all understand the brief explanation that has been made. The item shows a reduction, and so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to let it go through.

Mr. BOYS: Have the services of the senior draughtsman been dispensed with, or has he been transferred to another department?

Mr. BELAND: His services have been dispensed with.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—capital, $30,000.

Mr. BELAND: This item is considerably smaller than the vote last year. The amount expended up to the 31st of December, 1922, was $46,495. We expect that this year we shall be able to meet the requirements for the purpose indicated, with $30,000. The amount is required for new fixtures and improvements to leased property. We are spending a very small amount in this regard. Last year we spent $9,000, and this year up to the first of January last only $1,500 has been expended. The balance of the vote is required for new equipment in machinery and furnishings for hospitals and sanatoria, insignificant additions to the capital expenditure, such as the purchase of a table for a hospital, or some smaller piece of furniture. This item is small, and shows a big reduction as compared with last year.

Mr. CALDWELL: Might I call the minister's attention to the fact that the committee last year recommended that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment endeavour to hand over as far as possible the care of the patients to other hospitals and discontinue that branch of the work of this department. I would like to ask the minister what has been done along that line.

Mr. BELAND: I shall be glad to give the information. When I was in the committee last year, for the same purpose we had seventeen hospitals administered by the department. During the course of the last twelve months it has been possible to close three of of them in accordance with the wish then expressed by members of the House, and the patients in these hospitals have been concentrated in some other of our institutions. So far we have not been able to close any more hospitals, but I may state frankly that it is intended to close one or two others within a few months when we find that we have sufficient accommodation in the remaining institutions. What we are adopting is really a process of concentration.

Mr. CLARK: Which hospitals will be closed?

Mr. BELAND: I am not in a position at present to say definitely. The matter is now being considered by the Director of Medical Services and myself, and I would be somewhat reluctant to mention the hospitals that are likely to be closed until a definite decision has been reached.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What hospitals have been closed?

Mr. BELAND: The Strathcona hospital in Edmonton, the Sunnyside hospital in Calgary, and the Sydenham hospital in Kingston.

Mr. GOULD: It seems to me that the committee have a right to expect that the officers who advise the minister as to what moneys are required, should place in his hands definite and exact information as to every item for which a vote is asked.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is quite right in his contention but I would point out that this department is somewhat different to the others. It is one which has been created out of nothing, and which grew into an institution, expending, at one time, as much as $30,000,000. It is very difficult indeed, even for the most competent officials, under the circumstances in which we are situated, to say exactly what amount will be required for the following year. Nevertheless I fully realize what my hon. friend has said, that they should be, as near as possible, conversant with the whole situation. If any portion of the required vote is unexpended the balance, of course, will remain in the treasury.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister referred to tables. I do not know whether he means operating tables or ordinary tables, but it seems to me that there should be enough supplies on hand in the hospitals which are closed to enable the department to carry on.

Mr. BELAND: It is intended, of course, to use whatever supplies are on hand. The amount which is called for is much smaller than it was last year, and, as I have already said, is an estimate only. The fact that we ask for such a vote does not mean that the whole amount will be spent or even the half of it, but we think that we may require that amount. I can assure hon. gentlemen that I am doing my best to impress upon the officials the necessity of practising economy to the very limit.

Mr. CLARK: Would the minister give us figures showing the numbers treated in the military hospitals for a period of say three years?

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection at all to answer the question of my hon. friend, but it seems to me that when we come to the next item dealing with the care of patients and the medical examination of pensioners I might more appropriately give to my hon. friend the information for which he asks.

Mr. BOYS: I noticed in last year's estimates of this department an item of $75,000 of which, apparently, only $9,000 was spent.

Mr. BELAND: Oh, no.

Mr. BOYS: If that be the case why was there such a discrepancy between the two items? Will the minister give us some idea of the items which were asked for and not required, and will he state whether they form part of the $30,000 now called for?

Mr. BELAND: In my previous answers I must have unintentionally misled the committee, if that is my hon. friend's impression, because the amount that was expended up to 31st December last was $36,000.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know whether I am in order in bringing to the attention of the committee a speech made by the leader of the Opposition in the county of Essex in which he stated that these estimates were to be cut down by $3,000,000 to the direct detriment of the widows and orphans of those who fought in France and Flanders. Perhaps the minister could give us some information on that point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was expecting to hear you, Mr. Chairman, declare the hon. gentleman out of order. I do not know that a speech made by the leader of the Opposition in the county of Essex is subject to review in connection with this particular item. If the chairman rules that it is, we are perfectly prepared to discuss the matter and to do so at some length.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps my hon. friend would find it rather awkward if the facts in connection with this matter were to be aired now and given to the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all. We have not the slightest objection. If the Chair should rule that this matter is in order we are quite willing to go on. I would point out, however, that what my hon. friend stated was not said by the leader of the Opposition. What he did say was, that there had been that amount of reduction made in the expenditure during last year.

Mr. JACOBS: He also said something about this reduction being one that affects the widows and orphans of the soldiers who died overseas.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BELAND: If I am in order I have no objection to making a statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everything is in order.

Mr. STEVENS: Especially in the absence of the leader of the Opposition.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. BELAND: I have no desire at all to say anything except this—the statement as it appeared in the newspapers is totally inaccurate and I cannot believe that the leader of the Opposition would have permitted such a statement to slip from his lips. I trust that later on it will be made apparent that I have good reason for expressing such a doubt.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apparently this is all in order. The only thing that I thought—and I may be wrong again—was that the leader of the Opposition, dealing with pledges made by hon. gentlemen across the carpet during the election period, dealing with their pledges that there would be a cash bonus given to soldiers, dealing with their pledges as to Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, said that the only thing that had been done was that a reduction of $3,200,000 odd had been effected in the expenditure of this department. I ask the minister if that is not true?

Mr. BELAND: There has been more than $3,000,000 of a reduction—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly, that is what he said.

Mr. BELAND: —but not at the expense of the widows and orphans of the men who died overseas.

Item agreed to.

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $3,500,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister can tell us the number of patients cared for at the time the last estimates were up for consideration, and the number of patients now in hospital.

Mr. BELAND: I will endeavour to give the committee the information that is sought by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) first, and then the information asked for by my hon. friend the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). The inpatients on pay and allowances on the 31st December last numbered 3,404, made up as follows:

General treatment	1,742
Tubercular	982
Mental	680

The outpatients on pay and allowances total numbered 293 as follows:

General Treatment	209
Tubercular	40
Mental	44

The total patients on pay and allowance numbered 3,697. The inpatients not on pay and allowances total numbered 610, made up of:

General treatment	249
Tubercular	72
Mental	289

This makes a grand total patient strength of 4,307. As to the number of clinical treatment cases, I may state, that the medical activities of the department do not extend merely to the men in the hospital, but also to a number of soldiers who come occasionally or periodically to our clinics to receive treatment. The number of clinical treatments in the twelve months of the year just elapsed was 216,991, a weekly average of 4,173 treatments, given in our clinics in the different units of the department. To summarize, we have, under general treatment, 2,200 patients; tubercular, 1,094, mental, 1,013, making a total of 4,307.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is this year?

Mr. BELAND: That is as of the 31st December, 1922.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I wanted to get at was how the hospital population compared now with what we had before.

Mr. BELAND: I misunderstood my hon. friend, but I hope the information I have given is satisfactory.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very interesting.

Mr. BELAND: I will undertake to give my hon. friend the information he seeks. The figures are:

December 31, 1919	8,031
December 31, 1920	6,431
December 31, 1921	5,930
December 31, 1922	4,307

The hon. member will see that there is a reduction in the number of patients, happily, in our D. S. C. R. hospitals.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Could the hon. minister tell us the number classified as tubercular and mental, and tell us whether the number is reduced?

Mr. BELAND: In order to do that, I shall have to take the inpatients on pay and allowances for every year. That is rather a long statement. I have no objection to giving it to my hon. friend, but I will take the tubercular inpatients only now:

1919	1,486
1920	1,096
1921	1,054
1922	982

Those are tubercular inpatients, receiving pay and allowances. The number of outpatients is a great deal smaller. They vary from year to year, from 1919 to 1922, from 57, to 11, 10 and 40. The tubercular outpatients on pay and allowances are rather on the increase.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Could the minister say what proportion of that reduction was due to death and what proportion to other causes?

Mr. BELAND: I have that information somewhere, but I do not believe I can lay my hand on it at the present time. Of course, a certain proportion would disappear through death, and a certain proportion also are discharged from the sanatoria as improved, but some of these are kept under the observation of the department as outpatients, some are let out with full pensions, and some, of course, are considered as cured and then might, in the judgment of the pension board, receive a pension commensurate with what they think the disability amounts to.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Without troubling the minister to read the long list, I should like to know if mental cases are decreasing otherwise than through death; in other words, if the mental treatment is proving successful.

Mr. BELAND: Unhappily the number is on the increase. These figures I give are up to the last of the year:

	Inpatients	Outpatients	Inpatients not on pay and allowances
1919	664	36	23
1920	639	16	207
1921	618	5	258
1922	680	44	289

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Could the minister tell us the names of the institutions where mental cases are being treated, and the number under treatment?

Mr. BELAND: The department has two important mental institutions, one at Westminster hospital, near London, and the other at St. Anne de Bellevue, near Montreal. The number of inpatients, mental cases in each of those hospitals is about 450.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Are there any cases in the provincial institutions?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, a number of patients are also distributed in the different provinces. I suppose I should be in a position to give my hon. friend all the information he seeks in this regard. We have, as he knows, mental institutions throughout the country. There are in unit A, which is Montreal unit, two mental institutions, one called St. Jean de Dieu, and the other the Protestant General, both in Montreal. We have twelve patients in those institutions. In the Maritime provinces, we have at Falconwood three mental cases, and at Dartmouth, three. At St. John Asylum, St. John, we have none. In the Ottawa unit, we have, at Brockville, two, and at King-

ston—Rockwood—fourteen. In D unit, which is Toronto, we have at Toronto, seven; at Hamilton, none; at Mimico, four, and at Whitby, ten. In unit F, which is Guelph, we have no patients. In the Winnipeg unit, we have at Selkirk, 65 mental cases. In H unit, which is Regina, we have at Battleford, 49. In Calgary unit, we have at Ponoka, sixteen, and at Red Deer, 35. In British Columbia, we have at New Westminster, fourteen, and at Vancouver 66. Those are mental patients in institutions other than departmental institutions, of which we have two.

Mr. BOYS: The minister gave us a table showing that in 1919, the number of patients was something over 8,000, and that number has gradually been reduced, until at the end of 1922, it is down to 4,307 patients. I notice there is a reduction this year of $500,000 in this item as compared with last year, a very substantial reduction. Is that due wholly to the reduced number of patients? If not, to what other cause may the reduction be attributed?

Mr. BELAND: It is mainly due to the reduction in the number of patients, the general cost of keeping the patients in hospital.

Mr. BOYS: I am not referring to some trivial amount. Is that really the cause of the reduction beyond some trivial sums?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What amount was spent last year under this head?

Mr. CLARK: Would the minister at the same time give us the figures for the preceding year?

Mr. BELAND: On 31st December last, we had spent $2,746,525.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Has the department any hospitals for taking care of tubercular patients, other than those regularly provided in the different provinces? I am thinking more particularly of Saskatchewan, which is at present overcrowded with tubercular patients.

Mr. BELAND: The department has four different sanatoria; one in Quebec, which they call the Laurentian sanatorium at Ste. Agathe; One in the Maritime provinces, called the Jordan Memorial at River Glade; one at Kingston, called the Mowat sanatorium, and one in Saskatchewan, called the Qu'Appelle sanatorium.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: How many patients are in the provincial sanatorium at Qu'Appelle under departmental supervision, and what is the rate paid for their care?

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. BELAND: In Saskatchewan we have sixty-seven patients in the Fort Qu'Appelle sanatorium, and the cost is $3.30 per day per patient.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Where those patients, either tubercular or mental, are mantained in provincial institutions, does the minister's department pay the same rate as that ordinarily charged by such institutions, or has it a special rate with them?

Mr. BELAND: I understand that the rate is the prevailing one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister think that he really needs this large amount? I want to point out in the first instance that he comes down with his figures 8,000, 6,000, 5,000 and 4,000, or a drop of approximately—I have not the exact figures—25 per cent in the number of inhabitants this year, and there is a reduction in the appropriation of one-eighth. The actual reduction in the number of inmates would make it appear that a much larger reduction should be made, and that the minister does not really need the money. On the figures the minister gives us of the amount which he has spent for the first ten months of this year, namely, $2,746,000, if he keeps his bills up fairly well, as I suppose he does, and if you take the twelve months on the same basis, the whole expenditure would be under $3,300,000 on the basis of the larger population. Has the minister considered these items? I do not suppose he wants to swell his estimates, and we do not want to put on one penny that is not necessary. This would look as if on his own showing, he was asking for something that he does not require.

4 p.m.

Mr. BELAND: No, Mr. Chairman, I am quite satisfied that I am not asking for anything that I do not require. I think it will be obvious to every hon. gentleman that we cannot reduce the cost of administration of our hospitals proportionately to the number of patients. For instance, if a hospital containing fifty patients costs us, say, $100,000 a year, and we reduce the patients to twenty-five, we shall not be able to make a corresponding reduction in our expenses, for, of course, the overheads, such as heating, light, and so on, are the same. As regards the amount that was spent during the first nine months of the current fiscal year, my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) if he calculates aright will find that the amount is much larger than he has figured.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood it was for the ten months' period.

Mr. BELAND: No, nine months. But even at that it must be recognized that the three months of January, February and March are the three worst months in our hospitals. There is more sickness prevailing, and we have generally a good many more patients to take care of during these three months than all the rest of the year, which will account perhaps for a larger expenditure. I have gone through these figures very carefully with the officials of the department with a view to reducing them to the lowest possible amount, but it will be recognized that we must have money enough for the purpose for which this vote is intended, and the purpose is so noble in itself that the department would fail in the discharge of their duties to our sick soldiers if they tried to get along with a lesser appropriation. I am sure no hon. member would like to see our returned men neglected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everyone recognizes the truth of the hon. minister's statement in connection with the overheads, but I hope he is not going to forget what is the answer to the question of overheads, namely, consolidation. When the hospital population falls below a certain number the proper course to pursue is to put the patients into another hospital where there is room for them, and in that way cut down the overhead. I hope my hon. friend will not overlook this suggestion.

Mr. BELAND: When the number of patients becomes reduced to a certain point we close the hospital. That has happened often.

Mr. CLARK: Can the minister give us the figures to show the number of patients in specific hospitals to-day compared with the number in those same hospitals in past years, so that we may be in a position to compare the overhead expenses?

Mr. BELAND: These figures are not under my hand at the present time. The closing of the hospitals is not brought about only by reason of a reduction in the number of patients; we must be in a position also to accommodate the remaining patients at a not too distant point from the place where they were first hospitalized. That is a consideration. As to a general reduction in expenditure, I am sure I shall be borne out by my hon. friend when I state that that is a sure way of effecting economy.

Mr. GOULD: Is there included in this vote a sum to take care of what I might call transients—returned soldiers who might be taken ill when passing through a municipality? I have a case in point. The municipality does not recognize such an individual as a resident, and yet, owing to the fact that he entrained for the hospital within the borders of the municipality the hospital to which he was sent threatens to take action against the municipality for payment of services rendered to the unfortunate soldier.

Mr. BELAND: This amount would cover every possible treatment of soldiers. In such a case as that cited by my hon. friend (Mr. Gould) it is always a question whether the ex-service man would be entitled to treatment at the hands of the department. Such cases come under our consideration quite often, and whenever we are able to ascertain that the patient so treated in a hospital entirely outside of our own institutions was entitled to treatment we refund the amount spent for his care.

Mr. GOULD: I would understand from the statement of the minister, then, that the disability from which the soldier suffers must be the direct consequence of his service overseas before he is recognized as being entitled to treatment? Or would a returned man under the conditions I have stated be entitled to treatment of whatever ailment he might be suffering from?

Mr. BELAND: Of course, the regulations of the department provide that a man can be treated with pay and allowances only when his disability or illness is connected with his military service. But, as I attempted to show the committee only a few minutes ago, there are a number of patients in our hospitals who do not receive pay and allowances. There is grave doubt as to the attributability in their cases, but on compassionate grounds they are admitted to hospital for observation without pay and allowances. But the general rule is, and it is the spirit of the law, that an ex-service man can only be treated for a disability which is connected in some way with his war service.

Mr. BOYS: Is it the policy of the department to reimburse municipalities which are called upon to pay for the treatment of returned soldiers placed in provincial hospitals?

Mr. BELAND: Only in those cases where it can be demonstrated to the department by medical evidence that the soldier was treated for an illness attributable to his war service.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What was the number of medical officers employed at the Sydenham hospital at the date of its closing, and how many are to-day employed by the D.S.C. R. at Kingston?

Mr. BELAND: The number at the time of the closing of the hospital, on 1st January, 1923, was eleven.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How many are employed now by the D.S.C.R. at Kingston? I want to see what reduction was made.

Mr. BELAND: Five.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What are their names?

Mr. BELAND: I have not their names before me. There is one medical representative for the district, one assistant, one oculist, one surgeon and one interne. Those are the five employed now in place of the eleven who were formerly in our service.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I can add to that list; there are two others, including a surgeon.

Mr. BELAND: We must have a medical representative, of course, and an assistant, so that any soldier who comes to receive treatment or to put in a claim for pension may be examined. Besides that, we have in the two hospitals in which the patients discharged from Sydenham Hospital were placed, the three officers I have mentioned. These are regularly employed; we have also a physician who makes bacteriological or pathological examinations, but he is paid only by fees, according to what work he does.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): That is eight out of eleven. I had omitted to mention the bacteriologist. You are now looking after only those cases which are not tubercular, and where you had eleven in the hospital you have eight now.

Mr. BELAND: I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I have here a statement from the Director of Medical Services which gives the number I have stated. There are five men where there were eleven, and one also who was formerly paid $200 per month but who now receives a fee only when he makes an examination.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I contend that there are seven or eight.

Mr. BELAND: I will have a personal conversation with my hon. friend on the subject. I have given the statement I have from the Director of Medical Services.

Mr. CARROLL: I hope the Minister will not think that I am trying to retard the progress of his estimates, but this thought has occurred to me; there is a commission abroad in the land, the chairman of which is Colonel Ralston, a man well known in this country.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

That commission is giving attention to the question of tuberculosis. The operations of this commission are a most important phase of the whole work of re-establishment, pensions and so on, and I humbly suggest to the minister that opportunity should be given under some item of the estimates for the discussion of the commission's report. Personally—and I am not following the government for the time being—I believe that if this commission does not bring in a report which is acceptable to the Canadian people, we should be given an opportunity to discuss it fairly in this House and criticize it where it is faulty.

Mr. BELAND: I assure my hon. frend that full opportunity will be provided for the discussion by the House of whatever report is made by the royal commission to which he has referred. That will come later in the session. Legislation will have to be introduced respecting pensions and re-establishment, but we shall have to wait until the report is received.

Mr. CARROLL: Shall we have an opportunity of discussing the report in Committee of the Whole, so that we may ask questions and so on, as it is not possible to do if the report is presented to the House in the ordinary way?

Mr. BELAND: As I have said, legislation will be introduced later in the session amending the Pension Act and also the insurance and other re-establishment provisions. The House will then be in Committee of the Whole, and my hon. friend will have the opportunity he desires.

Mr. CALDWELL: As a past member of the pension committee I had expected that the royal commission would before this have reported its findings on the charges made against the Pension Board. I understood from the order in council appointing the commission that they were to report on that phase of the inquiry before proceeding to investigate the general subjects involved in soldiers' pensions and re-establishment. I have been disappointed to find that that report was not brought down early in the session and is not in fact before us at this time.

Mr. BELAND: I have myself been expecting the report on the first phase of the work of the commission, that is, with reference to the charges made against the Pension Board by some veterans' association. The report is not yet at hand, but I think it is only fair to say that in the latter part of the investigation bearing upon pensions it was declared by representatives of the veter-

ans as well as by representatives of departments before the commission that the charge of conspiracy to deprive ex-service men might very well be waived.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then there is all the more reason why we should have had this report. It is not a healthy thing to have the matter continue in its present state of uncertainty. These charges were made, and if they are substantiated action should be taken; if not, the country should know it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BELAND: I have already taken steps to hasten the submission of the report by the commission. I expect it very shortly.

Mr. CLARK: The Minister has stated that legislation will undoubtedly be submitted to parliament at this session embodying amendments to the Pension Act and the Insurance Act based upon the report of this commission. Has the minister a preliminary or other report from the commission that we have not got, or has he any information that he can give us now on which any such legislation would be based?

Mr. BELAND: I have no report, either confidential or official. I am expecting a report almost daily.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does this vote cover the cost of the supplying of artificial limbs?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: In how many factories in Canada are these artificial limbs made?

Mr. BELAND: In only one factory now, in Toronto; but there are distributing centres in the larger Canadian cities.

Mr. CLARK: How many medical officers were in the employ of the department in the years 1920 and 1921, and in the year that has just closed?

Mr. BELAND: I have with me a list of all the medical officers of the department. I have not counted them, but there is a considerable reduction in the number of medical men employed by the department in the different units. While the reduction is substantial, it may not appear as large as one would expect. It must be realized, however, that in a unit like Winnipeg, for instance, you may have a few hundred patients in the hospital, but whatever the number of patients may be practically the same number of medical men are required. An ex-service man may come into a unit any day claiming that he is suffering from any disability, and you must have ready to meet him a medical man who will give him an examination. It is impossible to turn out an ex-service man who presents himself for treatment. He may have no shadow of a claim for treatment, but if he is an ex-service man and comes into a unit and reports himself sick and claims treatment, there is nothing to do but subject him to a close examination, and for that one soldier you will require perhaps—indeed, it is very likely—the services of a chest specialist, the services of an X-ray man, the services of a specialist in genita-urinary diseases; you may require a surgeon and an eye specialist; so whatever the number of men who report in any one year for treatment, you must always have five or six different specialists ready to meet their contentions. I say that because I myself, though I am a medical man, was under the impression at the time that the number of medical officers in the department could be reduced very greatly, but it is not so. We find we have to keep in our service a larger number of medical officers than at first would appear necessary. I confess, however, that a substantial reduction has been effected in this direction, and we are reducing our medical staff constantly.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not possible for the minister to give the figures?

Mr. BELAND: I am sorry that I cannot lay my hands on them at the moment, but I may be able to give them officially to my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. MacLAREN: Can the minister give the figures for the nursing sisters, showing the reductions in the last three years?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. The figures in connection with the nurses' staff in our different hospitals are as follows:

Ste. Anne's	35
Ste. Agathe	8
Camp Hill, Halifax	17
Jordan Memorial	7
Lancaster	8
Sydenham (now closed)	13
Mowat Memorial Sanatorium	10
Euclid Hall, Toronto	7
Christie Street Hospital, Toronto	52
Brant Hospital, Hamilton	16
Westminster	26
Deer Lodge	3
Col. Belcher, Calgary	11
Central Alberta Sanatorium	11
Shaughnessy Hospital, Vancouver	20
Total	244

Mr. CALDWELL: Do I understand that you have thirteen nurses in a hospital that is closed?

Mr. BELAND: We had them, but they have been discharged from the service.

Mr. CALDWELL: In connection with this vote, while I am one of the strongest advocates in this House of economy, we must not hamper the minister in this branch of the service. I feel that we owe to the returned men adequate care. I realize the force of what the minister has said in regard to the medical staff. You cannot turn the ex-service men away without consideration, and in order to give them consideration you must have a medical staff. I think we must vote this item and leave it to the good judgment of the minister—and I think we all have a great deal of faith in his good judgment—to exercise the greatest economy possible consistent with proper service to the returned men.

Mr. CLARK: I think I may claim to be as ardent a supporter of the interests of the returned men as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I think that one of the most extraordinary statements I have ever listened to is the statement of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) that we must not question this vote.

Mr. CALDWELL: I rise to a question of privilege. I did not say that we must not question this vote. I said that we should not hamper the minister. I do not want the hon. member to put words into my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. CLARK: I understood the hon. member to say that we must give the minister a free hand and leave it to his judgment as to whether or not the amount is required. I question that absolutely. I want to know the details for which this money is to be expended, and I want to know how money voted in previous years has been expended. If we find that there is any of this money which is not legitimately required for this purpose, some of it may be devoted to the returned soldiers' interests where it is required, and there are many ways, I suppose, in which we can use the money in the interests of the returned soldiers, and not throw it away on medical service or other services if the money is not absolutely and specifically required for these particular things. I think we must ask the minister to give us a little more definite answer than he has done so far.

Mr. BELAND: I am ready.

Mr. CLARK: So far as I am concerned, I am not quite satisfied with the definiteness of the answers that have been given by the minister so far.

Mr. BELAND: I shall be glad to supplement the information which I gave to my hon. friend. I have now the figures under my hand. My hon. friend asked about the number of doctors employed in the hospitals. I have here the list:

Doctors	Full Time	Part Time
Ste. Annes	7	6
Ste. Agathe	2	..
Camp Hill	4	5
Jordan Memorial	2	..
Lancaster	3	4
Sydenham	5	2
Mowat Memorial	3	..
Euclid Hall	1	..
Christie Street	14	2
Brant Hospital, Hamilton	6	1
Westminster	9	..
Deer Lodge	1	..
Col. Belcher	2	..
Central, Alberta	3	..
Shaughnessy	3	6
Total	65	26

These figures of course, apply only to hospitals, and not to the clinics or the union headquarters for pension examination, or the examinations of soldiers who come in claiming treatment.

Mr. CLARK: There are other doctors who are employed by the department?

Mr. BELAND: Yes we have a number of representatives of the department located in the different towns and cities of Canada outside of the unit cities which are—Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston (sub-unit), Toronto, London (Ontario), Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary and Vancouver. Outside of these cities we have, of course, a certain number of medical officials who, for the purpose of convenience are acting for the department either discharging duties as pension examiners or as treatment examiners. In the province of Quebec we have 26 of these, distributed in the different cities and towns; in Nova Scotia, 52; in Prince Edward Island, 12; in New Brunswick, 21; Cape Breton Island, 23—making a total for the Maritime provinces of 108. In the three divisions of Ontario we have the following: Eastern, 46; Central, 70; Western, 45; making 161 for the province of Ontario. Then there are in Manitoba 55, in Saskatchewan, 12, in Alberta 42, in British Columbia 72, making a total of 476 medical representatives of the department. These medical officials are not employed for full time, or even for part time; they are paid fees whenever an examination is required from them.

Mr. CLARK: Would the minister give a comparison with the previous years?

Mr. BELAND: The number would be about the same.

Mr. CLARK: The totals I mean.

Mr. BELAND: I have not got the figures but the representatives in question have been there for a number of years.

Mr. LOVETT: Could the minister give us the number engaged for full time and the number engaged for part time in Halifax during 1919-20?

Mr. BELAND: I am sorry that I cannot state offhand what reduction has been made in the Halifax unit. I think we have dispensed with three medical officers during the last year. I am not absolutely certain, but there has been a reduction there.

Mr. ANDERSON: I have no desire to delay the passage of these estimates, but I would like to ask the minister to give the number of patients that were treated at Brant hospital, also the number of patients still there, and what the total expenditure at that institution was last year.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend was probably out of the chamber when I supplied that information. However, I have no objection to repeating it. The grand total of patients on December 31, 1921—

Mr. ANDERSON: Perhaps the minister misunderstood my question. I was referring particularly to the number of patients in Brant military hospital.

Mr. BELAND: We had 107 there to the 31st December, 1922, for general treatment. In the same institution there were 26 tubercular cases. This makes a total of 133.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): The vote consists of two separate items, one for the care of patients and the other for the medical examination of pensioners. Would the minister divide these and tell us how much goes to the care of patients and how much to the medical examination of pensioners?

Mr. BELAND: That differentiation is rather difficult to make, my hon. friend will realize, because a large number of the medical officers are acting at the same time for the Pension Board and for the department proper. For instance, doctors are being employed in the Toronto unit who make examinations not only for pension purposes but also for treatment purposes. It would be an extremely difficult thing to say what particular amount is being spent for the examination of pensioners, and what is devoted to the care of patients. I confess it would be almost impossible for me to give that information.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Is it the policy of the department to grant a board of examination upon the application of any pensioner, and then that he should be re-examined, or is it customary to periodically examine pensioners in order to determine whether their pension should be increased or decreased?

Mr. BELAND: Where the pensioner has not been declared permanent by the board he is subjected to a periodical examination. The board, of course, use their own judgment in this regard, but it would be fair to say that they examine about every six months in order to determine whether the pension should be maintained at its actual figure, increased or decreased, or discontinued entirely.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Well, is there any degree of disability which an ex-soldier must suffer before he can be declared a pensioner permanently?

Mr. BELAND: It is not based so much on the degree of disability as on the nature of the disability. The disability may be only 16 per cent but it may be permanent, as the loss of one ear or the loss of one finger. In such a case the pension would be declared permanent, though it may be only 15 or 20 per cent. In other cases a man may suffer from an ulcer which is attributable to war service. If the ulcer is in the leg and prevents him from walking, he may receive 60 per cent disability pension, and he is subjected to a periodical examination, because that ulcer may be healed in six months or a year or two years, as the case may be, so that it is not based so much on the percentage of disability as on the nature of the disability.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): In the case of a pensioner who is not satisfied with the decision of the board of examination, is there anybody to whom he can make an appeal?

Mr. BELAND: Last session the parliamentary committee which dealt with pensions and re-establishment made a recommendation that a certain board of appeal should be appointed for the purpose of hearing appeals by men who had been denied treatment. In every case where an ex-soldier is refused treatment by the medical officials of the department, he has an appeal to that board of appeal which is constituted independently of the department. In order to secure the appeal to this board of appeal, the soldier who is refused treatment must supply the department with a certificate from a regular practising physician stating that in his opinion the illness or the disability from which the

man suffers can be traced to his service. In this case, and in every similar case, the appeal is being heard by that board of appeal which has been constituted as a consequence of the recommendation of the committee last year, and the decision of that board is final. That, however, applies only to treatment. Let us come to the case of pension. When an ex-service man applies for a pension his application is dealt with first of all by the pension commissioners. I need not explain what kind of a tribunal that board is. It is constituted by the statute, and the statute is known as the Pension Act. The decision as rendered by the Board of Pension Commissioners is final. Neither the minister, nor the Governor in Council, nor any court in Canada, has any authority to reverse, alter or change the decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners in any way whatsoever. During last session the committee was appointed and investigated questions of pensions and re-establishment. A recommendation was made that a board of appeal be constituted, not only for treatment but also for pensions; but in the case of pensions the appeal exists only when the board in Ottawa refused to agree with the recommendation of the pension examiner in the field. One minute ago I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) asked me how many medical representatives the department had in the country. I stated that there were 476. If an applicant for pension lived out in the country was examined by one of the examiners, and that examiner recommended 20 per cent disability pension in his case, and the board at headquarters refused to grant the 20 per cent but said it should be only 15 per cent, that would constitute a divergence of opinion between the examiner in the field and the central board, and the man may then bring his case before the board of appeal. But in the case where the recommendation of the examiner in Toronto, Winnipeg, Hamilton or Halifax, is supported and agreed to by the Board of Pension Commissioners, there is no appeal. In other words, there is an appeal in every case for a soldier who wants treatment and is denied treatment, and there is a limited appeal in the case of pensions—limited I say—where a divergence of opinion exists between the recommendation of the examiner and the Board of Pension Commissioners. In every case where the two agree, where, for instance, the board in Toronto recommends 20 per cent and the Board of Pension Commissioners agree that it shall be 20 per cent, there is no appeal, even if the man thinks he is entitled to 30 per cent. I hope I have made this clear.

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I think the minister has made the matter fairly clear. The case in point that gave rise to my question was one in which the returned man had been granted 100 per cent disability, and had been refused 100 per cent pension on account of a regulation of the Pension Board cutting a pension in two by reason of the pensioner refusing treatment. That was, I think, partially a mental case. The examiner in the field who had examined this case periodically had reported that this man was still 100 per cent disabled and reported that there was no reason why he should not be receiving 100 per cent pension, but the board did not quite agree with that report, stating that, on account of the regulation, the man was not entitled to 100 per cent disability pension, although he had 100 per cent disability. On account of refusing treatment he is still only getting 50 per cent pension.

Mr. BELAND: This may be an exceptional case where a man refuses treatment when, in the opinion of the medical officers of the department, he would benefit by it. Of course hon. members will realize that if an ex-soldier suffers from a certain disability, and in the opinion of the medical officials he could be cured or highly improved by treatment, and if, treatment being recommended, the man refuses to submit himself to treatment, the board would be justified in a large measure in reducing his pension. That must be the kind of case my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): It is, partly. I doubt very much if any of the medical examiners ever hope to improve this man's condition through treatment. I cannot recall any report of that nature in his case, and yet after going to his father's home he has improved somewhat and would prefer to stay there, rather than to take treatment; yet he is only receiving 50 per cent pension.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has a court of appeal been established to deal with an appeal from the decision of the pensions board as regards pensions?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Who are they?

Mr. BELAND: It was specified in the recommendation of the committee that it should be constituted of three medical men. They are Dr. Biggar, Dr. Chevrier and Dr. Whitton, three Ottawa physicians. They have already dealt with a number of cases, in some of which they have reversed the decision of the medical officers of the department, in others of which they have maintained the decisions.

Mr. WHITE: In view of the explanation given to the minister as to any disagreement between the examining physician and the finding of the Pension Board, I should like to know if a man who has been examined, is given a copy of the examining officer's report, so that he may know what percentage of disability he is reported to have.

Mr. BELAND: In every case, he is informed of the degree of disability. Those are the instructions to the examining officers.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Just pursuing the hon. member's question, I think that point is a little more important than many of us realize, because it causes a great deal of trouble. Sometimes a soldier, who is examined by a medical man out in the field, is told verbally by the medical examiner that there are certain things wrong with him, and he goes away with the impression that he is disabled to a certain extent and is entitled to a pension, whereas the report which is made by that medical man to the department does not contain any such recommendation as the man has the impression it does. It would be well if the minister would see that every man who applies for and receives an examination, is given a copy of the report of the medical examiner, similar to the one which is sent to the department. This would save a great deal of trouble.

Mr. BELAND: The medical examiner in every case has to inform the man who is examined, what degree of disability he suffers from. As to the exact nature of the report, I would be disposed to agree with my hon. friend as a question of general policy; but some of the reports must be treated as confidential, even in the interest of the man himself.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I quite agree with the minister; but I do not think the medical examination gives a report to the man, because many ex-soldiers have come to me to take up their cases with the department, and I have yet been unable to get from any one of them a report of a medical officer who examined them. They have told me many things which the medical examiner told them were wrong with them, and they have been wondering why they have not received more consideration from the department. It should be a rule that those examiners should give to the men a report at least substantially the same—of course, I can quite conceive that some reports must be confidential—as the one that the medical examiner sends to the department, because many of those men—and I suppose this is natural—think there is something seriously wrong with them and the medical man who examines them does not care to disappoint them, but keeps up their hopes as long as he possibly can that they are going to get a pension. This causes a great deal of trouble, not only to the men and to the officials of the department but to members of parliament.

Mr. WHITE: I should like to support the remarks of the hon. member for Glengarry and Stormont (Mr. Kennedy). Coming as I do from a city which is the centre of Military District No. 1, I have a great deal to do with the claims of returned men. I have inquired of them if they have any written
5 p.m. report from their examiners; but so far I have failed to find one. An examiner should be required to give a small amount of information, perhaps only the amount of pension to which the man is entitled, or the percentage of disability; but let the men have something in writing, so that they will not have to depend on a verbal statement, and not claim pensions on account of a misunderstanding.

Mr. ANDERSON: I understand the Pension Board itself sends a report to the man along with the degree of disability and the pension to which he is entitled. The doctor in attendance does not do so, and many of these men do not know until the report is sent to the Board of Pension Commissioners what their disability is. They are accordingly very much dissatisfied. They frequently have to wait for a very long time, and finally get from the Pension Board, a reply with which they are dissatisfied, because they think, from the remarks of the doctor, the degree of disability to which they are entitled is greater than the board allows.

Mr. BELAND: I am glad that this feature of the matter of examination has been brought to my attention. My intention was that every examiner should inform the applicant of the degree of disability which he was recommending in his behalf. Those are, I think, the instructions that should be carried out by examiners, and I will certainly see that they are observed.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I think medical examiners in the field do not set the degree of pensionable disability. That is done by the board at Ottawa. Do the men in the field determine the degree of pensionable disability?

Mr. BELAND: They express their opinion as to the degree of disability.

Mr. CALDWELL: In every case?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, if the application is one for a pension.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to draw the attention of the minister and the committee to a phase of the question which I think has not been mentioned this afternoon, namely as regards the appeal board. The minister has stated very clearly the procedure provided for last year by the Pension Committee. A man who wants an appeal as regards his pension must obtain from a medical officer of the department or his medical man, an opinion which differs from that of the board at Ottawa. That is quite correct, because otherwise, the power of appeal would be open to everyone. At least that was the idea in arranging the matter in that way. In actual practice, this has worked out to what I consider a great and gross injustice as regards returned men seeking to make an appeal. I have only a very limited knowledge of the subject; very few cases come particularly to my knowledge; but I know of three in which the men have been most grossly treated by the board at Ottawa. The man secured from the military doctor a certificate that he was entitled to a pension, and when he brought his case to me I told him that that enabled him to have an appeal from the decision of the board at Ottawa which said that he was not entitled to a pension. I took up his case, and what did I find? I found—not in one, but in three cases, and I have heard of others from other members—that while the local board, the original board, admitted that their doctor had said that the man was entitled to a pension, they got around that and forbade the appeal to the higher board, because, they said: "We gave this local doctor further information, further light on the subject, and he changed his decision." In other words, they wrote to the local doctor in Vancouver or Toronto, wherever he might be, stating: "You had better send a new form in,"—number 685, I think it is,—"certifying that this man is not entitled to a pension." and in nine cases out of ten the doctor would do that. The board said that they gave them "further light." Yes, they gave them a hint that they had better change their opinion. Sometimes they did and sometimes they did not. If they did not, perhaps they might have difficulty in getting similar employment in the future. At any rate the committee of last year and this House and the government which passed the act never intended it to be worked out in that way, that when the man got a doctor—in one case two military doctors—who certified that he was entitled to a pension, and his right to an appeal in consequence was taken away from him, because this board at Ottawa wrote and told the doctors, "You had better change your minds." Such a condition is most unfair to the man and is contrary to the spirit of the law passed last year.

There is only one remedy for it, and it will have eventually to come, that every man will be entitled to appeal, not before a board of doctors, who are very excellent men, but not skilled in the weighing of evidence, but before a Supreme Court judge. That is the proper person for anyone who has a grievance of any description to appeal to, for a Supreme Court judge is skilled in law of evidence and knows how to weigh the testimony adduced before him. A doctor may be a very excellent man, a man of the greatest sympathy, but he is not accustomed to accurately weighing evidence. If the appeal from the beginning is to a Supreme Court judge, there will be a series of precedents established which will not increase appeals but rather will tend to reduce them, because it will be known that along certain lines men will be entitled to certain pensions; and it will possess this great advantage, it will ensure justice to these men and prevent the board from whose decision they are appealing practically blocking the right of appeal in the way that I have indicated.

Mr. BOYS: In that connection, would the minister inform the committee if in case of an appeal relative to medical treatment the appeal board does not act on the same evidence as that presented to the board below? It seems to me that this is not a reasonable course to follow, because there would be very few cases in which there would be room for reversal, but there must be room for such when the medical practitioner supplies the certificate required.

A man should be given an opportunity of pressing his appeal before the board. Whoever heard of a court of appeal disposing of a case merely upon the evidence that had been given in the court below without hearing an advocate or someone else in support of the appeal? An appeal is almost useless unless the soldier himself is given an opportunity of appearing and pressing his appeal.

Mr. BELAND: Or his representative?

Mr. BOYS: I do not know whether that would mean a solicitor or advocate. I think it is the desire of the department to get away from that end of it, and I do believe the soldier himself would be better satisfied if he had an opportunity to appear personally. Of course, if he chooses to have some one appear

on his behalf, very well, if he can go to that expense let him do so. I would suggest that when the appeal is taken an opportunity be given to the soldier to appear in person and support his appeal. It would seem to me reasonable too that his expenses in that connection should be allowed.

While I am on my feet I want to say a word in regard to pensions. This is perhaps not directly in point here, but I think it is an opportune time to bring it to the attention of the minister. I have had two instances brought to my attention where pensions have been withdrawn from widows, and they were not even asked regarding the truth of the evidence received by the department. In the two cases I refer to the evidence involved misconduct. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very, very serious thing indeed when a widow is deprived of her pension without a hearing and on grounds which involve her social position. I protested these two cases, and one of them is still pending. In no case should a pension be set aside without the person affected being given every opportunity to be heard, and that surely is particularly essential when the honour of a woman is involved. I can refer the minister to the cases I have in mind, if necessary, and I have no doubt there are many others. It seems to me that as a general rule where it has been determined that a person is entitled to a pension the decision should not be reversed before the pensioner has been given an opportunity of being heard in some appropriate manner. I earnestly bring these cases to the attention of the minister.

From conversations I have had with soldiers, I find their main objection is that when an appeal is taken they do not know what is going on, they have no chance of presenting their case ,and in the end they are merely told that their appeal is dismissed, without being informed of the reasons which moved the board to reach its decision. None of us would be satisfied to have an appeal before a court dismissed in this way. To a soldier an appeal in the case of treatment is just as important, probably more so than the average appeal to ordinary litigants, and he should be given the same facilities to support his appeal as are accorded in our law courts.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to withdraw my objection to the report of the royal commission not having yet been presented to the House. In view of the statements made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) I would recommend very strongly to the minister that this matter be referred to the royal commission before they make their report. This is the most serious charge which has been levelled against the Pension Board since its inception, and if it is true I think one-half the facts have not been told. As a member of the pension committee for three years past, I have never felt satisfied with the administration of the Pension Act by the Pension Commissioners, and was one of those instrumental in recommending that a royal commission be appointed last year to investigate the workings of the commission. I would again very strongly recommend that this matter be referred to the royal commission.

Mr. BELAND: I will deal for a moment with the observations made by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). I stated that in the first place an appeal was granted when there was divergence of opinion between the doctor in the field and headquarters. Cases have occurred where the doctor in the field has recommended, say, 10 per cent disability. Upon receipt of his report the medical officers of the Board of Pension Commissioners have opened correspondence with him with a view of coming to an understanding, representing, as my hon. friend has stated, that the examiner in the field might perhaps waive his first opinion as regards disability. In some cases he has changed his views and has come to the conclusion that headquarters officials were right. So no divergence ultimately existed between the two. I was asked as a minister to express an opinion on the possibility of an appeal being carried to the appeal board in such a case. My opinion is recorded officially. I stated that when in the first place the examiner in the field reported to headquarters a percentage of disability, and it was not agreed to by headquarters, and if as a result of correspondence the examiner in the field changed his view, then I was of opinion that the divergence having existed originally there was still a right of appeal, even if the examiner in the field and headquarters ultimately reached the same view. I have in mind one particular case that was appealed. The decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners was reversed, but the board refused to carry out the decision of the board of appeal, on the ground that they had ultimately come to an agreement with the examiner in the field. I suppose it is a question for the Department of Justice to decide.

Mr. BOYS: Should there not be further legislation?

Mr. BELAND: Perhaps it is a case for legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON: The minister is a physician; does he think that a board in Ottawa

is in a better position to decide upon the disability of a man say three hundred miles away than the physician who is in charge of the case?

Mr. BELAND: I do not.

Mr. ANDERSON: How is it, then, that they can ask the physician to change his opinion? How can they presume to tell what the disability of a pensioner is when they have not seen the case at all? I have had the commissioners practically tell me that they could decide a pensioner's disability just as well as or better than the man who was in the field.

Mr. BELAND: In some cases the documents on file would be quite sufficient for a proper discussion of the case; it would not be necessary for the patient himself to be observed at headquarters. Medical cases of the same type are frequently characterized by noticeable differences. A typical illness is typhoid, but among a thousand cases of typhoid no two may be exactly the same. In some cases it is possible to come to a decision on the basis of the file only; in other cases it is not.

Mr. ANDERSON: These files really come from the men in the field or are based upon information received from them. I am speaking particularly of the determination of the amount of disability.

Mr. BELAND: I was coming to that. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) argued that when appeal was taken by a man to the appeal board he should be afforded an opportunity to appear before the board in person. Well, in the majority of cases that would be physically impossible; the man might be unable to travel, or he might not wish to come. But there is a provision under which an ex-service man who appeals may be represented or may submit his own case before the board of appeal. If his contention is upheld by the board, the department pays the whole cost; if it is not, he meets the cost himself. This is the first experiment that we have made in providing for appeals from the decision of headquarters. It has been operating only a few months; some decisions have been reversed, and others have been sustained. I have not heard any complaint so far in respect of any case appealed, whether the contention made was maintained or whether it was rejected.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister care to venture an opinion with respect to my remarks concerning the disallowance of pensions without giving the persons affected an opportunity of being heard?

Mr. BELAND: There is certainly a good deal in what my hon. friend says. If a man is discharged from hospital with say a 50 per cent pension and if treatment is continued so that after six months the pensioner is, by his own admission as well as according to the report of the physician, entirely cured, I imagine that in such a case the Pension Board would be justified in discontinuing the pension without calling upon the person concerned to state his objections. On general grounds, however, it is perhaps only fair, especially in the case of widows of men who fell on the other side or who died here as a consequence of their war service, that no pension should be discontinued without the pensioner being given an opportunity of stating his or her case, at least by correspondence. I think the Board of Pension Commissioners would be ready to adopt that procedure. I must point out once more that when hon. members take the attitude that I have some authority in regard to the Board of Pension Commissioners, they are, if I may be permitted to use the word, mistaken. I have no more power than hon. members opposite have; no more influence upon the board than a lawyer would have upon the judges of the Supreme Court if he were arguing a case before them. The Board of Pension Commissioners is an independent tribunal whose decisions are final. Their powers are defined in an act which was unanimously adopted by this parliament. When I suggest to the board that a certain widow is entitled to a pension, they may judge the case on its merits and decide differently without my having any recourse whatever. My powers in this regard are limited to the mere reference of particular cases to them and the request that they give to the application their kind attention, applying to it a generous interpretation of the Pension Act. I am, as it were, the attorney representing before the Pension Board a soldier who has presented his case to me; the board, after examining the file and the correspondence and my recommendation, render a decision, and that is the end of it.

Mr. CLARK: Who is responsible for seeing that the Pension Board carry out the Pension Act—for instance, the recommendations made by the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at the last session and adopted by the House?

Mr. BELAND: The Pension Board is its own interpreter. At the head of the com-

mission is an eminent lawyer; I say that without any hesitation. Col. Thompson is an eminent lawyer. I am not responsible for his appointment, but I am free to admit that he is a lawyer of repute. The other two commissioners are medical men. The pension commissioners interpret the Pension Act as they see fit, and they render their decision according to their interpretation, and I have no power, I repeat, to alter their decisions.

Mr. BOYS: In making the observations I did, it was not for the purpose of criticising the minister at all. I have great confidence in him. I know he is sympathetic so far as the returned men are concerned, and is doing all he can. He has said that he is an attorney, as it were, for the returned man. In that capacity I appeal to him, and I appeal to him also as the responsible minister. If these grievances, and I believe they are grievances, exist and if legislation is necessary to remedy them, the proper person to appeal to is the minister in his capacity as such. I do urge upon him to look into what I have mentioned for it is a very serious state of affairs to have any woman deprived of her pension without being given a chance to be heard at all, even if there were no question of honour involved, and when that is added the situation is accentuated. If the minister wants me to give the cases I can do so. One is pending at the present time. May I also say while I am on my feet that I have confidence in the board. Any matters that I have had to bring to their attention have always received consideration, and in some cases favourable consideration. It is not a criticism of the board or of the minister, but a criticism of the system. I do not think anybody should be deprived of the right without being given the opportunity of being heard.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to hear what is the minister's view with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) to put this matter of appeal in the hands perhaps of district court judges, who could weigh the evidence impartially, hear the parties at the very place where the returned man happens to be located, gather the evidence and perhaps give a decision on appeal which might in some cases, at least, be much more satisfactory.

Mr. BELAND: I have very grave doubts as to the advisability of referring such cases to a district or superior court judge as the case may be. The appreciation of the strength of an application for pension is mainly based on medical evidence. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it is a medical case, and to decide upon such a case in any open court, bearing in mind that the gentleman who sits there as the presiding officer is mainly concerned with law, would not, I believe, give as much satisfaction as might on the surface be expected. I repeat, it is almost exclusively a medical matter, which has to be decided upon by medical experts.

A man dies. He apparently dies of a chest trouble. He has had whilst on service some manifestation of sickness in the chest; he may have had a cough for a few days. He is treated in a hospital for a chest condition, and he dies. The autopsy is made, and it is found that this man suffers from a disease of the spleen which in medical opinion was the principal and only cause of death. Though this man was treated in hospital with pay and allowance, the Board of Pension Commissioners will say that he did not die of the illness for which he was treated because medical opinion says that the principal cause of his death was a spleen affection which could not have been contracted on service. That is only one instance. There are thousands of different features in medical and surgical cases. The cases vary as much as human faces. Though two men may look alike they are not exactly similar, and it is more difficult in medical science to find twin cases than it is to find two people as much alike as twins in the ordinary course. It is mainly a question for the appreciation of medical men. There are difficulties, there are grievances. Some are founded, some are not. It is exceedingly delicate to pronounce upon them one way or the other. My personal view is that when a doubt exists, however remote it may be, the applicant should be given the benefit of the doubt. That is my view expressed in hundreds of memoranda sent to the Board of Pension Commissioners. But, of course, they are in the last analysis the men to decide, and I am powerless to alter their decision.

Mr. MARTELL: After hearing the very able explanation of the minister, I think it is too bad that he himself is not constituted the appellate court because this commission standing there are very apt to view matters purely from the standpoint of the information which they find on their files, without going deeply into the matter. I am very glad that the minister has made the statement that where there is the least semblance of a doubt the applicant should be given the benefit of the doubt. I believe it is not good policy to put into the hands of the Board of Pension Commissioners here at Ottawa the right to have the final say as to whether or not a person shall receive a pension. I believe, if we are going to have responsible government in this

country, that the minister should be the appellate court and I think we all will agree that the present minister would make a very excellent appellate court because his heart would sometimes govern, and I believe in most cases it would not be found to be wrong. It is a grievous fact that it has not been found expedient this year to continue the very excellent Committee on Civil Re-establishment that we had last year, chairmanned by a man who worked day and night to get all the facts and endeavoured in every way possible to see that right was meted out to people who deserved the right. I would urge upon the minister to make that committee a permanent committee of this House so far as it is possible to be made permanent. I would also urge upon him to take steps to have an appellate court created for giving a final decision in these pension cases, and if you cannot go to a court of judges, let us go to the minister himself, because if you go to him you will find that he will be prepared to deal out right where right is due. It is all very well to say that a board of medical practitioners have decided so and so. Lawyers disagree, and it is often said that we are a crooked bunch. Doctors disagree and they bury their mistakes. It is not fair that any medical man should decide upon the absolute merits or demerits of a matter from the purely medical standpoint; considerations of law and equity, and what is right and just, should also be held in mind. All of us probably have in our constituencies cases where men are receiving pensions who do not deserve them, and other cases where people who deserve pensions but have not been granted them. It is absolutely necessary, in my opinion, that there should be an appellate court in cases where there is good ground for an appeal. I believe also an opportunity should be afforded of presenting such matters before a committee of the House of Commons. The minister could do an act of justice to the country, and to the returned men in particular, by continuing the committee of last year so ably presided over by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence and St. George (Mr. Marler).

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not find myself in agreement with the last speaker in his suggestion to make the minister a final court of appeal. My position in that regard is taken largely out of consideration for the minister who, I think, would not want any such job as that wished on him. If that were done I think the minister might well pray to be delivered from his friends. I am of opinion that there should be a court of appeal, in certain cases, such as was provided for last year. However, I would like to ask the minister what action he means to take with regard to the case he spoke of that was appealed —in which he said officially there was a case to appeal, whereas the Pension Board decided there was none. I do not think the authority of the Pension Board should extend to this matter. I do not think they should have the final say as to whether there should be an appeal or not. I think that is over-stepping the authority which was vested in the pension board; I do not think it was ever intended to vest any such power in them. I am becoming more convinced all the time that the charges levelled at the pension board last year were justified in view of the statement of the minister that they are doing things in an autocratic manner. I think we all respect the fairness and judgment of the minister, and feel convinced that he will not come to a decision lightly in a matter of this kind.

Mr. BELAND: In reply to my hon. friend's question I may say that I have given instructions to secure an opinion from the Department of Justice and it will be their duty to decide whether the regulations should be so amended as to permit an appeal where a divergence has existed between headquarters and the examiner in the field in the first place notwithstanding the fact that, as a result of correspondence, headquarters and the local examiner have come to an agreement.

Mr. CLARK: The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Caldwell) seemed to interpret remarks of the minister as declaring that the pension commissioners had given decisions of an autocratic character. I should like to know from the minister himself if that is a correct interpretation of his remarks.

Mr. CALDWELL: I made that remark in reference to the fact that the board had overridden an appeal although the minister had declared that there should be one. That was what my remarks had reference to and I still stand by that.

Mr. BELAND: I shall not use the term "autocratic" although perhaps somebody has merited the appellation.

Mr. CALDWELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. BELAND: I do not want to use the term in this case, but the facts were as I have related. I had a conversation with the chairman of the board on the subject in question and as a result he holds to his view and I hold to mine. As far as the interpretation and administration of the Pension Act is concerned he is supreme; I am only the minister.

Mr. CLARK: Is he autocratic?

Mr. WHITE: Will the minister say if he is in a position to introduce legislation which will deal fairly with the returned soldier at the present time?

Mr. POWER: In reference to the complaint that the Board of Pension Commissioners are autocratic I suggest that we do not proceed to enact other legislation which would perhaps render them more so. Perhaps the remedy would be found in removing the members of the board, and I am sure I will take great pleasure in making recommendations to the Civil Service Commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt that the hon. member would be very glad to see reductions carried out and that he would be prepared to do an awful lot of recommending. The trouble is that the recommendations would all come from one camp. I do not interpret the remarks of the minister as some of the hon. members have done. I remember hearing him say this afternoon that so far as he was able to learn charges against the Pension Board were largely without foundation. I think the minister made that statement; if I am mistaken he will be good enough to correct me.

Mr. BELAND: As far as the charges of conspiracy were concerned. What I said was that there had been different charges levelled against the pension board. There were charges of premeditated conspiracy, for example, and at one of the sittings of the commission of inquiry held in Ottawa it was admitted on all sides that such an accusation could not stand. I think the remark was made by the chairman himself that this charge might be discarded and all parties agreed to that. As to other charges that the board have interpreted too rigidly some clauses of the Pension Act no report has been made to me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not profess to have the intimate knowledge of the charges that the minister has. Apparently, however, all charges of bad or ill faith have disappeared. The matter now to be determined is whether the sections of the act have been properly interpreted. It would seem to me to be perfectly easy for my hon. friend to deal with the question of an appeal. My suggestion to the minister would be to simply make a change in the rules and regulations and provide that an appeal should be subject to his consent and not subject to the consent of the board whose decision is to be appealed from.

Mr. MARTELL: That is good argument.

Mr. MARLER: During the discussion this afternoon reference has been made on several occasions to the Board of Pension Commissioners. It will be remembered that last year I was chairman of the special committee which investigated this case, and when I presented the report of the committee to the House last June I intended to say something with respect to the Board of Pension Commissioners. But the matter was placed under the purview of the royal commission, and therefore I said nothing at that time. But I did think then, and still think, that it is only fair to say that I was in constant touch with the Board of Pension Commissioners for a period extending over very many weeks during last session, and I found them most assiduous in their duties in every respect and most sympathetic to the returned men. I did not think there was any kind of conspiracy, nor do I think now that there was any conspiracy, but I will explain that just in a moment. This question of conspiracy came up before the royal commission. I have not any idea what the report of the royal commission will be. I have not been in touch with them, except on one occasion only, and that occasion was to submit to that self-same commission a memorandum which my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) and I agreed on in this House. The royal commission wanted to see exactly what we agreed upon, so that in the second part of the inquiry it might be dealt with. That is all I know about the matter. I do not know what the royal commission will say, or what their judgment will be, but I know that on the argument which took place before the royal commission on the first scope of the inquiry regarding the conspiracy of the Board of Pension Commissioners, those gentlemen making the charges against the commission more or less withdrew them.

Now let us be fair to the pension commissioners. They have an exceedingly difficult task to perform, and at times it is impossible for them to perform that task to please everybody. I know there are dozens of cases of hardship under the act. I have brought cases before the Board of Pension Commissioners, and have begged and prayed them to let them go through, and they have told me on more than one occasion that they would like, if they could, to grant a certain pension, but, Mr. Chairman, the Board of Pension Commissioners is regulated by the act. The act is there; it was passed by this very House and they cannot go outside of it. Now parts of that act may possibly be unfair. Parts of that act may be cold-

hearted, but if it is a question of the Board of Pension Commissioners introducing sentimentality, they cannot do it. We in parliament framed the act, and if it is not right, let us amend it in such a way as to give the Board of Pension Commissioners and the government sufficient control to give pensions where they may be due, or to bring in sentimentality or compassionate feeling where compassionate feeling or sentimentality should come into consideration. But I do not think we should direct the blame to the Board of Pension Commisisoners, because for my part —and I say it quite frankly and openly— I have found them most considerate and assiduous in their duties, and I do not believe the charge of conspiracy laid against them was well founded at all. That is my opinion, and I think I should give it to the House at the present time.

Mr. CLARK: I would like to ask whether it is the policy of the government to treat patients in military hospitals, or whether the policy of nursing hospitals will be continued and the soldiers placed in hospitals run by private or municipal authorities.

Mr. BELAND: A large number of our patients will ultimately resolve themselves into incurable home patients, and gradually, as the hospitals are being closed, and the process of concentration is proceeded with, we will have to come to this last consideration, how best to care for that residue of men who are disabled for life, chronic cases which cannot be cured. It will be for the minister in charge, if it is not myself, to decide what the proper policy should be in this regard. Evidently the government of Canada is not going to continue to operate fourteen, or even ten, different hospitals in Canada for the active treatment of cases. The process is under way with the object of concentrating, in two, three or four different institutions, all the patients who are now distributed over fourteen institutions. Then it will be for the minister in charge and the government to decide what should best be done in the interest of those soldiers and of the country at large. My hon. friend may have some views and other members may have their own views. It is difficult to say beforehand, but evidently we will have to concentrate, and ultimately use some homes for the soldiers who are now almost chronic cases, and also for a large number of soldiers who, growing in age, and being in distressed circumstances, will require the attention of the public or the government of the country.

[Mr. Marler.]

It would be a mistake to think that, when we are through dealing with the cases that are now actually under treatment, we are through with the problem. I regret to say that the number of applications for treatment is as large this year as last. Men advanced in age, make their appearance with some disability under the name of rheumatism or something else, which, in the opinion of the soldiers themselves, is due to their war service. So that I say that it will be for the department or the government as time goes on to determine what is best to be done.

Mr. CLARK: Am I correct in drawing the conclusion that it is the intention, even though concentration takes place, to keep soldiers together in one institution, and that they will be housed together and not distributed among the municipal institutions?

Mr. BELAND: That is the first step of course. What will be done after a few years, when only a few institutions remain, will be decided at the time.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the House resumed and then took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 25, respecting a certain patent of Arthur R. Wilfley.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 26, to amend the act incorporating "La Société des Artisans Canadiens Francais" (English and French versions).—Mr. Seguin.

Bill No. 27, respecting a patent of Hans M. Olson and Esther Maud Butcher.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—vocational expense, $50,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What activity does this cover?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): This expenditure has been decreasing very rapidly during the last four years. The peak load was carried in 1920, when we had 26,000 returned men undergoing vocational training. This number has been reduced gradually until it now amounts to only 224. The only men now entitled to vocational training are those who are dis-

charged from hospital after treatment. The committee is doubtless aware that after the 1st February, 1920, no returned man was admitted for vocational training unless he had enlisted as a minor, or unless he had been undergoing treatment in a hospital. The fact that only men who are discharged from hospital or who had enlisted as minors can be admitted for vocational training, accounts for the small number now being vocationally trained.

Item agreed to.

Salaries, $4,425,000.

Mr. BELAND: Hon. members will notice a very substantial reduction in this item amounting to $1,000,000 for the next fiscal year. There has also been a very large saving under this head in the present fiscal year. The item "salaries" covers salaries to administrative, clerical, medical, dental, technical and training staffs, nurses, orderlies, ward maids, workshop instructors, social service workers, and dining, kitchen, laundry, farm and garden employees; in a word, all those not dealt with under the short list of Civil Government, numbering 7 or 8, for whom we voted an item this afternoon. The total staff of the department on the 31st December, 1921, was 4,886; on December 31st, 1922, 3,823. I claim, very modestly, of course, credit for this reduction of 1,063.

Item agreed to.

Pay and Allowances—	
Treatment..	$3,000,000
Training..	200,000

Mr. BELAND: This item, Mr. Chairman, is for pay and allowances to inpatients in our hospitals and also to outpatients. No doubt hon. members are familiar with the rates paid, so I will not take up the time of the committee in giving the details. The amounts, of course, vary according to whether the patient is a single man or has dependents. There is a substantial reduction also in this item, amounting in the case of treatment to $500,000, and in the case of training to $200,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose there is no change in the scale of pay and allowances?

Mr. BELAND: There is no change in the scale.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The reduction is owing to the smaller number of men under treatment?

Mr. BELAND: That is so.

Mr. CALDWELL: How much was used of the $3,900,000 voted last year?

Mr. BELAND: I can give my hon. friend the figures for nine months only. For treatment we spent $2,189,700, and for training pay and allowances $263,000.

Item agreed to.

Vocational loans, $15,000.

Mr. BELAND: It will be apparent to hon. members that there is also relatively a very large reduction here of $60,000. This is accounted for by the fact that we have fewer vocational students. The regulations provide for a loan of $500 for the acquisition of tools and equipment by the vocationally trained man to carry on his occupation. If I can trust my memory, we have loaned $630,000 to such men. A very large proportion of these loans has been repaid, the amount now outstanding being in round figures $260,000.

Mr. BROWN: What number of men have taken training?

Mr. BELAND: Two hundred and twenty-four.

Mr. ARTHURS: How many applications have been made for such loans, and how many have been granted?

Mr. BELAND: In 1922, 94 applications were received and 80 granted. For the two years, 1920 and 1921, 2,369 applications were received, and 1,801 granted.

Mr. ARTHURS: Can the hon. minister give the committee the reasons for the disapproval of applications?

Mr. BELAND: I am sorry that I cannot supply the information. I presume that if the official at the head of this branch—who, of course, must use his discretion—came to the conclusion that a vocationally trained man was not very much in earnest, his application would not be approved. In this regard I have never received any complaint.

Mr. BROWN: I am not sure that the minister understood my question. I did not mean the number who took vocational training last year, but the total number who have been trained under this system.

Mr. BELAND: Fifty-one thousand have begun vocational training, of whom 41,000 have completed their course.

Mr. BROWN: That is what I wanted.

Mr. MacLAREN: What was the amount loaned last year?

Mr. BELAND: For the nine months ending December 31—that is all I have the figures for—the amount loaned was $18,403.

Mr. BOYS: Of the amount outstanding, which the minister stated to be something over $200,000, what amount is overdue?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that while it is outstanding, it is not overdue. It is being regularly paid.

Mr. BOYS: None of it is overdue?

Mr. BELAND: Nothing, I am informed.

Mr. BOYS: If that is so, it is a very creditable showing; I would like to be sure of it. What rate of interest is charged?

Mr. BELAND: No interest is charged.

Mr. POWER: May I ask whether every ex-soldier who has undergone vocational training is entitled to this loan?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, he has the right to make application for it, subject to the approval of the official in charge of the branch. A few loans have not been approved, for the reasons I attempted to give a moment ago.

Mr. POWER: Is there any other reason than that stated by the minister, namely, that the deputy minister was not satisfied that the ex-students were really serious?

Mr. BELAND: Not that I know of.

Mr. POWER: Are there any other reasons which would be allowed by the regulations? Is it entirely in the discretion of the deputy minister?

Mr. BELAND: If the vocationally trained man shows a disposition to engage seriously and earnestly in the occupation for which he was trained, the loan is granted. If the responsible official has reason to believe that the man is not in earnest, that he is not really desirous of engaging in the occupation, the loan is not granted.

Mr. POWER: I am asking this question because I know of the case of a man who was refused vocational training because he was not drawing a pension. Must one be drawing a pension in order to take advantage of this loan?

Mr. BELAND: I did not quite catch my hon. friend's question. I thought he was asking whether every ex-service man who had undergone vocational training was entitled to a loan.

Mr. POWER: I was asking that.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. BELAND: I gathered from my hon. friend's last remark that he was asking whether every ex-service man was entitled to vocational training.

Mr. POWER: Not at all.

Mr. BELAND: Only those who are disabled and who fall within the class of pensioners are entitled to vocational training.

Mr. POWER: The minister has misunderstood me. Take the case of a man who has pursued a vocational training course and on making application for a loan is told that he cannot get it because he is not now on pension. There are a number of men who have followed vocational courses but who are not now pensioners.

Mr. BELAND: There is a certain time following the vocational training course within which application for loan must be made. If it is not made within that time, it cannot be considered.

Mr. POWER: I quite understand that. I wish to know the policy of the department in this matter. Does the fact that a man is not drawing a pension prevent him from taking advantage of this loan?

Mr. BELAND: The regulation is very clear; a man who is not drawing a pension cannot be vocationally trained.

Mr. POWER: He could very well have been vocationally trained and have had his pension cut off.

Mr. BOYS: The minister will pardon my insistence, but the information he gives me regarding this $200,000 outstanding is so remarkable and so delightful that I would like to be sure of it. It is very creditable indeed if all these men who have secured loans to the extent of the amount mentioned, of which there is $200,000 outstanding, have paid up so well that no part of the amount is overdue. If that is the case I really think the country should know it; I do not believe there is any other class in the community—business men, professional men or otherwise—who could make such a showing. I should be glad if the minister would confirm the information, which he gave with some little hesitation.

Mr. BELAND: I can only give my hon. friend the information which is supplied to me here. The total amount loaned was $675,856; cash repayments, $207,000; cancelled loans, $73,000; discontinued loans, $161,000.

Mr. BOYS: I think the minister misapprehends my question. I merely wanted

to be sure that of the $200,000 outstanding, none was overdue.

Mr. BELAND: That is my information.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister has stated that a large number of applications for loans were refused on the ground that the applicants could not satisfy the powers that be that their intentions were honest, to put it plainly, or that they intended to go ahead with the trades for which they had been trained. The minister states also, however, that every one of these loans has been promptly repaid and that there are no amounts overdue. In that event it would appear that complaints which have come to my attention that some of these men have been harshly treated and have not been granted loans where they were necessary, are well founded, and that in this matter the department has hewn very close to the line. They have not made a loan without being sure of repayment.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend may have been in receipt of complaints in this regard. I myself have received a good many complaints from returned men in respect to different matters but I do not remember receiving any on this score. If the hon. gentleman has in mind any cases of that kind, I would like to have them submitted to me for consideration.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister must admit that part of the correspondence has not come to his hand. It is not reasonable to suppose that two or three thousand applications for loans would be refused without some complaints being made.

Mr. BELAND: There could not have been that number during the year, because we had only 224 men under training.

Mr. MacLAREN: The minister says that of the amount loaned, $73,000 was cancelled. Does that mean that some loans were waived?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: For special reasons, I presume?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I would like to ask the minister a question in reference to a returned man whose case I have in mind. This is a man who is getting a pension. He has taken some vocational training but would like to farm. In fact, he has bought a farm. What would the department do in the way of giving that man a loan? He wanted me to see what I could do for him, and I think this is an opportune time for me to bring the matter up.

Mr. BELAND: So far as this department is concerned, we are granting loans only to those who have been vocationally trained. My hon. friend is referring, I think, to a soldier who desires to settle on the land.

Mr. PRITCHARD: He has taken vocational training, but would rather go on the farm. He has already bought a farm on his own initiative.

Mr. BELAND: The soldiers who desire to settle on the land, if they are not trained for farming, must undergo training.

Mr. PRITCHARD: But this man has been trained. He was on the farm before he went to the front.

Mr. BELAND: If he wants a loan he must apply to the Soldier Settlement Board, which operates under the Minister of the Interior. The conditions under which such a loan is granted are well known. If this man has already undergone vocational training in our department, the only loan to which he would be entitled would be $500 so far as we are concerned. That would be only for tools and implements to enable him to carry on the vocation for which he was trained.

Mr. PRITCHARD: On what conditions would the money be loaned?

Mr. BELAND: It is repayable in instalments in five years.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was asking about cancellation. Under what circumstances was $73,000 cancelled?

Mr. BELAND: The men were unable to carry out the contract conditions, and the tools were returned.

Item agreed to.

Interest on War Service Gratuity and Administration Funds, $22,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. BELAND: The balances left with the department are constantly increasing. Many of the men who are undergoing treatment do not desire to avail themselves of their pay, and they leave it with the department; their war service gratuity is also turned over to us from the Militia Department. We pay five per cent on that. It is simply a matter of accounting.

Item agreed to.

Unemployment relief, $500,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What amount was paid during last year under this head?

Mr. BELAND: There was quite a large amount spent last year in unemployment relief. First of all, there was an amount of $650,000 which was voted for 1922-23. This amount has been over-expended at the present time, and as was the case last year a further amount will be asked in the Supplementary Estimates for the present fiscal year to cover that over-expenditure. Last year, that is the year that came to an end on the 31st of March, 1922, an amount of over $2,000,000 was spent in unemployment relief. I am glad to be able to convey the information that we are not spending nearly so much as last year in unemployment relief. Hon. members of the committee may like to know for what class of soldier this relief is provided. It is only used for the relief of distressed ex-service men who are suffering from a disability, and are therefore pensioners, but whose pension is insufficient to support them and their families.

Mr. WHITE: How many individuals benefited last year under that distribution?

Mr. BELAND: To the 31st December, 1922, the total number of men assisted was 22,941.

Mr. BOYS: Is the reduction in this item due to fewer applications or to a smaller allowance per man?

Mr. BELAND: Nothing is paid out in cash. The officials of the department in every unit satisfy themselves through their social service visitors that a family is in need of assistance, and the assistance may be provided in the way of rent, fuel, food or clothing. The maximum amount that is being paid out this year is $67 per family per month.

Mr. IRVINE: If this relief is granted only to men suffering from a disability, how does it happen that you are paying less this year than last? Have they died?

Mr. BELAND: Because there are fewer out of employment. That is the only reason I can see.

Mr. IRVINE: Do I understand that it is not for men who are totally disabled, but only for the partially disabled and who are working all the time?

Mr. BELAND: For the partially disabled, also totally disabled, some of them.

Mr. ARTHURS: The minister has said that only pensioners are eligible under this scheme. What about those who have commuted their pension and are not now pensioners?

Mr. BELAND: They are also attended to.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. BOYS: Does the relief come as a result of application or as a result of intervention by local committees? If as a result of application, have there been fewer applications in the last nine months?

Mr. BELAND: It is granted as a result of application. There have been fewer applications than last year by a large number.

Mr. CHURCH: I am sorry to see the minister cutting down the vote for this purpose because if any reduction is to be made it certainly should not be in relief for unemployment. There certainly does exist a large amount of unemployment, especially among the returned soldiers. A large number of these men are not one hundred per cent efficient and after a year or two when they return to regular employment their health goes back on them, and under the existing legislation they cannot qualify for aid because the doctor cannot pass them. Therefore they do not receive anything. In the city from which I come the unemployment situation is just about as bad as it was in 1919, and I do not know what the soldiers who are out of work would do if it were not for the municipal authorities. I am sorry that the minister is curtailing this vote because on the occasion of his visit to Toronto he was very active and did a lot of good work there. Undoubtedly the unemployment situation is very acute in Toronto, as well as in some of the other larger centres of population, because many men flock there from all parts of Canada in the hope of getting work. It has been suggested that it is not necessary at this stage to continue to give out doles but in Toronto we have it on the authority of Dr. Hastings, medical health officer, that the situation demands such aid. Conditions are so bad in fact that the municipal authorities in striking the tax rate have to make provision for relief for the unemployed. The state of unemployment is aggravated by the great amount of sickness which prevails, particularly among the families of returned soldiers.

Item agreed to.

Operating expenses and working capital, $600,000.

Mr. BELAND: This item also shows a decrease of $100,000 for the next fiscal year. Last year we appropriated $700,000 for this purpose. These operating expenses are made up as follows: Telephones, telegrams, postage and car fare; transportation and travelling expenses of staff; stationery and office supplies; insurance and storage; light, heat, and power and water rates; maintenance and repairs to furniture and equipment; automobile

expenses; freight expenses; advertising and publicity, and other general expenses. The expense incurred in connection with the royal commission on Pensions and Re-establishment will also be paid out of this vote.

The working capital is for financing the treatment and medical examination of Imperial and other foreign former soldiers, also the operation of the Imperial Pension office. The total amount which was expended on 31st December, 1922, was $486,187.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the estimate for the expenses of the royal commission?

Mr. BELAND: The sum of $35,000 has been placed in the estimates for that purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any other appropriation elsewhere for that purpose?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): How much was received for the treatment of these patients from other countries last year?

Mr. BELAND: This vote is, to a large extent, carrying itself, because the money that is being advanced for the examination and treatment of former Imperial soldiers is being collected from the Imperial government; but the committee will realize, of course, that we have first to make the disbursement and then collect the money from the Imperial authorities. In answer to my hon. friend from Kingston I may say that on the 31st December, 1922, we had received $404,000 for financing the treatment and medical examination of Imperial and other former foreign soldiers. These accounts are not settled until six or seven months after the expenses have been incurred.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I was under the impression that the amount received was something like $600,000. I would ask what becomes of this money?

Mr. BELAND: I am referring only to the nine months which ended on 31st December, 1922, and, as I have already said, the receipts on that account were $404,000.

Mr. SHAW: Have we a similar arrangement with other countries, for example, with the United States, and under what head shall we find the moneys expended for that purpose?

Mr. BELAND: We also have an arrangement with the United States for the same purpose. They undertake to care for our soldiers, giving them treatment and so on, and their expenditure is refunded by this department. The arrangement is a reciprocal one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: While we are on that subject, can the minister tell us how many of our returned men are now in the United States? The minister has no idea as to the number?

Mr. BELAND: There are quite a number but I am unable to give my hon. friend the exact figures offhand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister has looked at all into the question of the large number of ex-service men who have been leaving this country and going to the United States? Has that been drawn to his attention?

Mr. BELAND: I did not know that a very large number of soldiers had left this country, and I would be sorry to learn that such was the case. However, I have no information on the subject.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend could not tell us how many pension cheques go to Canadians who are now living in the States?

Mr. BELAND: I will be able to give the information when the item for pensions is under consideration. That is an entirely different item from the one we are now considering.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member for Kingston put a question as to what became of the moneys collected. I assume they are paid in the ordinary way to the account of the Receiver General and do not go to the minister's department at all?

Mr. BELAND: The money goes to the account of the Receiver General.

Item agreed to.

Employers' Liability Compensation, $75,000.

Mr. BELAND: We have spent very little in this connection. The total expenditure for the ten months ended January 31, 1923, was $14,816. A large amount is being asked this year although not so large as last year. We think that the employers have not been made aware of the provisions that we made to offset the liability for which the employment of the disabled would make them responsible. The regulations provide that any employer of a disabled man whose disability is over 20 per cent may be refunded any money that he would have to pay in rates of assessment or as compensation on account of employing a disabled man. I think that is a very wise provision. It will help to a very large extent the disabled men who are otherwise precluded from readily finding employment, on account of the employers being very diffident in regard

to using their services for fear of accidents. We are providing this amount, but we have no idea whatever what amount may be spent. It may be $25,000, $50,000, $75,000 or perhaps $100,000. The first consideration we gave to this item led us to ask $175,000, but finding that we spent so little last year, I surmised that perhaps $75,000 would meet the requirements.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the vote started at $175,000. I do not think the policy the hon. member is alluding to is his own creation at all. I have a recollection that we started that some time ago. My recollection is that we had a vote of $100,000 in the year 1921 for the same purpose. I do not think we started at $175,000, nor did the idea start with the minister.

Mr. BELAND: No, I did not say that. I said that last year I asked for $125,000, of which only $14,000 was expended. I was not referring at all to the former administration. This vote was placed in the estimates last year pursuant to an order in council that had been passed covering any liabilities that an employer might suffer by reason of employing a disabled man in his shop.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The vote was put in just the same as any other vote in connection with service already being performed. I forget the exact year in which the policy was inaugurated. I entirely agree with the minister that it is a very good thing. He is generally right when he follows the system adopted by the late government. I should like to know what is being done now with a view to letting the manufacturers know just exactly what the situation is. It is something on which we want to spend money rather than save it, because it means we are getting employment for the returned soldier through this means.

Mr. BELAND: I think that it is now pretty generally known amongst the employers, but the department is taking steps to make this provision known to every employer in the country.

Mr. IRVINE: What provision is being made to check up the returned men who are reported by the employers as coming under this clause?

Mr. BELAND: We have one unit in every province, and the officials in the department in every province are in a position to know exactly what the situation is in connection with all manufacturers who make a claim for a refund from the department on account of these disability cases where the men meet with accidents, or on account of special assessment rates to which the manufacturer may be subject. That is as easy a matter to supervise, I should say, as the unemployment relief, for instance, in every large city. I hope this answers my hon. friend's inquiries.

Mr. CHURCH: This is a very good form of insurance, but there seems to be some doubt as to whether it is well known in the country. It was only in force a very short time last year. Would the minister tell the committee how an employee would make an application of this kind and to whom he would apply? Of course, there are some employers of labour who are patriotic enough to employ these men themselves, but there are some cases where they are not willing to take a man with a disability of 20 per cent. I should like the minister to tell us how they can make these applications. I may say I never heard of any complaint. This is a very reliable form of insurance. Many men suffer more than 20 per cent disability. If a man has not 100 per cent efficiency, he has to take a lower rank in the service, and I would like to ascertain whether this desirable form of insurance is generally known.

Mr. BELAND: There is no need of a special application on the part of the employer. Nobody is excused for ignorance of the law. In this case it is not a statute but an order in council. This order in council has been made known pretty well all over the country by this time. Any employer who employs a disabled man with a disability of over 20 per cent, and on that account becomes liable for compensation and also for a special assessment rate, has a right to come to the department for a refund. He need not make any application.

Mr. CHURCH: Will this sum be sufficient to cover the whole of Canada for one year?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, because however reluctant the employers may be to take in their service disabled soldiers, the experience shows that men with disability of 30, 35 or 40 per cent will not meet with accidents much oftener than the other employees. It may be, as my hon. friend suggests, that the amount is too small. I have no possible means of gauging what amount would be required in this instance. It may be $100,000 or it may be only $30,000. It is purely speculative, because it is based on the accidents with which the disabled employees may meet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The government stands behind the order in council anyway?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the government are now providing themselves with this amount of money?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it goes further than my hon. friend pointed out. Not only are we responsible in the case of accidents, but we also pay the increased premiums to the insurance companies.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, certainly.

Item agreed to.

Sheltered employment, after care, transportation of the blind, burial expenses of the destitute, etc., $375,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Why the increase of $135,000?

Mr. CHURCH: Could the minister let the committee know if the recommendations of the special parliamentary committee as regards the blind have been carried out? I understood from the minister last session that he was to make a further inquiry regarding the compensation to be paid to these men. Six hundred dollars a year is not very much for a man who has lost his sight, especially, in the larger cities, when he has to pay an attendant to conduct him to any work that he has to do. Many of these blind men, now that the war is over, are receiving very little work and still less sympathy. I think the sum recommended by the organization representing the blind was two or three hundred dollars, but they did not get the money. There is another appropriation—I do not think it is this item—of $10,000 which the House passed unanimously last year for the Canadian Institute for the Blind, which do nearly all the work in Canada for the blind soldiers; but they did not get the money; it was held up in the Finance department. This may not come under this item; but something should be done, especially in the larger cities throughout the country, where the blind have to have guides to lead them around the streets. That was the only thing for which the blind asked last year, and which they did not get. I should like to see them get the increase, I think it is about three or four dollars a week.

Mr. BELAND: All the recommendations of the parliamentary committee of last year have been carried out. We have adopted a regulation to provide for an escort in the case of a totally blind man, and also to defray his transportation expenses if, of course, he does not make a play of travelling all the time. I know my hon. friend has taken a special interest in that particular class of returned soldiers, and the country at large, I am sure, shares his views in that regard. The blind are receiving special treatment at the hands of this parliament, and the recommendations that have been made particularly in their behalf have been carried out. Perhaps I might go a little further and give the committee just a few figures in that connection. Hon. gentlemen may be interested to know the number of ex-service men afflicted by total or partial blindness. The total number on record is 2,285, of whom 1,258 are afflicted with blindness on account of loss of one or both eyes, and 1,027 suffer from defective vision, both eyes being retained. Of this number, 158 are in receipt of a 100 per cent pension. It will be interesting, undoubtedly, for the committee to know that 171 of those having defective eyesight have been fully trained. I will bear in mind what my hon. friend (Mr. Church) says on behalf of the blind. I am sure there is no class of war-disabled men that appeals more strongly to hon. members and to myself.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is and has been for some years in the Estimates another appropriation of $10,000 to which my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Church) has referred. It is number 321, and I see it is put in as a grant to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind under agreement with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, authorized by order in council of April 2, 1919. It comes by agreement under the minister's department. My hon. friend from Toronto intimated that for some reason or another this $10,000 had not been paid last year. Perhaps the minister can give us some information in regard to that.

Mr. BELAND: The Auditor General ruled that this amount under the head of Miscellaneous should be paid over to the department for the discharge of their obligations to the National Institute for the Blind. The amount was paid over to our department, and in turn was paid over to the Institute for the Blind. I may say, however, that some of the representatives of that worthy institute came in a delegation to interview the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and myself. They claim that they are entitled to $10,000 as a grant, besides the $10,000 which they should receive under the agreement with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

The representations that they have made to the Minister of Finance and myself have all but convinced us that their contention is probably right. The matter is now under consideration, and it is likely that in the Supplementary Estimates $10,000 further will be provided as the institute claims.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can my hon. friend not say that he is already persuaded and tell us that the money will be given? There is no question about the urgency of this matter or the character of the work that is being done by the institute. I am quite sure my hon. friend agrees. Perhaps, he could make this appropriation just large enough to look after the matter.

Mr. BELAND: I do not want to promise, but I make it a policy of always giving more than I promise.

Mr. CLARK: How much of this vote is to go to sheltered employment, how much to after care, how much to transportation of the blind and how much to burial expenses of destitutes?

Mr. BELAND: For sheltered employment, operation of vetcraft shops and payment of Red Cross societies and similar enterprises, the amount is $320,000; for special tubercular clinics, $15,000; for transportation of the blind, $5,000; and for burial expenses of destitute former soldiers, $10,000.

Mr. CLARK: Does that include the appropriation for the last post fund?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, burial expenses of destitute former soldiers and payment to last post fund.

Mr. CLARK: How much was paid to shops operated by the Red Cross Society?

Mr. BELAND: The sheltered employment, through the Red Cross, is just getting under way. We have concluded some arrangements with the Red Cross societies in Winnipeg, Vancouver and Victoria. So far as St. John and Halifax are concerned, it is only a week ago that a deputation from those cities interviewed me on this very subject, and we have made arrangements with them to open vetcraft shops. In the case of Toronto, for reasons that are unknown to me, the department has been unable to come to a definite agreement with the provincial Red Cross society. The department has therefore taken steps to open a vetcraft shop in that city to replace the shop destroyed last winter. We have secured commodious premises for the purpose on Dundas street, and during my stay in Toronto it was my privilege to inspect them.

[Mr. Beland.]

Sheltered employment is one feature of our work in which the minister as well as the officials of the department are keenly interested, for we realize that in this way we can render real service to men who on account of some disability are precluded from entering the open labour market. We have spent little so far in that direction, and the amount which is now being asked is large comparatively, but as far as I am concerned I hope we will spend it all—of course, in a manner to secure the best results. I wish to see established in every large city in Canada a vetcraft shop where problem cases can be employed during a certain number of hours each day at liberal rates of remuneration, for this is not entirely a philanthropic enterprise; it is somewhat of an economic undertaking.

The agreement which we have made with the Red Cross society will, I think, commend itself to every hon. member. It provides that the government shall pay 85 per cent of all capital expenditure and the provincial division of the Red Cross 15 per cent, the equity in the equipment and buildings to remain in both parties in proportion to the percentage of expenditure contributed by each.

These vetcraft shops will be under the direction of a committee of three members appointed by the Red Cross Society. This committee will have control of the type of occupation, the rate of remuneration, the purchase of supplies, the disposal of the product, the framing of disciplinary measures, and the admission of men to the shops. The Department of Soldier's Civil Re-establishment may appoint two members of its staff to act in an advisory capacity, but the final control in this instance remains with the Red Cross Society. A board of admission, composed of three doctors, two appointed by the department and one by the society, is to be established in connection with each workshop. This board is to decide what cases shall be admitted to the shop, the nature of the work assigned to each man, the hours of employment, and the termination of the employment on medical grounds. It will be readily recognized that this is absolutely indispensable in dealing with men suffering from disability, or who may be threatened with a recurrence of disability, and who being paid by the hour might be tempted to work longer than would be good for their health.

While we regard this as an economic undertaking, we do not expect that it will be self-supporting. It would be very satisfactory if it were, but I think it is too much to expect this. At all events the department, in view of the representations made to it by the Red

Cross society, has agreed to make good any deficit to the extent of 75 per cent, it being always understood that no more than $25 per man per month will be contributed by the department.

As I said a short time ago, such an agreement has been arrived at with the provincial Red Cross society in some of the provinces. In others, it has been impossible so far to induce the provincial branch to accept the proposition. We are not at all deterred by this failure, and are determined to provide employment for this class of disabled men. We have succeeded in establishing a vetcraft shop in Toronto, and it may be that in the course of a few months we will pass it over to the provincial Red Cross branch.

It seemed to me desirable to furnish this information to the committee, because it relates to a somewhat new feature of the work of the department—work which I think is becoming more necessary as the years go by.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister state what portion of this fund has been earmarked for particular vetcraft shops operated by the Red Cross society?

Mr. BELAND: A sum of $320,000.

Mr. CLARK: I know. But taking, for instance, the vetcraft shops established in Toronto and Vancouver, how much will be paid to each of those shops?

Mr. BELAND: Not until operations have been carried on for a number of months shall I be in a position to give that information. Of course, on how favourably we can dispose of the product of those shops, will depend the economic outcome of the work. The amount is in a bulk sum because we have concluded agreements only with three branches of the provincial Red Cross, and in all the other instances, with the exception of St. John and Halifax, we are carrying on the work ourselves on a more or less limited scale. But the intention is to extend these vetcraft shops and so provide more and more employment for this class of disabled soldiers, in the expectation that if the shops are not self-supporting, at least there will be relatively only a small deficit to be met by the department.

Mr. IRVINE: Do these vetcraft shops explain the increase of $135,000?

Mr. BELAND: That is the explanation. The increase is for the purpose of providing sheltered employment to the extremely disabled.

Mr. CLARK: Are any other steps being taken by the government to secure employment for the very large number of disabled soldiers who are at present untrained and unemployed?

Mr. BELAND: We have in every unit a section known as the unemployment and relief section. When a disabled returned man applies for relief because he lacks employment it is the duty of the officials of that unit to seek employment for him. Last year we provided employment for 18,000 of these applicants throughout Canada.

Mr. CLARK: I am aware of that. But the method is unsatisfactory, because some of these men are not able to compete in the open labour market; even though they secure employment they cannot retain it for any considerable length of time. I had hoped that under this item the government would aim to secure some permanent employment or training for the whole body of returned soldiers who are disabled and unable to compete in the open labour market.

Mr. BELAND: I assure my hon. friend that we are exerting every effort to secure employment for those who are disabled. In 1922 we had 35,000 applications for employment. We placed 18,000 of these; 13,000 applications were withdrawn, and there is a pending placement balance of 4,504. We are endeavouring to secure employment for these in our shop. We do not want to venture upon this vetcraft employment on too large a scale, but if it proves satisfactory we will extend it so that in a year or so we shall be in a position to procure employment for disabled men who cannot find it elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK: How many disabled men are there who are unemployed?

Mr. BELAND: I have no exact date.

Mr. CHURCH: The least the country could do for the returned soldier who dies destitute is to provide him with a decent burial. The officers of the department should be instructed to see to it that in a case of that kind the necessary arrangements should be made—whether the funeral is to be a military one, whether there is to be a band or not, and so on. The other day a soldier who had been under treatment in a hospital in Toronto was transferred to London and died there. The body was kept in a morgue or undertakers, I believe, or in a box of some kind, for four weeks; nobody seemed to do anything about providing a decent burial. Friends in Toronto took the matter up with the municipal officials, but nothing could be done. The military authorities were appealed to, but they said he did not come under the last post fund,

or in some way did not come under the regulations of the department provided in such cases, so that nothing could be done. It was proposed to make a house to house canvass to get the money with which to bury him. The city authorities finally said they would look after the matter, and after a good deal of correspondence the burial took place. I hope that the D. S. C. R. officers throughout Canada will receive instructions so that there will be no doubt about how to proceed in matters of this kind, and so that a few paltry dollars will not stand in the way of a destitute soldier being given a decent burial. There should be no conflict between the military authorities, the municipal authorities and the D. S. C. R. in the matter of burying a man who served over four years in France, who had been out of work, and who had a wife and four very small children.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does the liability compensation apply to men who may be engaged in work in the sheltered employments?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will there not be some difficulties arising in that connection? I take it that accidents can occur in connection with the sheltered employments under the Red Cross just as they can in other workshops. Will provision not be made for compensation in the case of accident, as is done under the compensation provisions of the different provinces?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend's suggestion may be well thought out, but the vetcraft shops are being operated by the Red Cross society under an agreement. If claims such as my hon. friend refers to should be presented to the department, I suppose they would be open for consideration.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have no doubt that the minister has given great care to the preparation of this item and that he has been interested, as many members of the House have been, in the vetcraft shops. But he has not given us any information as to the approximate loss involved in the operation of similar shops which have been in existence for a number of years, and I would like to have that information. I would also ask whether the minister has made any special provision since taking office for the care of neurological patients, which constitute, after all, our most serious problem so far as the returned men are concerned.

Mr. BELAND: The vetcrafts to which I have referred have been in operation only a few weeks.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. ARTHURS: There were some operated two or three years ago, one notably in Hamilton.

Mr. BELAND: None of these shops was self-supporting.

Mr. ARTHURS: To what extent were they not?

Mr. BELAND: I have not that information at hand. This afternoon I gave some information with regard to the cases in our mental institutions. The number has very largely increased, whereas the number of cases in other hospitals for general treatment has decreased. These neurological cases are being treated mainly in two hospitals, one at Ste. Anne and the other at Westminster, Ontario.

Mr. ARTHURS: Unfortunately I was not able to be here this afternoon; if the information is on Hansard, I will not ask the minister to give it a second time. I should be quite willing to accept the figures given with regard to these hospitals; I have no doubt that the neurological cases are being well looked after by the department. There is a class of cases that has come before the committee quite frequently in previous years, and that is the man who is not necessarily ill in the hospital but has a recurrent disability of this nature. What has been done to take care of that class? They are the most difficult cases for the minister and the country.

Mr. BELAND: The regulations in this connection are very elastic. We are far, I think, from being severe when it comes to granting treatment, especially in nervous and mental cases. It will occur to every hon. gentleman how difficult it is some years after a man is discharged to attribute a mental disability to war service, but in every instance we give the man the benefit of the doubt, and that accounts for the number of mental cases in our mental institutions.

Item agreed to.

Medical advisory and appeal boards, $50,000.

Mr. CHURCH: Is the minister contemplating any change of policy with regard to the Christie street hospital, Toronto? This hospital is serving a most useful purpose. I hope there will be no change in policy, and that the government will see its way clear to keeping it open for another year at least.

Mr. BELAND: I can assure my hon. friend that we have no intention, at the present time at least, of discontinuing the Christie street hospital; on the contrary, it is for the time being the policy of the department not only to keep it open but even to conce-

trate there patients from other institutions. This has been done because there were a large number of vacant beds at the Christie street hospital.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I have had a case referred to me which I would like to look into and bring before the minister. It refers to the Medical Advisory Board, and I would ask the minister if he would be good enough to allow this item to stand.

Mr. BELAND: Of course I do not want to refuse any reasonble request of my hon. friend, but so far as the Medical Advisory Board is concerned, we discussed it lengthily this afternoon. A number of hon. members have shared in the discussion and a good deal of light has been thrown upon the subject. As a matter of fact, the subject has been almost exhausted. I may say that no money has been spent so far under this item. It is a revote. The Medical Advisory Board has been sitting for a little time, but no bill of expenditure has yet been furnished.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): If I shall have an opportunity of bringing up the case on the Supplementary Estimates. it will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, certainly.

Mr. BOYS: The hon. member for Fort William, the former Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Manion) is not here, and will probably want to speak. The minister has passed about $12,000,000 since 3.30 this afternoon, and it seems to me it would not be amiss if he consented to the request of the hon. member for Kingston and let this matter stand.

Mr. BELAND: I have no intention of refusing the request, but perhaps I might suggest this: There is an item of $32,000,000 for pensions to come up, and I can assure my hon. friend that he will have ample opportunity of discussing any feature of the work of this department on that item.

Mr. HUMPHREYS: What steps have been taken to advise the returned men that they have access to this appeal board?

Mr. BELAND: No special steps have been taken so far because no publicity expenditure has been incurred. The intention was to await the report of the royal commission on Pensions and Re-establishment so that all the information could be supplied in pamphlet form. I may say to my hon. friend that whenever a case comes before the department where it has been found necessary to refuse an application, the man is notified that if he so desires he may appeal, and the proper machinery and the procedure is set out for him. I know that in numberless instances in the last three or four months I have written back to applicants setting out what the procedure would be if they desired to appeal.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Under section 4 of the report of the special committee appointed last session on soldiers' re-establishment, there was a recommendation in regard to publicity of this board of appeal. Just what steps have been taken in regard to following out this recommendation of this special parliamentary committee?

Mr. BELAND: I have just explained to my hon. friend that we were awaiting the report of the royal commission before all that information was conveyed to the veterans. The report is not in yet, but as soon as it comes in we will undertake to supply in pamphlet form, I suppose to every pensioner, and every returned man, if it is possible, the necessary information. If the report is going to be much delayed, we shall take some means of diffusing the information through some of the veterans' newspapers.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

The administration of the Act respecting Food and Drugs, Honey and Maple products, and Opium and Narcotic Drugs, $90,800.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give us a little information on this vote. I have a few questions I want to ask having reference to the administration of the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. Is it the intention of the minister to bring down an amendment correcting an error that occurred in an amendment to the act last year which makes it exceedingly difficult to secure convictions under this act? I think the minister will recall some communications I had with the department, I think with the minister himself, during the year regarding it. For the moment I think the section in question was in number 21. I submitted to him the opinion of one of the chiefs of police and it was pointed out, I know, in the reply that there had been an oversight, or that something had been left out, in draughting the amendment in question.

Mr. BELAND: At the present time I do not recollect what the particular point was that my hon. friend brought to my attention but I may inform him that it is my intention to submit to the House, a little later in the session, a consolidation of the different opium and narcotic acts that have been passed by

this parliament. Therefore in that consolidation the little oversight to which he refers will undoubtedly be remedied.

Mr. WHITE: Last year provision was made in the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act whereby the deportation should be carried out, under certain circumstances, of orientals found guilty of infringing the law. Can the minister tell us how many deportations of orientals have been effected?

Mr. BELAND: In complying with my hon. friend's request for information on one particular feature of the operation of the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, I might give to the committee some details as to the number of prosecutions which have been carried out by the department. During the ten months of the present fiscal year, ended 31st January, 1923, the total number of prosecutions was as follows:

British Columbia, not including Vancouver; five illicit dealers other than Chinamen, 145 chinamen. Vancouver: eight other than Chinamen; 14 Chinamen.

Alberta: two doctors; 3 dealers other than Chinamen; 26 Chinamen.

Saskatchewan: one dealer other than Chinamen; 10 Chinamen.

Manitoba: two druggists; 16 dealers other than Chinamen; 6 Chinamen.

Ontario, not including Toronto: one veterinary surgeon; 9 dealers other than Chinamen; 52 Chinamen. Toronto: one druggist; 9 dealers other than Chinamen; 37 Chinamen.

Quebec, not including Montreal: one druggist; 21 dealers other than Chinamen; 4 Chinamen. Montreal: ten doctors; 7 druggists; 55 dealers other than Chinamen; 124 Chinamen.

New Brunswick: one doctor; 2 dealers, no Chinamen.

Nova Scotia: thirteen Chinamen; no others.

Prince Edward Island: none.

This gives a total of 13 doctors, 11 druggists, 1 veterinary surgeon, 129 dealers other than Chinamen, 431 Chinamen, or a grand total of 585 convictions.

Mr. WHITE: How many of the Chinamen were deported?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that about 30 Chinamen have been deported, and that 200 are awaiting deportation.

I have also a mass of information in connection with the seizure of opium lamps and pipes, decks of opium and other drugs like cocaine, morphine, heroin, and so on. I do not suppose it is of any interest to the committee to have all those details.

The importation and exportation of narcotic drugs are under license. During the ten months referred to we have issued 161 import licenses, 38 export licenses, 108 wholesale druggist licenses, and 55 retail druggist licenses to manufacturers.

[Mr. Béland.]

I also have here a table the details of which, sad as it is, should be given to the committee. The table gives a survey of the Dominion and an estimate of the number of addicts in Canada at the present time. It is claimed that there are in British Columbia 2,250 addicts; in Alberta, 350; in Saskatchewan, 250; in Manitoba, 500; in Ontario, 1,800; in Quebec, 3,800; in New Brunswick, 250; in Nova Scotia, 300; and in Prince Edward Island, none. These figures give a total of 9,500.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister kindly state upon what this estimate is based so that we may have some idea of the authority for it?

Mr. BELAND: It is based on reports which are constantly coming into the department, mainly from the officials of the Royal Mounted Police. We also secure information from the various religious bodies, from the charitable organizations, from the municipal councils, and different people who take great interest in the operation of this act.

Mr. STEVENS: May I also ask the minister if any further steps have been taken to bring about closer co-operation, under the International Conference, towards the suppression of the export of narcotic drugs from other countries? I am not speaking of exportation from Canada, because we do not produce the drugs here, but from Germany, France, where a good deal is manufactured, India, and other countries where it largely originates.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, we are in contact with the League of Nations in this connection. Not very long ago the deputy minister of the department was in Washington in conference with the authorities over there. There is a very heavy traffic, it is assumed, of narcotics, between the United States and Canada. At times it has been supposed that New York was the distributing centre in North America, but it is not an easy task to discover where the distributing centre is. The opinion is now more or less prevalent that Montreal would be the distributing centre. Narcotic drugs are imported clandestinely into Canada by all possible human and inhuman devices. The regular traffic of course, is under control and closely checked. I could tell the House the amount of cocaine and the amount of morphine which has been imported into Canada and also exported, but that amount has been considerably reduced in the last five or six years. The clandestine importation has been on the increase, and it is exceedingly difficult to control. All I can say is that I am not

thoroughly conversant with all the devices that are being resorted to, in order to unearth the illicit traffickers and dealers. The matter is principally in the hands of the Mounted Police in every large city, especially in Montreal and Vancouver. We have secured a large number of convictions and collected a certain amount in fines. We have secured penalties to the extent of over $200,000, of which we have been able to collect only $15,000. We are deporting Chinamen as fast as we can. We are making very strenuous efforts to check this very undesirable traffic.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In the case of drug addicts, many of whom are young girls innocently led into the habit, could the minister tell me what efforts are put forth to effect a cure of these victims? Is any systematic effort put forth by the department?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend will realize that this matter is principally in the hands of the provincial authorities through their social charitable institutions, and in some cases mental institutions. I must confess that the federal Department of Health has not put forth very great effort in this direction because we realize that it does not come principally under our jurisdiction.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I notice further on in the estimates that there is a considerable grant given to the provinces in connection with venereal diseases, the Dominion authorities working in conjunction with the provinces. Would it not be a good step for the Dominion authorities to work in conjunction with the provinces in this matter?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, there is such an item for the prevention of venereal diseases, but the subject we are dealing with at the present time is entirely different. I do not say that it would not be proper policy to enter into an agreement with the provinces in this regard, but social work is in the hands of municipalities and provinces.

Mr. STEVENS: I am very pleased to hear the statement made by the minister, and I desire to say that my experience with his officials and the department having this matter in charge would indicate that every effort is being made to curb this frightful traffic. There is one thought I would like to bring forward just now and it is this: My observation and study of this problem leads me to the conclusion that the energy of those administering the law, both provincially and from a federal standpoint, should be concentrated more to destroying the central distributing ring to which he has referred. It is of very little effect to secure a conviction against an ordinary distributor, or, as we term him, drug peddler, and it is rather strange that after some years of effort I cannot recall any very prominent trafficker being convicted, or even prosecuted. I think the Department of Justice controls our Mounted Police, and if the minister would give instructions to his department, and the ministers would give instructions to the other departments, that the federal officers should be requested to co-operate with the provincial or local officers in a definite manner, with the idea of discovering the central distributing ring, good results might be obtained. There is no question that in Vancouver and Montreal very strong groups exist. It is rumoured that sometimes fairly prominent citizens may be involved. It matters not to me how prominent a citizen may be, if he is in any way involved in this nefarious traffic, he should not only be exposed,, but the utmost limit of the law, including the lash, should be administered. There have been somewhat strained relations between the different police authorities, such as the Mounted Police, the local police and the provincial police. I know in my province that is the case. Not necessarily strained, but, shall I say, there is a lack in cordial co-operation. This matter is too serious to allow any petty red tape to interfere with the most vigorous administration. I should like to bring that to the attention of the minister. Apropos of that, I notice in the paper to-day the report of a speech delivered by the Attorney General of British Columbia before the Anti-Narcotic Drug League just recently formed, I believe, on the Pacific coast, in which he states that he had been in communication with the minister, and some definite plans had been arrived at to deal with this traffic. Perhaps the minister could inform the committee just what steps had been taken between himself and the Attorney General of British Columbia in this regard.

Mr. BELAND: Since I have been at the head of the department, our efforts have never been abated for one moment in the effort to secure a closer co-operation between the municipal, provincial and our own police, in the work of suppressing illicit traffic in drugs. Whether we have achieved anything or not I might hesitate to say. I may say frankly that there is a good deal of rivalry between the provincial, the municipal and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. Each of those worthy bodies claim that they have special immunity of their own, which they will not allow any others to infringe; but if it were possible, as my hon. friend has suggested, to effect that co-operation, our work

would be more efficient and greatly increased. We have in some respects, though, made some progress in this connection. As regards the co-operation of the national league for the suppression of the traffic, I have also heard a rumour that there was such a league in process of formation, but it is in the infant stage, I am sure. I have no information, whatever, on that score. If it is a worthy association, composed of men of responsible character and standard, we shall be willing, of course, to avail ourselves of its service and co-operation.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the minister did not quite catch my last question, which was in regard to the public statement of the attorney general before this league in Vancouver, when he intimated that something of a definite character had been brought about between himself and the minister by recent correspondence. I was wondering if the minister could give the committee any information on that point.

Mr. BELAND: Nothing that I am aware of.

Mr. NEILL: The minister stated, a few minutes ago, that it was his intention to consolidate the Drug Act this year. In that event, I would suggest that he pay some attention to the wording of those sections of the act dealing with the deportation of those convicted, because, if I am not very much mistaken, it was found last year in British Columbia that a number of Chinamen convicted could not be deported on account of the terms under which they had been convicted. It appears that if they were sent to jail, they could be deported; but if they were sentenced to a heavy fine, and in default of payment, jailed, they could not be deported. I think if the minister will look into the matter, he will find that a trivial amendment would remedy the situation. I know a number of those convicted got off on habeas corpus for some reason of that kind.

I would also ask the minister to take into cognizance the necessity for increasing the severity of the penalty. I noticed in the press the other day that in Great Britain they have taken power to give men no less than ten years for trafficking in these drugs.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand from the minister that fines to the extent of $200,000 have been imposed, while only $15,000 have been collected. Where a fine is not collected, is the person fined sent to prison instead?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, the term of imprisonment is, of course, extended proportionately, and it is so stated in the statute. One section will provide for a penalty consisting of so much in money and a term of so many months in prison. In case of failure to pay the penalty in cash, the man is retained longer in jail.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand this traffic has been growing from year to year, and that it never was so serious as it is at the present moment. How is it then that the appropriation asked for is $20,765 less this year than last year?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that though this traffic has been on the increase during the last few years, lately, during the last eight or ten months, to our great satisfaction, some decrease has been shown. There is, indeed, a decrease in the amount of the item; but it was arranged that a part of the amount, which was formerly paid out by the department as expenses to the Royal Mounted Police, would be paid from now on by the Justice department, under which the police operate.

Mr. JACOBS: So that the money is expended from some other quarter.

Mr. BELAND: Certainly.

Item agreed to.

Proprietary or patent medicines, $5,000.

Mr. JACOBS: What is this for?

Mr. BELAND: This is to control the sale of proprietary and patent medicines, which can be sold only after a license has been obtained from the department. A number of samples are being collected and analysed to find out whether the patent medicine which is offered for sale corresponds exactly with the formula submitted for approval and approved. There is, in this connection, for the issuing of licenses an advisory board which exists under statute and which costs about $2,000 a year.

Item agreed to.

Pollution of boundary waters, $2,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What waters has the minister cleaned up since the last vote?

Mr. BELAND: We have spent no money out of the $5,000 voted last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are the waters still standing dirty?

Mr. BELAND: No. This is to co-operate with the International Joint Commission in the enforcement of any rules and regulations that they may make in regard to public health.

Mr. CALDWELL: We have a serious situation on the border line between New Brunswick and the state of Maine where the St. John river is on the boundary on the upper waters of the river. On the Canadian side of the river and on the lower reaches of the river where it runs through New Brunswick, we are strict with our mill owners as regards putting sawdust and refuse into the water, because the salmon are killed thereby. On the upper reaches of the river, where one side of the river is bounded by the state of Maine, we have no control of the United States sawmills. I should like to know if our representative on the International Joint Commission could not take this matter up and have some agreement made with the United States authorities that they will compel the sawmill owners in the state of Maine to burn their sawdust or dispose of it in some other way than by putting it into the river. This does not affect the fish in the United States part of the river, because just below where the St. John river becomes the international boundary are the Grand Falls on the river, and no salmon can go up over those falls. Therefore, there are no salmon there. But this sawdust flows down and pollutes the river where it runs through New Brunswick entirely, and is very disastrous to salmon. This has been a very important question with us for years. We have taken the matter up, but so far we have not been able to get any relief. I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), and he said that something would be done. The situation is a delicate one, but something should be done in the matter by the United States authorities. I would like our representative on the International Joint Commission to take this matter up, and I hope the minister will bring it to his attention.

Mr. BELAND: I will take the necessary steps to have this matter brought to the attention of my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe). I think it is a proper subject for the consideration of the International Joint Commission.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am aware of what my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) has referred to, and I know that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is taking very good care to fine any of our lumbermen who may be caught throwing sawdust and other mill rubbish into the St. John river where that is the international boundary. Complaint has been made to the authorities on many occasions that while fines are imposed on our Canadian lumbermen their rivals in the state of Maine are left free to pollute the river and so destroy the fish. I hope that the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Health will look into the matter as soon as possible and take the necessary steps to make our American friends respect the law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, the International Joint Commission is very largely a court, and the hon. minister can easily have this matter looked after by laying a complaint before the commission. I have no doubt he will do so.

Mr. BELAND: Certainly.

Item agreed to.

Marine hospitals, including grants to institutions assisting sailors, $110,000.

Mr. BELAND: Mr. Chairman, my long list of decreases is now exhausted, and I have to present an item showing an increase of $15,000. This is accounted for by the natural increase in shipping after the war and the additional amount required for defraying the salaries of the physicians, the cost of board and the treatment of distressed mariners. As a matter of fact I think that the $95,000 voted last year will be barely sufficient to cover our expenses up to the 1st of April next, and we may have to look after a trifling deficiency in the supplementaries. All the marine hospitals have been closed with the exception of one at Sydney and another at Lunenburg. Provision is made at contract rates for the treatment of sick mariners at local hospitals, or, where there are none, at boarding houses. The dues collected from ships are more than sufficient to defray the expenses.

Mr. STEVENS: There has been some complaint from shipping concerns that the dues are too high. Would the minister therefore state what is the comparison between the dues collected and the amount expended, so that we may be informed on the point? Would the minister also kindly give me figures showing the distribution of these cases in the hospitals at the port of Vancouver, which is one of our leading ports?

Mr. BELAND: The expenditure for the ten months ending 31st of January amounted to $94,327, while $130,000 was collected in dues. As for the other part of my hon. friend's inquiry, the following hospitals in British Columbia receive a grant from the department in return for taking care of our patients: Esquimalt, Sailors' Club and Institute; Vancouver, the Vancouver Sailors'

Home; Victoria, the Victoria Seamen's Institute.

Mr. STEVENS: Does not the department under this vote pay the hospitals that care for these sailors?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, we pay for the treatment of sailors at the hospitals. Let me supplement the information. In British Columbia the following hospitals receive sailors and are paid by the department: Anyox, General Hospital; Chemainus, General Hospital; Ladysmith, General Hospital; Nanaimo, Nanaimo Hospital; New Westminster, Royal Columbian Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital; Ocean Falls, Ocean Falls Hospital; Prince Rupert, General Hospital; Union Bay, Cumberland Hospital; Vancouver, Vancouver General Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital; Victoria, St. Joseph's Hospital and City Isolation Hospital.

Mr. STEVENS: Could my hon. friend give the number of cases and the amount of money expended in Vancouver? I am not particular about the others.

Mr. BELAND: In Vancouver: St. Paul's Hospital, board and treatment, 3,017 days at $3, ambulance, $125—total, $9,176; Vancouver General Hospital, board and care 424 days at $3, treatments, 56 at $3, ambulance $10—total $1,450. Victoria: Isolation Hospital, board and treatment 41 days at $5, nursing $119—total $324; St. Joseph's Hospital, board and treatment 1,165 days at $3, ambulance $11.50—total $3,506.50; Victoria General Hospital, board and treatment, 792 days at $3, ambulance $7.50—total $2,383.50.

Item agreed to.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts; public health in other districts: Tracadie and D'Arcy Island Lazarettos, and Public Works Health Act, $250,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: How many lepers are there in the Tracadie lazaretto? Have any new cases arisen during the past year? What is the name of the medical officer, his residence and his salary.

Mr. BELAND: At the Tracadie lazaretto there are six male lepers and five females. The physician in charge there is Dr. Langis. Only one case developed during the past year; it was brought from Montreal.

Mr. STEVENS: A Chinaman?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: What comes under the Public Works Health Act in this item?

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. BELAND: We have an inspector in the West who sees that proper sanitary conditions are maintained in connection with the public works carried on by the government. Dr. Clendennan, with headquarters at Edmonton, is responsible for the western district. The eastern district is looked after from Ottawa.

Mr. MacLAREN: May I ask whether the medical officer at the Tracadie lazaretto has had the opportunity of visiting any clinics or any lazarettos in other parts of the continent? I understand that advances have been made in the treatment of leprosy in the last few years.

Mr. BELAND: I know that a certain oil—chaulmoogra, I think it is called—has been very much praised as a treatment for leprosy. It has been applied to the six cases at the British Columbia lazaretto with encouraging results. I am not aware that Dr. Langis has visited any institution on this continent in connection with the treatment of leprosy. I do not know the gentleman. He has been in charge for many years, and I would presume that he has taken good care to follow the progress of science in this connection.

Mr. MacLAREN: The matter would involve considerable time and expense. I think the remuneration of the medical officer at the Tracadie lazaretto is very small.

Mr. BELAND: I think his salary is about $2,800. I can give my hon. friend the exact figure if he wants it.

Mr. MacLAREN: I suggest to the minister that he consider the advisability of affording opportunity to the officer under these circumstances to visit some of the other lazarettos on this continent.

Item agreed to.

Department of Health—immigration medical inspection, $50,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In view of the immigration that is coming, or rather not coming, to this country, does the minister not think that he could save money here? Is there any use in maintaining a staff that is doing nothing?

Mr. JACOBS: The object of these institutions is to keep them out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then let us get rid of the staff entirely.

Mr. BELAND: The number of immigrants inspected during the year ended 31st March, 1922, was 63,743, at the different ports in the following numbers: Quebec, 41,000; St John, 8,900; Halifax, 7,400; Montreal, 797;

Sydney, 452; Vancouver, 1,600; Victoria, 1,500; New York, 1,600. The number of immigrants who entered Canada by ocean ports during the nine months period from April 1 to December 31, 1922, and were medically inspected, was as follows: Quebec, 31,717; Montreal, 171; Halifax, 2,164; St. John, 3,086; North Sydney, 1,311; Sydney, 8; Vancouver, 631; Victoria, 454; U. S. ports—Boston and New York, 1,723; total, 41,265. The number of non-immigrants admitted at these ports and medically inspected was 13,405.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister refers to immigrants and non-immigrants. What was the number of actual immigrants? Never mind the non-immigrants.

Mr. BELAND: The total number of immigrants examined was 41,265.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How does this vote of $50,000 compare with the vote when we were having from 150,000 to 160,000 immigrants coming in?

Mr. BELAND: I have not the figures for past years. Last year the amount was the same.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Is there any medical inspection of the immigrant before he leaves the country from which he comes to Canada, or does the inspection take place only upon his arrival here.

Mr. JACOBS: He is inspected twice.

Mr. BELAND: There is a very superficial examination on the other side. We have only one medical official there.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What is his name?

Mr. BELAND: Dr. Jeffs. He has been in charge for a number of years. This question was discussed in the House some years ago. I remember myself when sitting where my hon. friend sits, and feeling quite comfortable I can assure him, asking the then Minister of Immigration if he did not think it advisable to examine immigrants on the other side before they boarded the ship, and he explained to me, very plausibly, that he did not think it would be advisable to do so, that we should make our medical examination on this side. He very wisely pointed out that it was questionable whether our inspection could be carried on in countries like Belgium, for instance, or Holland. There might not be any difficulty as far as Great Britain is concerned, but many of our immigrants for years past have come through the ports of Rotterdam and Antwerp and I do not think we could subject a man who boards the ship at these ports to a medical examination over there for the very obvious reason we have no power at all to enforce any regulations either at Rotterdam or Antwerp.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that every immigrant has to be examined by the ship's physician before he comes aboard, and that if he is not in good health when he arrives in this country, the shipping company must take him back at their own expense?

Mr. BELAND: It is a fact.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Where is this officer who makes the medical examination located?

Mr. BELAND: Mainly in Liverpool, but he often goes to Antwerp and Rotterdam, which are the main continental ports through which our immigrants come.

Mr. CALDWELL: How many immigrants were turned back who failed to pass the medical examination last year?

Mr. BELAND: During the last ten months 433 immigrants were rejected.

Item agreed to.

Medical research standardizing and testing laboratory, $15,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where is this laboratory?

Mr. BELAND: In the Department of Health on Elgin street.

Mr. CHURCH: I think it would be a good thing if the government would lay down a policy such as has been done in the United States and Great Britain, and in Australia, of giving financial aid to those Canadians who through their skill, industry and professional ability help medical science—a policy whereby young doctors and students of research who make an important discovery such as Dr. F. G. Banting and Mr. C. H. Best made in discovering the insulin treatment for diabetes, should receive some recognition. I have been a member of the Toronto General Hospital Board for seventeen years, and I know that up to a short time ago nothing could be done for a man suffering from diabetes. He simply wasted away and died, but now owing to Dr. Banting's discovery most of these cases will be eventually saved.

I think something should be provided in the Supplementary Estimates or some substantial financial aid be given to men like Dr. Banting and Mr. Best, and Professor McLennan who made important helium discoveries, and to other distinguished Canadian scientists. That is the British and the American research policy, to substantially and voluntarily assist

those who give of their best for the relief of humanity and devote themselves to scientific discovery and the development of the resources of Canada.

The German government long before the war made the universities a department of the state, fully realizing the importance of scientific university research, and they commandeered the labour of the best students at their universities during the summer months for scientific purposes. Many of our students in the universities are self-made men, especially in medicine, where the fees are so high. In fact, I know two important professors in an American university with whom I went to college, who had to sell newspapers in their younger student days and do other small work to make up their fees.

Mr. JACOBS: Was it the Toronto Telegram?

Mr. CHURCH: I would therefore urge upon the minister that he consider providing something in the Supplementary Estimates of a substantial nature for these two young men, in the best interests of research in Canada, and as an incentive to scientific men.

Dr. Banting, after all, was a soldier, and he has not made a cent out of this discovery which will bring relief to a great many people in this country. A professor of Johns Hopkins University says that 750,000 on this continent are suffering from diabetes, so you can see what this discovery will mean.

I would also suggest that the government commandeer the summer services of the brighter students at the different medical colleges for laboratory work, so that they will not have to work as cooks and waiters on boats or do manual labour in mines, or sell newspapers, and that their services be used for the development of medical science, as in Germany. I think such a policy would commend itself to the wisdom and judgment of the people of this country and greatly help scientific research. We should be a progressive people. Recently I addressed the Canadian Club at Detroit, at which Mayor Cousens and others were present, and I may say that fifty of the most prominent doctors in Detroit were Canadians. When you think of the numbers of our brightest professional men who are leaving Canada for the United States and England, I think you will agree that it is time the government of Canada did something to encourage scientific discovery and work of this nature, and announce its policy on the subject. Let us take a leaf out of the book of Germany in making the universities a department of the state.

Mr. BELAND: Just a word in commendation of what my hon. friend has said regarding Dr. Banting. We all hope that the experiments which have been for a number of years carried on by Dr. Banting will prove in the end to be a fruitful and a most useful scientific discovery. However desirous I might be to say that it is an accomplished fact, I must, however, state that it is still somewhat in the experimental stage.

So far as the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is concerned, we have afforded to Dr. Banting the opportunity of applying, with the consent of the patients, his method of treatment to some of our soldiers suffering from diabetes in Christie Street hospital. It is not for me to say definitely that it is a discovery, but certainly something has been achieved which we hope in the end will redound to Canada's credit.

As far as putting an amount in the Supplementary Estimates is concerned as a recompense for Dr. Banting's labours, however favourable I would be to the idea, I would first of all like my hon. friend to bring together the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and if the three of them will consent, I shall have no objection whatever, but I am afraid my hon. friend will probably find some resistance in some quarters. If we did this for Dr. Banting, we would have to do it for a good many students and scholars who have achieved valuable results in scientific affairs. However, we are all proud of the results which have so far been achieved by Dr. Banting in the treatment of diabetes, and hope that it may prove a world discovery of the greatest benefit to humanity.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment able to get sufficient quantities of insulin for the treatment of returned men in hospitals? I know that at Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, during the latter months of the past year it was impossible to secure sufficient insulin to afford relief to those who were suffering from that disease. I think the government, perhaps, might assist therefore in the production of a sufficient quantity of insulin to, at least, ensure treatment for returned men in hospitals. I think that would be a fair matter for government expenditure if money is the only impediment in the way of production. Perhaps it is not.

Mr. BELAND: There is no limit to my desire to provide all the money necessary to give treatment to the ex-service men in hos-

pital. If insulin is available in sufficient qauntity, and is required for treatment in any of our hospitals, I will certainly give instructions that it be procured immediately.

Item agreed to.

Grants to the provinces of Canada, on condition that the provinces receiving grants will expend at least an equal amount in combatting venereal diseases, $200,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I submitted to the minister some time ago a resolution with reference to this matter, and I have his answer in my hand. It had to do with requests for the establishment of an institution for the treatment of contagious diseases, coming under this item, I presume. The minister's letter says that the matter will receive consideration. Can he now say what consideration he has given to it?

Mr. BELAND: Will my hon. friend state exactly what the subject was?

Mr. STEVENS: I will send the minister's own communication over to him.

Mr. BELAND: This refers to the establishment of an institution in British Columbia for the treatment of contagious diseases. I would doubt, therefore, whether it would apply to venereal diseases. Generally speaking hospitals or establishments for the care and treatment of contagious diseases do not receive cases of venereal disease. The latter of course is contagious but in a much different manner from diseases such as smallpox, for example, or diphtheria. I do not think that I have taken any steps so far in order to meet the object of the resolution referred to in this letter. Dealing with the item under consideration, however, I must say that we have again decided to appropriate this rather large amount of $200,000 for the treatment, and prevention of the spreading, of venereal disease throughout Canada. This money is not spent directly by the Department of Health. It is distributed to the provinces in proportion to population, and under certain conditions set out in an order in council. One of the conditions is that a province shall spend at least as large an amount as it receives as a grant from the federal government. During the last fiscal year the distribution of the grant was as follows:

Province	Amount Received
New Brunswick	$ 7,517
Nova Scotia	10,573
Alberta	11,979
Manitoba	12,611
British Columbia	14,628
Saskatchewan	15,361
Quebec	47,388
Ontario	57,473

Prince Edward Island did not enter into this campaign. Each of the provinces mentioned has expended an amount at least equal to the federal grant, and has provided clinics for the free treatment of venereal disease, hospital beds for patients requiring indoor treatment, free treatment in other institutions such as reformatories and gaols, free laboratories for all necessary examination, and has also made provision for propaganda work. I may state further, that out of the vote a sum of $10,000 is being given to the National Council for the Prevention of Venereal Diseases.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is the minister able to state that there have been any beneficial results noticeable up to the present time?

Mr. BELAND: I am able to give that information mainly so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. In that province eight different clinics have been established, and the report of the provincial officer in charge of the work is to the effect that the results are really important and gratifying. We believe that we are achieving a good deal in checking the spread of venereal disease throughout Canada.

Mr. CALDWELL: Possibly I may be out of order, but before the item carries I would like to ask the minister if he is making provision in any way for carrying out this work through the D.S.C.R. My reason for asking the question is that I know of returned soldiers suffering from venereal disease who were not pensionable and were therefore held to be not entitled to treatment from the D.S.C.R. I have one case in mind at present for whom I have been endeavouring to get treatment for nearly a year from that department. However, they disclaim any responsibility in the matter. They say there is no provision in the Pension Act to treat a patient unless he gets pay and allowances and these are not granted to a man who is not pensionable. In view of the fact that the government is giving aid, through the civil authorities, for the treatment of venereal disease, I think provision of the same nature ought to be made for returned soldiers.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Administration of Justice—Yukon territory, $30,600.

Mr. SHAW: Has the minister considered the advisability of having one of the Supreme Court Judges of British Columbia perform this work, and in that way save much of the expenditure which is involved in this item?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): We would not like to deprive the people

of the Yukon of their judge. The population is not increasing, but it may some day.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries, $1,670,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is a matter that we will require to discuss for some time. I think perhaps my hon. friend will feel that he has made pretty good progress.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Then the item will stand.

Item stands.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, February 28, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

INQUIRY INTO AGRICULTURE

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the following special committee be appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions throughout Canada: Messieurs Bouchard, Caldwell, Clifford, Elliott (Waterloo South), Gardiner, Grimmer, Hammell, Lanctot, McKay, McMaster, McMurray, Milne, Munro, Robinson, Sales, Sinclair (Queen's, P.E.I.), Stansell, Sutherland, Tolmie.

Mr. SPEAKER: As no notice has been given, the motion may be adopted only by leave of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 34, respecting The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill No. 36, respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

REJECTED IMMIGRANTS

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many immigrants have been refused admission to Canada?
2. From what countries did these people come?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

Statement showing rejections of immigrants, by nationalities, at ocean ports, and along the International Boundary, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1922:

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

	International Boundary	Ocean Ports	Totals
African, South	5	1	6
Albanian	13	....	13
Arabian	9	1	10
Argentinian	2	....	2
Armenian	83	1	84
Australian	13	1	14
Austrian	731	2	733
Belgian	61	7	68
Bermudian	1	....	1
Brazilian	15	....	15
Bulgarian	67	....	67
Chinese	16	227	243
Cuban	11	....	11
Czecho-Slovak	46	4	50
Dutch	64	1	65
Egyptian	2	....	2
Finnish	230	7	237
French	103	9	112
German	189	3	192
Great Britain and Ireland—			
English	827	133	960
Irish	113	4	117
Scotch	114	15	129
Welsh	7	1	8
Greek	470	19	489
Hawaiian	1	....	1
Hebrew—			
Hebrew, N.E.S.	2	8	10
" Austrian	4	....	4
" German	1	....	1
" Hungarian	....	1	1
" Lithuanian	....	9	9
" Polish	15	98	113
" Roumanian	....	38	38
" Russian	9	102	111
" Ukrainian	....	50	50
Hindu	9	1	10
Hungarian	189	1	190
Italian	1,419	198	1,617
Jamaican	10	....	10
Japanese	13	3	16
Jugo-Slav	102	22	124
Luxemburg	1	....	1
Maltese	108	....	108
Mexican	26	....	26
Negro	7	....	7
Newfoundland	11	5	16
New Zealand	4	....	4
Persian	3	3	6
Polish	731	14	745
Portuguese	12	....	12
Philippino	....	2	2
Roumanian	242	31	273
Russian	1,433	18	1,451
Scandinavian,—			
Danish	56	2	58
Norwegian	75	2	77
Swedish	156	8	164
Spanish	142	4	146
Swiss	37	1	38
Syrian	186	7	193
Turkish	71	5	76
Ukrainian	19	....	19
U.S.A. Citizens	10,264	4	10,268
West Indian	3	10	13
Totals	18,553	1,083	19,636

MOOSE MOUNTAIN RESERVE

Mr. GOULD:

1. What revenue was received by the Dominion Government from the sale of—
   (a) Fishing permits.
   (b) Grazing leases.
   (c) Wood permits.

for the years 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922, respectively, in the forest reserve of Moose Mountain?

2. What revenue was received by the Dominion government from the sale of—

(a) Coal royalties.

(b) Leases on coal lands.

in the lignite coal area in Southern Saskatchewan for the years 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922, respectively?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1.

	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22
(a) Fish permits.. ..	nil	nil	$863 00	$ 564 00
(b) Grazing permits. ..	$590 65	$1,025 25	901 20	1,001 45
(c) Wood permits	254 60	566 05	415 35	398 20

2. (a) 1919.. .. ..$ 3,193 05
1920.. .. .. 2,573 32
1921.. .. .. 2,703 41
1922.. .. .. 3,309 86

(b) 1919.. .. ..$ 3,701 55
1920.. .. .. 2,795 95
1921.. .. .. 6,117 73
1922.. .. .. 3,191 56

GREAT NORTH WESTERN TELEGRAPH COMPANY

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe):

1. Is the Great North Western Telegraph Company virtually owned or controlled by the federal government of Canada?

2. If so, are all officials of the federal government instructed to send and receive, if possible, all messages by this company?

3. If such instructions have not been issued to said officials, what is the reason for their not being so instructed?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Although up to the present no general instructions have been issued, officials of the federal government are expected, wherever practicable, to make use of the Canadian National Telegraphs for public business.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXPRESS

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe):

1. Are all officials of the federal government of Canada instructed to send and receive, where possible, all parcels by Canadian National Express, thus swelling the government's receipts?

2. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Although up to the present no general instructions have been issued, federal officials are expected, when making shipments by express, to make use of the Canadian National Express where it is practicable to do so.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TALBOT

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Is the recently appointed Director to the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Onesiphore Talbot, an employee of the government of the province of Quebec?

2. If so, when was he first engaged by said government, for what department, and at what salary?

3. At the time the said Onesiphore Talbot was appointed Director to the Canadian National Railways, what position did he fill in the service of the Quebec government, and what salary was he paid?

4. Does the government insist that the said Onesiphore Talbot resign from his employment in the service of the Quebec government, or is he continuing in such service?

5. What remuneration and privileges does the said Onesiphore Talbot enjoy as Director of the National Railways?

6. Was the said Onesiphore Talbot a defeated Liberal candidate in the General Elections of 1911? If so, for what constituency did he run?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Mr. Talbot is reported to be an employee of the province of Quebec.

2 and 3. No information.

4. The government does not require of Canadian National directors that they give up their regular employment.

5. Director's fee, $2,000 per annum, necessary transportation, and living expenses when attending meetings of the board.

6. Mr. Talbot, like many other very worthy gentlemen, failed of re-election in 1911 when he stood for the county of Bellechasse, which constituency had honoured him in 1896, 1900, 1904 and 1908.

SPORTING MOUNTAIN MAIL SERVICE

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the contract of Mr. Peter Thibeau, of Thibeauville, Nova Scotia, for carrying mail to Sporting Mountain Station, Nova Scotia, been cancelled, or has he received notification that such contract will cease?

2. Since what date has Mr. Thibeau been carrying such mail?

3. What was the rate per year?

4. If the privilege of carrying such mail is to be denied Mr. Thibeau, on what ground is the work being taken from him?

5. Did Mr. Thibeau not have two sons who served through the Great War?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. The contract at present held by Mr. Peter Thibeau will expire on 31st March, 1923.

2. Since August, 1907.

3. $100.

4. A new contract from 1st April, 1923, has been authorized with Mr. Edward Thibeau at the existing rate of payment under the terms of Section 108 of the Post Office Act which empowers the Postmaster General to enter into such an agreement when he considers it to be in the public interest.

5. Mr. Peter Thibeau has so advised the department.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

DUNDAS HIGHWAY

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What part or parts of Dundas street between Toronto and London have been completed by the Provincial Department of Highways?
2. How many miles have been completed?
3. What is the actual cost per mile?
4. How many miles have been approved by the Dominion Department of Highways?
5. What amount has been paid to the province of Ontario on account of the approved part of this road?
6. What was the estimated cost per mile?
7. How many miles of this road have been completed within the county of Halton and how many miles have been approved in the said county?
8. Has the actual cost exceeded the estimated cost or a reasonable cost for this section of the road?
9. If so, how much?

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FIXED CHARGES

Mr. EULER:

1. What total sum is now charged against the railways now comprised in the National Railways by way of cost of construction, cost of equipment, and deficits?
2. What portion of said sum is chargeable to capital expenditure and deficits respectively?
3. What amounts regarding No. 2 are respectively chargeable to the railways formerly known as the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the National Transcontinental, the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk?
4. What are the respective fixed charges against the former Canadian Northern Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Railway?
5. Are there any annual fixed charges against the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway?
6. If so, what are the amounts?
7. What are the total annual fixed charges on account of securities held against the National Railways by private investors and excluding all securities and advances made by the government of Canada?
8. What is the amount of the annual fixed charges of the various railways in the National system on account of securities and loans made by the government of Canada?

SALES TAX—EXEMPTIONS, ETC.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

What, if any, rulings, orders or regulations have been made or adopted which exempt or declare to be exempt from the operations of the sales tax, purchases when made by certain individuals, organizations or companies, or what, if any, rebates or remissions have been made or authorized to be made in respect of taxes payable under the sales tax?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CLAIMS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

For a return of all correspondence passing between the Prime Minister and the Honourable John Oliver, Premier of British Columbia, since January the 1st, 1923, having reference to claims of British Columbia on the federal government and other problems outstanding between the two governments.

[Mr. Graham.]

PRIVILEGE—Hon. MR. BELAND

On the order, "Notices of Motions":

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, as it is likely that the Orders of the Day will not be reached to-day, may I be permitted at this stage to make a personal explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is pretty hard to give consent until we know what it is about. If it is a matter of privilege, of course no one would object.

Mr. BELAND: I would rise, then, to a question of privilege. I made a certain statement in the House yesterday in connection with a statement reported in the newspapers as having been made at a public meeting in North Essex by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). The statement is in Hansard. I read in this morning's Citizen the following:

> Dr. Béland replied that such a statement was entirely inaccurate, and he was willing to believe that the leader of the opposition had made it.

The only explanation I have to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it is exactly the contrary of what I said, which was that I believed the right hon. leader of the Opposition had not made it.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Had the hon. gentleman given me notice that he would bring the matter up, I would have had exact quotations here. I did not read the report, but I read in Hansard what had been said by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). No such words were stated by me. What I said was that there was a diminution of some $3,000,000 in the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, and that nothwithstanding that, there was a large increase of debt. I did not state that that affected widows and orphans, for anyone who knows anything about our accounts knows that widows and orphans are not affected by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department or benefited thereby. I find that according to returns which I have in my office, what I stated was within the mark by several hundred thousand dollars. I may add that I found some consternation in the district owing to a reported utterance of the hon. minister to the effect that, of the $700,000,000 increase in debt since the war, he was only able to account for some $300,000,000. I am not able myself—I am thoroughly unwilling—to believe that the Minister made such a statement as that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, all this is out of order, but as there seems to be perfect agreement between the hon. minister and the right hon. leader of the Opposition we will regard the incident as closed.

RACE-TRACK BETTING

MOTION BY MR. GOOD TO AMEND THE CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, it is expedient that subsection two of section two hundred and thirty-five of the Criminal Code be repealed, and that it be enacted that the provisions of subsection one of said section, and of sections two hundred and twenty-seven and two hundred and twenty-eight of the said code shall not extend to any person by reason of his becoming custodian or depository of any money, property, or valuable thing staked for the purpose or become the property of the winner of any lawful race, sport, game or exercise or to a private bet between not more than ten individuals who are not engaged in any way in a business of betting.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps unfortunate that the resolution should have been worded as it is, but I am not responsible for that. It was put in the hands of the Parliamentary Counsel last year and I did not like to question the propriety of his wording. The only change which has been made in the resolution this year is that which has been necessitated by the amendment made to the criminal code dealing with this matter at the last session. However, in spite of the fact that the wording is rather technical and perhaps unintelligible to the lay reader, the meaning and effect of the proposed amendment is very simple. It is not to make horse-racing illegal, as is sometimes said; it is not to make illegal the betting on horse-racing, as may be alleged; but it is to make illegal the business of betting on race-tracks—commercialized betting. It is to remove the exemption which now exists in favour of racing associations, as against all others who are forbidden under the criminal code to keep betting houses. Perhaps I may make the purport of the resolution a little plainer by quoting from an order in council that was passed on the 7th of June, 1917, and published in the Canada Gazette of July 7 of that year.

Whereas it is deemed advisable, in view of the conditions created by the present war and the desirability of encouraging in every way possible thrift and economy among the people of Canada and of taking steps to prevent as far as possible extravagant and unnecessary expenditure, that the exception in favour of horse-racing—

May I remark that although the language is a little bit vague and indecisive, the meaning is plain.

—that the exception in favour of horse racing in section two hundred and thirty-five of the criminal code respecting betting, pool selling and book-making should be rescinded during the continuance of the present war and immediately thereafter;

And whereas it has been made to appear by very strong representations that this opinion is shared in by a great body of the population of Canada;

Now, therefore, His Excellency the Governor General by and with the advice of the King's Privy Council for Canada, and under and by virtue of the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:—

1. Subsection 2 of section 235 of the criminal code, chapter 146 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by chapter 19 of the statutes of 1912, is amended by striking out all the words after the words "business of betting" in the eighth line thereof.

The effect of striking out those words was to remove the exemption, to strike out the saving clause which operates in favour of a certain type of keeper of betting houses. It goes on:

2. This regulation shall come into force on the first day of August, 1917, and the amendment hereby made continue in force only during the present war in Europe, and for six months after the conclusion of the said war.

I may have occasion later on to show something of the operation of this order in council.

I do not propose to deal with the ethics of gambling. The seconder of the resolution, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) will, I understand, deal with that part of the subject so far as it has relation to this resolution. But I may be permitted to remark that the evils of gambling are only partly amenable to legislative control; it is not practicable to legislate against gambling of all kinds. But I think it is practicable and desirable to legislate against the commercialized business of gambling, against those who make it a business to prey upon the weaknesses and the vices of their fellow-men. This, I think, is generally admitted, and the admission has been given expression to in our criminal code in a great body of legislation. I had proposed to submit to the House in some detail the various acts or sections of acts dealing with this matter, and to trace the changes which have taken place between 1892 and the present time in relation to the law against gambling, but I think perhaps the House would prefer that I should give just a brief summary of these changes. I have all the legislation here, and if necessary may refer to it later. But perhaps it may be sufficient just for the moment to give a summary of the legislation dealing with this question from the year 1906, when the last Revised Statutes of Canada were issued, up to the present. The following, therefore, is a condensed summary of the changes in the Canadian law respecting race-track gambling between 1906 and the present time.

Commencing then with the Revised Statutes of 1906, chapter 146, section 235, subsection 1, made it an indictable offence punishable by one year's imprisonment and a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars:

(a) To use or knowingly allow premises to be used for betting.
(b) To keep, exhibit, employ or knowingly allow to be employed thereon any betting device.
(c) To become a stake holder, or
(d) To record or register a bet on an election, race or contest.

But by subsection 2 these provisions were not to apply to bets between individuals or to those made on a race course of any incorporated racing association during a race meet.

There was an amendment in 1910 which re-enacted subsection 1 of the foregoing section, and added to the list of offences therein contained by making it an offence:

(a) To engage in pool-selling, or book-making or the business of betting, or to make an agreement for the purchase or sale of betting privileges or of information intended to assist in betting.
(b) To advertise, print, publish, exhibit, post up, sell or supply, etc., or offer to sell or supply such information.
(c) To advertise, print, publish, exhibit, or post up any offer, invitation, or inducement to bet.
(d) To sell, transmit, deliver, or receive any message relating to book-making, pool-selling or betting.
(e) To aid or assist in the foregoing.

But the application of subsection 1 was further limited by adding to subsection 2 the provision that subsection 1 should not apply to book-making, pool-selling, betting or wagering upon such race course provided that such race meetings are not continued for longer than seven days or occur oftener than twice a year on such race course.

There was a further amendment in the year 1912 which re-enacted the foregoing subsection 2, as amended, but limited the racing associations to those incorporated before March 20, 1912, and to any incorporated after that date by act of parliament or the legislature of any province, and also for the first time permitted racing associations to sell information or privileges to assist in or enable the conducting of book-making, pool-selling, or betting, etc., during the actual progress of a race meeting.

After the Rutherford Commission, which was appointed in 1919, reported, there was another amendment to this section in 1920, re-enacting the foregoing subsection, as amended, but limiting the non-applicability of subsection 1 to bets made on a race course through the agency of the pari-mutuel system, limiting the percentage which could be retained by a racing association out of the amount of any money paid or stake deposited with such association and of which it became the depository under the pari-mutuel system, and providing that the type of pari-mutuel machine should be approved by the Minister of Agriculture, and that he must be satisfied that a proper proportion of the gate receipts and of the percentage retained as above was given in purses for the horses racing.

There was a further slight amendment last year. A very minor change was effected by the insertion of these words:

Bets between not more than ten individuals.

This enlarged the number of individuals who might be considered to bet, as it were, privately. There was also a more specific exemption of all race-track gambling from the operation of the law.

Now, having given this summary I desire to call special attention to one or two incidents, which throw light upon the changes which I have referred to. The law as it was stated in the 1906 statutes seemed to be unsatisfactory, I think largely on account of the fact that it was rather vague as it applied to race-track gambling. May I quote the last two or three lines of subsection 2 of section 235:

Or to bets between individuals or made on the course of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting.

Now, I understand that that was not specific enough to give instructions to anybody, and that a good deal of dissatisfaction arose in connection with the law. At all events in 1910 a measure called the Miller Bill was introduced into this House, which occasioned a tremendous amount of discussion during that session. The bill was referred to a select committee which reported in its favour. That report was considered in Committee of the Whole House and was debated for two days. There seemed to be no prospect of coming to any conclusion, or of the debate terminating. and finally Sir Wilfred Laurier, who was leader of the government at that time, sug gested that the two parties who were con testing, or the two sides or factions if you like, might get together and see if they could agree on some kind of a compromise. That was done. During the following week, after this two days' debate the two sides got together and reached a compromise which was embodied in the legislation of 1910. Perhaps I may be permitted again to sum up the effect of that amendment in 1910. It was a general stiffening of the law against the business of betting, but a giving of greater latitude to the betting on race tracks, and that showed the position of the two sides to the controversy. There was evidently a desire to stiffen the general law; but those who were opposed to making it apply drastically to race-track gambling had their way. Accord-

ingly the exemptions in favour of that were made more specific and perhaps a little wider than they had been under the previous act.

May I refer again, just in passing, to the amendment of 1912 which further relaxed the restrictions on race-track gambling by allowing racing associations to sell information and privileges to engage in book-making, pool-selling, etc., on race-tracks. Now, conditions as they are defined by the amendment of 1912 continued until the summer of 1917 when, as I have already mentioned, the government by order in council under the War Measures Act, put a stop to these exemptions in connection with race-track gambling for the duration of the war. On the 1st January, 1920, this order in council was annulled, but prior to that annulment the so-called Rutherford Commission was appointed. I have here a certified copy of the report of the committee of the Privy Council dated 23rd August, 1919, appointing Mr. J. G. Rutherford a commissioner, under the Inquiries Act, to make certain inquiries. May I quote the scope of the inquiry as defined in this order in council. Mr. Rutherford was asked to inquire into and concerning:

(1) The number, character and methods of operation of race-tracks in each district or locality;

(2) The amounts of capital invested in the several jockey clubs and race tracks in each district;

(3) The respective periods of time and the seasons, during which race meets have been or are customarily held in each year in each locality;

(4) The general effects of such race meets and betting upon the community or any particular class or classes of the community;

(5) The methods, devices and operations in connection with betting at the race meets and at other places; and the extent to which and the methods by which betting is carried on legally, or illegally, in each locality;

(6) The effects of racing upon the production of improved breeds of horses and thoroughbred stock;

Then comes the omnibus clause, No. 7, which reads:

(7) Generally all matters, directly or indirectly, connected with, or relating to conditions surrounding race meets and betting in connection therewith;

I have seen the evidence and reports of this commission downstairs in this building. It is a very massive body of evidence.

Mr. CANNON: Has the hon. member read it?

Mr. GOOD: I certainly have not read all of it. It would take more time than I have at my disposal to read all of that report. Following upon the report of the Rutherford Commission we have the amendment of 1920, to which I have referred. That amendment, as has already been stated, made certain restrictions upon the methods of gambling on race-courses, but did not make it illegal to keep a betting house, as defined under the law in connection with the race meets. I desire to call attention to one section of the amendment of 1920 which I think is significant. Sub-paragraph 3 of subsection 2 reads:

Nor shall the provisions of said sections apply to race meetings at which there are trotting or pacing races exclusively, where pool betting or wagering is permitted by an association incorporated as provided by subsection 2 of this section on such race-course during the actual progress of the race meeting conducted by this association.

Now this, it will be evident, legalizes book-making in its worst form on the small country pacing and trotting tracks. In the amendment enacted last year a clause was added to clear up, I presume, any ambiguity about the applicability of the law, and reads:

Nothing in this act shall apply to such operations on any race-course as are authorized by section 6 of chapter 43—

That is the 1920 amendment to which I refer—

—of the statutes of 1920.

That, I presume, is to make very clear that all these operations on race-tracks were to be completely exempt from the general law against the keeping of betting houses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to submit to the House next some little statement of what has happened to the racing associations and to the public in connection with this business, as these various amendments and changes have been made in the law May I quote, in the first place, the number of prosecutions for keeping illegal betting houses in Toronto form 1916 to 1920. In 1916 there were 26 convictions and in 1917 there were fifteen convictions. Let hon. members recall that it was on the 1st August, 1917, that the order in council came into operation. In 1918 there were fourteen convictions and in 1919 there were five convictions. At the end of 1919 the order in council was annulled and complete liberty was given again to the keeping of betting houses on race-tracks, and hon. members will note that immediately the restraint was taken off the effect upon the convictions for keeping illegal betting houses was that in 1920 the convictions numbered 26 and in 1921 they numbered 55. So that there was an immediate and very large increase in the number of convictions for keeping illegal betting houses in Toronto after the restriction was removed.

I wish to submit next some data concerning the profits made by racing associations out of this business, because I think that here is perhaps the key to or the crux of the whole question. If we properly appreciate the extraordinarily good opportunities for making

money that have existed in connection with this business, I think we shall see what forces have operated to retain these special privileges in favour of racing associations. I am quoting now an address given by the Hon. W. E. Raney, Attorney General for Ontario, in June, 1921. He said:

At the Hamilton Jockey Club the investment was $4,000.

I may say that all this information was elicited during the Rutherford investigation. He continues:

On this original investment the club paid $378,300 in cash dividends between 1910 and 1917, and its capital investment in 1917, according to the figures prepared by the club itself for the Commissioner of Taxation, and reported to Dr. Rutherford, was $688,229. In other words, the $4,000, under the fertilizing influence of the amendment to the betting house section of the criminal code of 1910, grew to a total sum, principal and interest, of $1,066,529—an average profit of more than 3,000 per cent per annum for the members of parliament and their relatives and the professional sporting housemen who held shares in this club. The returns to the treasury of Ontario for 1920 show that the rake-off of this club last year was $447,927, which was more than twice the rake-off for any previous year, and more than seven times the rake-off in 1910.

I might add that in one meeting held in 1917 the balance of receipts over disbursements was $125,383.40, and that profits of $48,500 were distributed from that one meet.

Now, coming to the Woodbine track at Toronto I have also obtained from the same document the following data:

Dr. Rutherford's report which deals with the situation between the enactment of the amendment of 1910 and the passing of the order in council in 1917, shows that on an investment of $10,000 the members of the Ontario Jockey Club drew cash and stock dividends from their betting house business of $710,000, and the stock dividends were and are worth more than cash. This was an average of more than $100,000 profit a year or more than 1,000 per cent per annum on their investment. And of this vast sum nothing went to the thoroughbred. It all went into the pockets of the gentlemen shareholders. It is interesting to note the progression of rake-off at this track as disclosed by the evidence before Dr. Rutherford. Here are the figures:

1910,	Book-making..	$ 58,932
1911,	Pari-mutuel	101,189
1912,	"	85,032
1913,	"	105,615
1914,	"	112,834
1915,	"	123,251
1916,	"	177,087
1917,	(for the half season before the order in council came to effect)..	105,764

Then Mr. Raney goes on to comment on this as follows:

But if the betting house profits of the Ontario Jockey Club down to 1917 were amazing, what shall be said of those of 1920 as disclosed by reports filed with the Treasurer of Ontario? The rake-off for that year was $561,506 as compared with the previous high-water mark of $177,087 in 1916, and as compared with $58,932 in 1910—in other words, an increase in rake-off of almost tenfold in ten years. In addition there were gate receipts last year of $212,555, making a total revenue from these two sources of $774,061 out of which purses were paid amounting to $202,282.

Mr. JACOBS: Has the hon. gentleman before him the figures of the profits made on certain lands which this company sold at an advance?

Mr. GOOD: I have no record of that at all.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that not mentioned in the Rutherford report?

Mr. GOOD: I am not aware that it is. It may be. I wish to submit next very briefly some figures also obtained from the same report, concerning the earnings of the Windsor Jockey Club. This was no doubt established to provide opportunity for the gambling that is prohibited in Michigan. The original capitalization of this concern was $29,500. This was increased in 1912 to $200,000, and in 1916, to $500,000. For one meet in 1917, the balance of receipts over expenditures was $97,742.68. In 1916, for two meets, the rake-off from pari-mutuel machines was $300,337.35. In 1917, for one meet, the rake-off was $188,714.75. In 1917, a dividend was paid of $100,000. In 1920, there was a rake-off of $848,054, and gate receipts of $255,881.

Let us consider the Fort Erie track. I may remark here that this type of gambling is prohibited in New York state, so that Americans who are addicted to it find a refuge and a rendezvous in Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the pool rooms in every city in the United States?

Mr. GOOD: Never mind about the pool rooms. We are, I hope, dealing with one thing at a time. The capital of this association was $100,000. The balance of receipts over disbursements in 1917 at one meet was $126,081.12. The rake-off from the pari-mutuel machines was $162,947.20, and the dividend paid in 1917 was $100,000, equal to the whole capitalization.

Mr POWER: I was not present at the beginning of my hon. friend's remarks, and purely for information, I should be glad if he can explain what he means by the word "rake-off." He mentions "rake-offs" and "dividends," and I would like to know really what the distinction is.

Mr. GOOD: I presume the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) knows this pretty well, much better than I do.

Mr. POWER: I do not know about rake-offs.

Mr. GOOD: I may enlighten my hon. friend by saying that a rake-off is that part which is due to the racing association, the part which they get from the amount wagered, either in the book-making or, as later, in the pari-mutuel machines.

Mr. JACOBS: It is the part you take off with a rake?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh. oh.

Mr. GOOD: This may seem a matter for joking, but there are many to whom this is a very serious question. Personally, I have never wagered any money on anything of that sort, and I do not expect to; but as I hope to submit a little later to the House, others have suffered very severely in this respect.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What name would the hon. member give to the amount of money which the Ontario government gets from this form of betting?

Mr. GOOD: I am quite prepared to have the hon. gentleman call it by what name he likes, "rake-off" if he pleases.

I wish to submit next some data regarding the effect on thoroughbred horses. Between 1910 and 1920 the increase in the number of race-tracks in Ontario and Quebec was from seven to seventeen, and during the same period, the number of days of racing, or the maximum racing period, increased from 96 to 238. If the claims of those who advocate a continuance of race-track gambling as being necessary to encourage the breeding of thoroughbreds were well founded, one might expect that while this increase in the racing was going on, you would find a corresponding increase in the breeding of thoroughbreds. I have on this point some data which I would like to submit to the House. In 1906, there was a government investigation into horse-breeding in Ontario, and according to the report there were in the province 78 thoroughbred stallions. From 1913 to 1919, the enrolment of thoroughbred stallions in Ontario was as follows:

Year	Number
1913	31
1914	43
1915	46
1916	36
1917	31
1918	25
1919	19

Therefore, one may infer this, I think, that the allegation made on behalf of racetrack gambling as an encouragement to the breeding of thoroughbred horses is baseless. I wish to submit also in this connection some opinions from people who are, I think, qualified to express opinions on the significance or importance of the thoroughbred horse in Canadian agriculture. Let me quote from the Hon. Mr. Drury in a statement made by him prior to his accession to power as premier of Ontario. He was asked as a farmer what his opinion was on this matter, and he replied:

> As to my views on the matter I am fully persuaded, from the standpoint of the farming community, that race-track betting is of no help whatever to the horse-breeding industry in this country. The most profitable class of horse to breed, from the farmers' standpoint, is not the thoroughbred, the hunter, or even the army remount, but just the heavy-draught type, and second, the roadster. In the first of these classes, and the most profitable to the farmer, thoroughbred blood has no place whatever, and there is no racing and no betting. In the second, while racing has its place, betting is not necessary to the encouragement of breeders. The roadster, unlike the thoroughbred, fills a useful place, and is bred for its use. The winning of a race has its own reward in the increased value of the animal, and betting is not necessary to its encouragement.
>
> Race-track betting has for its centre the thoroughbred, a type of beast which, as regards its usefulness, under the conditions in this country, has about as much use as the gamecock among fowls. The horse-breeding industry of this country would be no worse off if the running horse were entirely eliminated.

I have also a letter from Mr. R. E. Gunn. I shall not read it, but it is practically to the same effect.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Is there much betting on the race-tracks on the part of the farmers?

Mr. GOOD: I really do not know; I should judge not. I do not know how many farmers are given to the practice, and I do not think it would be possible for one to give any accurate information on that point.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a further question? Have the complaints against the betting practice come from the farming element of the country?

Mr. GOOD: I do not know that they come from the farming element. I cannot give definite information on that point, and I do not think it makes any difference where the complaint originates. We are considering the merits of the question.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend say what interests prompted him to raise this question if the farming interests are not at stake? Has any other interest prompted him to introduce this subject?

Mr. GOOD: I am presenting this matter to the House as one of general importance to the country. I do not come here primarily as a representative of the farming industry; I come here to discuss and decide, so far as

I can, public questions from the standpoint of the national welfare. Now, Sir, I do not wish to weary the House, but I should like to quote from Mr. Raney, to whom I have already referred, in his summary of the situation as he saw it and as set out in the address I have already mentioned. Let me read:

> The criminal code, as it stands to-day, recognizes four kinds of disorderly "houses." Section 228 reads as follows:
>
> "Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who keeps any disorderly house, that is to say, any common bawdy house, common gaming house, common betting house or opium joint."
>
> Section 229 makes it a crime to be found in any disorderly house.
>
> It will be observed that the penalty for keeping a common betting house is precisely the same as the penalty for keeping the other kinds of "disorderly house" specified in the section.
>
> In 1910 the so-called jockey clubs of Canada procured from the parliament of Canada the amendment to the criminal code that has since been the law of Canada, exempting the common betting houses conducted by them from the penalties against that kind of disorderly house. They procured this extraordinary exception to the criminal law in the face of an adverse report by a strong committee of the House of Commons, and in the face of the strongest evidence of the demoralizing effect of such places. They procured it in the face of the fact that nearly all the states of the American Union—including the great states of New York and Michigan—were then enforcing stringent laws against the race-track betting houses. They procured it in the face of the opposition of the churches and the farmer and the labour organizations of Canada. They procured it on the representation that they were sportsmen and horsemen and that such an amendment of the law was necessary in the interests of the thoroughbred horse. That those representations were false pretences has been abundantly established by the report of the government auditors on the operations of the jockey clubs and by the evidence taken before Commissioner Rutherford and by his report made to parliament last year. It is now clear that of the millions of dollars of profits from their betting house rake-off, made by the jockey club betting houses of Ontario alone between 1910 and 1917, nothing at all has been diverted to the thoroughbred, but that the whole amount has gone into the pockets of the shareholders of the jockey clubs, for the most part, either professional betting house men or men of high social position, many of them occupying seats, or otherwise exercising political influence in the parliament of Canada or in the legislature of Ontario.

I have only one more point to deal with and that is the gambling forces in politics. I have here a little pamphlet which was sent me last year, in anticipation, I presume, of the debate which was expected to take place on this question at that time. It was sent by the Ontario Jockey Club of Toronto, and I take it that every other hon. member received a copy last year. It is very significant and I shall make some comments upon it. It bears the title "The Social Service Council of Canada versus The Thoroughbred Horse." Mark the significance of the title,—"versus The Thoroughbred Horse."

4 p.m.

Mr. JACOBS: Neck-and-neck, so to speak.

Mr. GOOD: Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think this pamphlet a disgraceful exhibition of crookedness, duplicity and misrepresentation in argument.

Mr. RINFRET: Where does it come from?

Mr. GOOD: It is signed by Colonel Hendrie, Albert E. Dyment and half a dozen others. All hon. members, I presume, have copies of it.

Mr. VIEN: Where was it issued?

Mr. GOOD: It was issued in Toronto in 1922.

Mr. RINFRET: That explains it.

Mr. GOOD: I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can proceed with this discussion in an orderly way. Two pages of the pamphlet contain a list of the officers, the executive committee etc., of the Social Service Council of Canada; And the text makes the following comment:

> We venture to think that few, if any, of the above persons had anything to do with the racing publications issued under the name of the Council, or had any knowledge of the contents of these publications, and the activities of the Council are left in the hands of the Rev. J. G. Shearer, a paid official, and paid for from funds contributed by the public at large under solicitation for objects which are quite foreign to the subject referred to in these pamphlets.

Now, what do hon. members think of that insinuation—indeed, it is more than an insinuation—that the pronouncements of the Social Service Council of Canada have not been supervised or considered in any way by the officers, the executive or the rank and file of the council? I take it that there are a good many hon. members here perhaps all who know something of the comprehensive and representative character of the Social Service Council of Canada. For the information of those who do not understand the mode of operation of the Council, I may say that every year the report of each subcommittee is passed upon by the full Council in annual convention. The statement which is made here is not only false, but utterly foolish. It goes on to say:

> Mr. Shearer has been supported by his former solicitor—

Mark you, by "his" former solicitor.

> —Hon. W. E. Raney, Attorney General for Ontario, in the press, from the platform and in pamphlets.

Well, we all admit that Hon. Mr. Raney has supported the measure of reform that I am now advocating; but that he should be represented as Mr. Shearer's solicitor is another statement which is foolish and false. Then the pamphlet continues:

The object of these two gentlemen is to destroy racing in Canada, and in their efforts to do so, facts are misrepresented and information concealed which give to the public an entirely erroneous impression of the situation.

Mr. Raney has distinctly stated his position with respect to racing; I shall quote from the address delivered by him to which I have already referred:

It will be idle to say that I am attacking sport or the thoroughbred horse or horse racing or even betting such as goes on on baseball or cricket fields. I am not attacking any of these things. As to horse racing, the evidence is clear that it was a great national sport both in England and on this continent before book making or the pari-mutuel was invented and that it is a success now without these concomitants where the race-track men are real horsemen and sportsmen.

That is an explicit denial of the charge which has been repeatedly and falsely made that Mr. Raney, in his agitation against race-track gambling, is in any way opposed to horse racing.

Now, mark this again—I quote from the pamphlet:

The money which is contributed by friends of the Social Service Council of Canada to promote worthy work is used by the paid officials to carry on this unprincipled propaganda.

Note that, Mr. Speaker, "unprincipled propaganda."

The breeding and racing of horses, properly conducted, cannot fill the place it should occupy in our province and survive, if conditions are imposed in the way of taxation, and the elimination of wagering as suggested by the above-named gentlemen—

Note this:

—in the name of the Social Service Council of Canada, and, if Messrs. Shearer and Raney ultimately succeed, the people of this province will have reason to regret the prohibition of the most popular recreation, and the cessation of the breeding of thoroughbred horses in Canada. The Ontario Jockey Club has no hesitation in advising the race horse loving public that a legitimate race meeting with adequate purses to encourage breeders and owners, cannot be conducted without provision being made for those who desire to exercise their right of supporting their choice in a financial way.

And then this threat comes in red type:

Should the Social Service Council meet with success in their efforts to have legislation enacted to amend the law passed by the Dominion government in 1910,—much as they would regret the step, the Ontario Jockey Club would be compelled to discontinue their annual race meetings.

That would be an awful calamity!

May I quote a few words from the concluding sentences of this extraordinary document:

It is a matter for consideration by those who are interested in the breeding of thoroughbred horses and by those who take pleasure in the sport of racing, whether the tactics employed by a few men in the name of the Social Service Council of Canada are fair—in continually seeking, by fair means or foul means, to deprive a large number of our people of an industry and a recreation fostered and patronized in all other countries of the world.

As a comment on that last statement, I may mention that there are only three out of the forty-eight states of the United States where this gambling is permitted. It is not permitted in Great Britain, or if so, only in an irregular way. This pamphlet was sent out by the Ontario Jockey Club last year, I assume to all members of the House; it came to me through the mails. I here say publicly that I regard it as a most discreditable document, a document that the club ought to be ashamed to put out to the public.

Now, here is something more, something even more significant than the document to which I have just referred. As hon. members will recall, Mr. Raney was chosen Attorney General of Ontario at a time when he was not an elected member, and he had to be a candidate in a by-election. Here is a letter which was sent out by the Citizens' Liberty League, with headquarters at Toronto, on January 28, 1920, a short time before Mr. Raney faced the electors of East Wellington, the constituency in which he ran. I want hon. members to note this letter:

Dear Sir:

In view of the coming election in which Mr. Raney, Attorney General, will seek to obtain a seat somewhere in Ontario, this league has taken into account his continuous and uncompromising attitude towards race tracks and his stand on prohibition and we have decided to oppose him at the polls.

Mark that; "we have decided."

This will entail an expenditure of about $20,000—

What for?

—and we are asking our friends to help us financially. We will appreciate it if you can see your way to contribute.

Thanking you in advance,

Yours very truly,

T. L. Carruthers,
General Secretary.

That was sent out to a number of persons just before the by-election in East Wellington in 1920. There is an example of the gambling forces and the liquor forces in politics.

Mr. JACOBS: Of what organization is Mr. Carruthers the secretary?

Mr. GOOD: "Citizens' Liberty League, Central Branch," is on the letterhead. If there is any one consideration that has led the United States to take the action they have taken in recent years on a certain very large question, it is the fact that certain large interests went into politics for their own selfish advantage. I think we have evidence—indeed, we have it in the two documents I have just

submitted to the House—that the race track gambling interests are also in politics and not I submit for the good of the country, but for the good of their own pockets. I have already quoted evidence from Dr. Rutherford's report as to the extraordinary profits which these gentlemen have obtained. It has been said that a lot of these men are estimable gentlemen and that consequently we should not criticise any of their activities. Well, when that is considered a valid argument, I think we had better, to use a slang expression, shut up shop here.

I wish to submit in conclusion a brief statement which I quote from the argument of Mr. John M. Godfrey as presented to the Rutherford Commission in 1919. This is the summing up of the case which he presented on behalf of the Social Service Council against the continuance of this special privilege.

1. The business of gambling, on account of the evils flowing therefrom is a public nuisance and a menace to society.
2. The laws of England and Canada make illegal common betting houses.
3. A common betting house is defined as a place where gambling is carried on and a rake-off paid to the keeper.
4. If it were not for the exception introduced into the criminal code in 1910 the owners of race-tracks who take a rake-off from pari-mutuel machines would be keepers of common betting houses.
5. That there can be no justification for a law which allows any group of men, no matter what their social, business or professional standing may be, to do that thing, which, if done by any other person, is a crime.
6. That race-track gambling, instead of helping the breeding of the thoroughbred, is detrimental.
7. That racing can be carried on and the thoroughbred better helped by direct means rather than the indirect method of race-track gambling, with all its attendant evils.

Let me conclude by stating again, as I stated at the outset, that the purpose and effect of this resolution is not to stop racing, not to stop what might be called private betting on race-tracks. We may have our own opinion as to the ethics of it, but it is impracticable to legislate against that. The object is not that, but it is to take away the special privilege which is now given to racing associations to keep on the race tracks what are defined under the criminal code as betting houses. That is all that I care to say at the moment. There are some other things which I may say in reply later on.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this resolution with hearty good will. I deem it a privilege as well as a duty to lift up my voice in the parliament of Canada against an evil which, if not abolished, will sap the very foundations of our national life. It is not my intention to go into the case at any great length. I would be glad to think that the merits of the case are so very obvious that any lengthy discussion of the case would be unnecessary, and also if there be any division of opinion in the House, that it will not be along any sectional or party lines, but that many members on the government side of the House, and those who sit behind the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, as well as many Progressives will be glad to associate themselves with this resolution, and will welcome the opportunity of putting themselves on record in its support.

I am pleased that the honour of moving and seconding this resolution has fallen to the Progressive party; pleased, because it gives us the opportunity of demonstrating what really should not need to be demonstrated, that the farmers' organizations out of which this party has sprung, are not wholly concerned, as has sometimes been thought, with merely seeking an increased reward for our own toil, but we have ever had in mind everything that makes for the destruction of those evils which tend to undermine our national life, and everything that makes for upbuilding in this Canada of ours the highest type of citizenship. The question asked by the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) when he was presenting his resolution, if it meant anything, was an insinuation that we in this part of the House, representing as we do the farmers, are concerned and only concerned with this question from the farmer's point of view.

Mr. VIEN: May I correct my hon. friend? There was no insinuation at all in my remarks. I simply wanted to inquire from the hon. member who moved the motion whether the farmer's interests were particularly at stake in this connection, because I represent myself a totally rural constituency, and I wanted to know from the farmer's point of view whether they had a direct interest in the question. There was no insinuation at all.

Mr. BROWN: I am only too happy to offer the hon. gentleman an apology if in any way I misinterpreted the purport of his remarks. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have endeavoured to approach all these questions from the standpoint of what makes for better citizenship. I do not want to approach this matter from the attitude of one who would seem to be opposed to any sort of manly sport. Indeed, I may frankly confess that I am a lover of sport, and if this session of the House does not end before the umpire calls "play ball' I may be tempted to neglect my duties in the House.

An hon. MEMBER: Atta boy!

Mr. BROWN: I think all of us who love that sport were grieved when a few years ago it was proven that the gambling element had entered into it and had brought disgrace upon it in the playing of the World's Series, and I think we all sympathized with Judge Landis when he said that he wanted to make the sport clean for the boys.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to deny the right of those who undertake to support the practices of gambling on the race track to assume that they and they only are the true representatives of sport, and that they are the ones who are the admirers of good horses. As a matter of fact, many of those who are led into gambling through information that is furnished by the race-tracks know absolutely nothing about horses, and it is absurd for them to pretend to be lovers of sport or lovers of horses.

As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Brant, this resolution is directed against that amendment to the criminal code of Canada procured by the jockey clubs of Canada from the parliament of Canada in 1910, and which has since been the law of Canada, exempting commercialized gambling on the race-tracks from the penalties that would otherwise be incurred. Let there be no misunderstanding of the purpose of this resolution. It is directed not against gambling as such, but against the business of promoting gambling as it has been carried on in the past by book-makers and now by parimutuel machines. It is very essential that we should make that distinction very clear, and that the distinction should be clear in the minds of hon. members. I know there is some confusion in the minds of people throughout the country upon this point, but I think it is very essential that hon. members who are called upon to deal with this question should make the distinction very clear between private betting and commercialized gambling.

Perhaps I might make the distinction a little clearer by using another analogy in regard to another vice. There is an immense difference between private prostitution and the commercialized white slave traffic, and we should bear this distinction in mind when we are dealing with this question. There is in this resolution no suggestion that a private bet on a horse race or on anything else should be interfered with. If such a bet is an evil, as we may very well hold it to be, it would be a matter to be dealt with by the preachers and the moral teachers of the country, and any attempt to restrain such a practice by law might very well be considered ultra vires of this parliament. It might very well be held that parliament would be unwise to seek to exercise any jurisdiction in such a matter, but the business of promoting gambling is something essentially different, something of which this House may very well take cognizance.

Now, it must be understood also that we are not introducing or asking for the introduction, of any new principle into our statutes. Let that be clear. I know there is a disposition to shy at new things and to be very chary about accepting new principles, but we are not asking for the introduction of any new principle.

As has already been pointed out, the criminal code as it stands to-day recognizes that the business of promoting gambling is a proper subject to be dealt with by law. The code recognizes, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) has already read the provisions in that regard, four kinds of disorderly houses. Then, section 228, and as he has already read it I will not repeat it, indicates these different kinds. Now why is the exception made in favour of permitting betting on the race-track, when the business of promoting betting elsewhere than on the race-track is by law held to be a crime? It certainly is hard to understand the reasons that moved our legislators in 1910 to make the exception noted. It does seem as though they had allowed themselves to be carried away by the sophistry of those who were themselves interested in exploiting the weaknesses and vices of their fellows. The reason given, and evidently accepted, was race-track gambling was essential to the continuance of horse breeding. The course of the argument runs thus: The horse breeding industry must be saved. The thoroughbred is essential to horse breeding in general; racing is essential to the thoroughbred; gambling is essential to racing. In this method of reasoning one is reminded of the argument that the crop of clover seed is in direct proportion to the number of old maids in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BROWN: I may say that this is a favourite illustration that one of our professors in logic used to use as an example of false reasoning. Perhaps hon. members may not understand the connection between old maids and the clover crop, so I will give it to them: Old maids keep cats. Cats kill mice. Mice destroy the bumble bees. The bumble bees assist in fertilizing the clover. Therefore old maids are necessary for a good clover crop.

Quod erat demonstrandum. That argument, Mr. Speaker, is not much more absurd than the contention that the business of betting is essential to the continuance of horse breeding. Sir Robert Borden is quoted as saying, after he had heard an able lawyer put up his argument on behalf of the race-track gamblers:

> I congratulate you on your skill and ability but it will take more argument and more evidence than I have yet heard to convince me that horse breeding depends on gambling.

I cannot imagine the Minister of Agriculture, or any other practical agriculturist, today risking his reputation in support of any such proposition. The hon. member for Brant indicated the opinion held by many that the thoroughbred was not a very useful animal anyway—that it had about the same relation to horse breeding in general, or useful horse breeding, as a game cock has to useful breeds of poultry. I shall not discuss that phase of the question at all, but granting that it is a useful animal we can promote this development by much more efficient means than by maintaining a race-track; and if we have to choose between the development of horses and the development of good men and women, I, for my part, have no hesitation in saying that we should seek to raise up good men and women in this country.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman introduce legislation to that effect?

Mr. BROWN: No, I do not propose to introduce legislation to that effect, but there are some things that we can prevent by legislation. An hon. member used an expression in this House a few days ago, in some other connection, that made an impression upon my mind, and it was this: Laws that fail to prevent such a thing are evil, laws that encourage it are vicious. Now, we are maintaining an institution sanctioned by law the effects of which, in my judgment, are none other than vicious, and while we will not undertake directly to make men moral by act of parliament we should withdraw from evil institutions the sanction which they have had from our parliaments.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the hon. gentleman aware that His Majesty King George V is one of the greatest patrons of the turf with everything that that implies?

Mr. BROWN: That is altogether aside from the argument. I do not know that it has any bearing upon the subject one way or the other, and up to the present I have not found it necessary to make the opinions, whatever they may be, of George V, the standard by which I shape my own.

I said that this resolution was not directed against private betting, but in order to make my point that the business of promoting betting should be suppressed by law I must, very briefly, deal with the ethics of gambling, and I shall deal with them only by way of a few quotations from practical men of affairs. I know there is a disposition in some quarters to sneer at what are called puritanical notions. In quoting expressions of opinion on the subject of gambling in general I shall confine my quotations to those who are eminent in walks of life other than as social or moral reformers. I might make the list a very lengthy one, but I shall confine myself to only a few. Horace Greely said:

> The darkest hour in any man's life is when he first thinks he can get a dollar by any other means than squarely earning it.

Judge Catron, formerly of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

> Gaming is a general evil which leads to vicious inclinations, destruction of morals, abandonment of industry and honest employment, a loss of self control and self respect.

Listen to what an eminent English judge says about it, I refer to Mr. Justice Hawkins:

> I know of nothing more likely to ruin a young and inexperienced man than the system of betting that goes on around us.

There is another whom I would like to quote, a member of this House, with whom I have at times to differ on matters of opinion but with whom on this particular matter I find myself in right hearty agreement. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says, as reported in Hansard during the debate in 1910:

> For my part I take the ground that the institution of betting in itself has done nobody any good in this world. I do not believe that under its best conditions it ever does any good and I believe it does infinite harm. The institution of betting, when you wipe away the verbiage, when you look down at the principle of its being, its heart and life, what is it? It is the attempt to get in this world by chance what should be got only by industry and toil. It is really based upon the desire to get the wages of this life without working for them. It is an effort to get the rewards of doing well by doing ill, an effort to get the prizes of life by doing injury to one's fellows instead of doing them good.
>
> I leave out betting in certain forms, I leave out betting in private houses and in some other places, not because it is not wrong in itself and should not be suppressed, but because it is beyond the power of parliament and beyond the power of the law to suppress it, and because the public opinion is not sufficiently far advanced to warrant such legislation and to ensure its enforcement. When I find the element of gambling removed from the business element and clearly disclosed in its naked deformity, I say it is the duty of parliament to strike at it as soon as we find we effectively can.

Mr. VIEN: Would not the same apply to all speculative operations on the stock exchange?

Mr. BROWN: I would have preferred to have been allowed to complete my quotations.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What about the grain exchange?

Mr. BROWN: Then, continuing the quotation:

I believe that if a vote were taken in Manitoba just as he (Hon. Mr. Stratton) said if it were taken in Ontario, eighty per cent of the voters would vote in favor of the suppression of race-track gambling. I do not think these figures overstate the fact. It is quite true that there may be constituencies more directly interested which are not of the same complexion; but, taking it all in all, I am of the opinion that the public sentiment of this country demands this legislation, and to deny it would be not to bring the law into contempt, as the hon. member for Brandon suggested, but rather to bring down in the estimation of the people of this country the standard of the parliament of Canada.

I am in hearty agreement with the right hon. gentleman, this is not a case where only the private morals of individuals are affected. The effect is felt upon our whole national life. It has been asserted again and again, and with truth, that as a nation we can only recover our financial stability by getting down to hard work. But hard work is the last thing that many people want to engage in. The desire for easy money, perhaps as much as anything else, lies at the root of our economic difficulties.

The desire for easy money finds its expression in a number of different ways. The bank robber and the burglar follow their nefarious practices because they do not want to work at all. Or it may be that the desire is expressed by always looking for a soft job, with a maximum of pay for a minimum of work. And then there is another class that seeks to escape work by living upon the weaknesses and vices of their fellows. I am by no means convinced that the last of these is any less a menace to our well-being than the first. Indeed I shall go further and say I am convinced that the man who lives by exploiting human weaknesses is a greater menace to society than the bank robber or the burglar.

Now we might take a few more quotations or illustrations from what has been said by hard practical men of affairs. I am informed —and I believe my information is correct— that the Quebec Board of Trade passed on its own initiative a resolution asking for the suppression of this curse; that the wholesale manufacturers of British Columbia passed a similar resolution; that the retail merchants of British Columbia have also passed similar resolutions; and I have here some newspaper clippings which I wish to read. The Toronto Globe during the past summer carried on an active campaign against these people, and these clippings are taken from the Toronto Globe. A reporter called upon a man in Windsor, and his account of the interview reads:

"Stepping into a grocery store on the way from the track, yesterday, the writer asked the proprietor how racing affected his business.

"'I'll tell you how it affects me,' he said. 'Very, very rotten. Let me show you how. Last Saturday night one of my customers came in and calling me aside he told me he could not pay his bill this week because he had been to the races in the afternoon and had lost his week's wages. Well, that was all right. It was only $15, but enough unpaid $15 accounts would soon put me out of business. About half an hour later another of my customers came in and told practically the same story. He owed me $20 and his wife had given him the money to come and pay me. Instead he had gone to the races, and when the last race had been run he had been cleaned out of every cent. Later a third customer came in and told me the same story. He, too, had lost his week's wages at races and couldn't pay.

"'No. I'm not in favour of race-tracks and I guess you can see why, and I'm not the only one. I'll venture to say that if a canvass of the city business men were made, 85 per cent of them would vote against race-tracks in Windsor.'"

Mr. CANNON: Did that grocer not have a couple of winners among his clients?

Mr. BROWN: I have another extract from the Toronto Globe, headed "Labour Chiefs Oppose Race-Track Gambling." It reads:

The executive committee of the Labor Temple Company is unanimous in its opposition to gambling on race-horses, and it is determined to stamp it out within the labour movement if it possibly can. It is the effect of the evil which concerns the committee. "The executive is unanimous in its determination to stamp out gambling in the labour movement. Men who are given to the habit are no good to the movement," said James Simpson, secretary of the company, yesterday.

I have still another newspaper clipping which I shall not read, which indicates that the women of the county of Essex—women who bear evidently French names—are taking the lead in an agitation directed against this institution as it is legalized to-day. However, I will give a few figures, omitting some that have already been given by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good), in regard to prosecutions:

And on the tracks the wagering rose from $12,500,000 in the first half of 1917 to $42,164,000 in 1920. That year Dr. J. G. Rutherford's commission after thorough investigation recommended further restrictions upon, but not suppression of the betting houses. Hereafter no book-making or pool-selling was allowed. Pari-mutuels, only were permitted; they were alleged to be respectable and honest; a lower and fixed percentage of rake-offs was allowed the jockey clubs.

Here is a statement that is taken from the Detroit News. It is an estimate made un-

doubtedly by some representative of that paper and it gives certain figures as showing the loss sustained by those who patronize the race tracks. There were seven different races run and the estimate made out of this one day's betting was that of $77,000 that was bet by the public they received back only $49,828. The total estimate made by this paper was that, taking into account not only the wages, but the amount received for tickets and in many other ways in which money was spent in this connection, the loss to Detroit gamblers in two days' racing was $92,151.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a phase of the question that we cannot very well afford to overlook. I tried to deal with this matter from the standopint of pure business and economics, but we cannot allow ourselves to be altogether blinded to certain other considerations, and I beg the indulgence of the House while I present this matter for a few moments. This touches more the question in its human aspect and reads as follows:

First Few Bets Are Won; Then House and Home Lost.

The social case against race-track betting is the case of the man who is tempted to bet that which he cannot afford to lose. The Globe was reliably informed the other day that betting on horses has added one more domestic tragedy to its already long list.

A man in the west end of the city, just north of Bloor street, owned a comfortable eight-roomed house last winter. His children were examples of cleanliness and thorough home training. They were among the best-dressed scholars at school. Then the father was seized with a betting passion.

Last spring he placed his first bet. He visited race-courses, and his wife accompanied him. They won a little money at the start. This gave them confidence that they could finally beat the unbeatable system. Not long afterward they began to lose, and continued to lose. Finally they staked their last possession—their home, the home of their children.

A few weeks ago the man had to vacate his comfortable residence. The furniture was moved away in one single small truckload. He is living in a frame shack on the outskirts of the city at the present time.

This is another clipping from the Globe, dated Windsor, August 3:

The only things found in the pockets of a man who leaped into the Detroit river from Belle Isle bridge at midnight last night were a notebook, 30 cents in money, and stubs of three Windsor racing tickets, which represented $2 bets on horses that had been beaten. The body was recovered to-day.

According to memoranda in his notebook the man is—

I will not give his name. It is bad enough to have it recorded in the press of the country, without having it permanently inscribed in the records of this House. It says:

—an employee of the Canadian Pacific who lived in Winnipeg.

I have a letter which I would like to read. I know, however, the prejudice and, perhaps, it is more than prejudice—possibly I should not use that term—the feeling and the very proper one that exists in this House against anonymous letters. This letter is anonymous, and yet I am thoroughly convinced of its bona fides. If there is the slightest objection to my reading it, why, I shall not do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. BROWN: Let me ask the House to forget all about the composition and the grammar of this letter and think of it only as it expresses the sufferings of a broken-hearted woman.

Mr. JACOBS: I hope it does not reflect upon any member of the House.

Mr. BROWN: No.

Mr. VIEN: How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. BROWN: If there is any objection to my reading the letter, I shall not do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. BROWN: The letter reads:

Dear Sir,

Seeing enclosed which I cut out from Herald paper, thought I would like to write you referring to same, asking you to do your utmost in fighting same. It is a curse just as the drink and dope is. I have one of the loveliest of husbands, but for this dirty gambling we would not have a word. It seems to me that these men that take the bets must follow them up and send them papers to urge them to gamble for I am sure my husband would be glad to be free of it, but if these snakes in the grass are allowed to traffic as they do we shall have to lose all respect for our husbands where we might have been Oh! so happy. I know mothers that are heart broken on account of their young boys gambling. Do you know there are candy stores, paper stores and I heard the other day of an old second hand furniture plying the trade, and then there are prominent men in cigar stores, and they tell me the detectives know and the storekeepers are warned when to expect them. Talk about race courses, we do not need them and these pool rooms why do we want them? It is only an easy living for these people who are running them. You, sir, can understand no one likes publicity of this kind, but you can honestly know that this comes from a good woman one that would be so proud to own her own little home instead of always paying gambling debts.

Why do they not make a law to stop this drink gambling and dope, if they gave them corporal punishment the lash it would do more good. Trusting this will do some good. I am yours truly.

I trust that the House of Commons of Canada is not indifferent to these considerations, and I hope the House will adopt this resolution, if not unanimously, at least by such a majority as will make it clear to the world that we hold to the sound economic theory that work brought to bear upon the natural resources of our country, is the only sure foundation for our national prosperity

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I first desire to congratulate the

mover of this resolution (Mr. Good) for bringing this question to the attention of the House. He is a man of study, and he has already initiated in this House a number of useful debates. I confess that I do not always share his views; but I wish I were able to argue the other side of the case as well as he does his own. But, the question of race betting is not, in my opinion, one that any hon. member need refrain from discussing through mere diffidence. My hon. friend has done a great deal of work in preparing and presenting his case. In fact, the very wording of his amendment shows considerable labour, although he is inclined to leave the responsibility for that to the law officers of the House of Commons. I will admit that I have been for many days at a loss to interpret it myself, and I came pretty nearly betting with a friend as to what it really meant. That meaning, the speech of my hon. friend, has at least made clear. And if I say that he has not succeeded in convincing me, that is no reflection, either against his treatment of the case, or against my sincerity in refusing to yield thereto.

If you free the observations of my hon. friend from the heap of information and the quotations with which he closed his arguments, notwithstanding his efforts and those of the seconder to specialize their motives in this case, what, in brief, they propose to do in practice, if not in their own intention, is, in my opinion, merely to introduce into this country a new offence, that of race betting. My hon. friend may say that his resolution deals merely with commercialized race betting; but he does not himself deny that race betting is closely connected with the holding of races in this country. But he says that that is an indifferent matter to him, and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) goes further and says that he is much more concerned in the raising of men and women. Whether we have race-tracks or whether we do not have them, the raising of men and women will not be interfered with in this country. Therefore, although his resolution does not explicitly say so, I say that he is really aiming at betting. The speech of the seconder of the resolution made that even clearer, for although he indulged in the same reserve as the proposer, the main substance of his speech was made up of quotations directed, not at commercialized betting, but at gambling as gambling, whether it be held in pool rooms or at race-tracks or anywhere else.

The first question, therefore, that we may put to ourselves is this: Is race betting in itself really a crime? I think that every hon member will admit that it is always a mistake for new legislation to create a new class of sinners.

Mr. GOOD: May I rise to correct the hon. member? I distinctly stated that I did not propose to make it a crime. The hon. member is clearly misrepresenting my position.

Mr. RINFRET: Perhaps both of us have been baffled by the resolution as prepared by the law officers. But what I am trying to establish is this, that whether or not my hon. friend proposes it, the tendency of his resolution will be actually to create a new offence, namely, that of race betting. The fact in itself of staking money on the eventual result of a race contains no element of evil; and I think it is going very far to say, as does the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), that it will sap the very foundations of national life. What may be regarded as bad—and possibly we may agree on this point—is the danger of an individual or an organization abusing the privilege to deceive or rob a portion of the public. What therefore, the law should seek to prevent is, not the act itself but merely its abuse. In other words, betting is not an offence; the abuse of betting and the dishonest methods surrounding it are alone to be fought against. It is on that principle that in many countries and in different provinces of our own Dominion, instead of prohibiting race betting altogether, legislators have thought better to regulate it and place it under proper conditions in order to protect the public. For me, it is merely a question of control. The pari-mutuel system, well-known to all, and to which my hon. friend himself has alluded, is an instance of such an application.

In my opinion this system of restricted betting is, to the proposal of my hon. friend, what the law of temperance in the matter of alcohol is to the law of absolute prohibition. Instead of curtailing individual liberty because of possible abuses, it stops the abuses by regulating individual liberty. And to my mind that is the proper way to proceed. We must not expect too much from human nature When a man obeys the Ten Commandments and escapes the seven capital sins he is on a fair way to sanctity. I do not believe in creating new sins; I find it hard enough to dodge the old ones. And unless I am shown that race betting in itself, even at the race-tracks, is an evil, I will persist in my opinion that those who care to should be allowed to do it. The law will serve its full purpose if it sees to it that such a practice is devoid of fraud and corruption. I grant you that even with the pari-mutuel or any such system

some people will suffer from the races by indulging in too much betting. I do heartily sympathize with the cases that have been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Lisgar. But what is the fact? I say that such people will not be stopped by any regulation. If they are debarred from betting on the races they will bet on anything,—on the number of white horses they will pass on the streets or on the odd figures on the licenses of passing automobiles. That is a well known fact. I believe that most of the men that have been alluded to, if they had not lost money at races, would have put their money on something else. I do not see at all, therefore, how this proposed resolution could do away with such an abuse. I would sooner see these men bet at the race-track under the control of a well-established system than see them go to the poolrooms. As a matter of fact, one of the young men referred to was, I understand, an habitué of poolrooms, places where men are not prevented from betting.

If you have proper regulation at the race-tracks you will provide, for the great majority of those who attend, clean sport and desirable enjoyment. My hon. friend himself has noted an increased attendance at the race-tracks. Of course, he argues that this shows that the evil is growing. But I might argue, on the other hand, that it shows a great increase in the public demand for race-tracks. Race betting and horse-racing have been so closely associated that it is readily conceded on every hand that you cannot have the one if you discard the other. Horse-racing has always been a great sport; it has been called a kingly one, and it is now enjoyed by great numbers of people in many civilized countries. Many arguments can be advanced in favour of it; but my hon. friend does not like the argument in regard to horse-breeding. Well, I am not an expert so far as that is concerned and I will indulge in no argument on that point. I would say this, however. My hon. friend says that he does not believe that race-tracks favour the raising of thoroughbreds; and further, he argues that these animals are not essential to the welfare of the agricultural class. A thoroughbred, I will admit, is an objet de luxe. But if we were to eliminate all such objects for such a reason as my hon. friend advances, does he not realize that the very progress of humanity would be
5 p.m. attacked in every direction? The fact that the raising of thoroughbreds is not essential to farming is certainly no argument against race betting.

But it might be well for the House to be reminded that race-track betting is a revenue producer for the public treasury. I could easily submit figures in support of this statement. Everyone knows that where race-tracks are permitted the state or the province, as the case may be, reaps an important revenue from the proceeds of the enterprise. In the province of Quebec the tax on receipts at the gates and the betting at the race-tracks totals, I understand, close to $700,000 annually; and the province of Ontario derives a still larger benefit from this source. If betting is controlled so as to prevent fraud, and if the public treasury obtains a commensurate proportion of its benefits, I do not see why there should be a demand for its prohibition. Besides, considering the human aspect of the case, as my hon. friend for Lisgar would say, I do not believe in a general way in the spirit of prohibition. In most cases it is not even practicable. We have in this country already too much prohibition and not enough enforcement. And my hon. friend in the end will find it much easier to prevent horse-racing than to prevent betting. If the people do not bet at the race-tracks, under a system of control, they will bet in the poolrooms, and the result therefrom will be much worse. Now, Sir, if we keep jamming the statutes with every shape of proposed reform we shall be so busy enacting that we shall have no time and no energy left to see that these enactments are enforced. It is not the racing but the betting that my hon. friend wishes to stop; and that I say he cannot do.

And after all, why prohibit so much? Life, Mr. Speaker, is not such a wonderful adventure that we should strive in every way and torture and wring and wrest our brains, to add to its difficulties. If we begin prohibiting there will be no end to the practice. A demand for prohibition may be advanced against anything that is not essential to common life. An economist has proclaimed that there are only three such things essential to life,—bread, water, and a blanket; and I believe that man must have lived in a cold country. The first element of luxury and excess appears when you put butter on your bread, when you flavour water, or when you cut a blanket in the shape of clothes. In primitive ages, Mr. Speaker, I fancy some censors must have objected to the flavouring of water or the cutting of blankets for the making of clothes, but the Liberals of the granitic period saved the day. If we were to apply that preventive spirit to every form of social activity which seems frivolous or superfluous, then we would gradually revert to the original state of primeval humanity. Some would prohibit the smoking of cigarettes; some

would stop theatres or motion pictures; some would do away with dancing or legislate against extravagant modes of dressing. Some vegetarians and utopians would condemn the eating of flesh and meat and would impose upon others the diet of their own delicate stomachs. But why try to deprive humanity of all that makes life bearable? What right have we to do it? We are endowed, I will admit, with legislative power, but that does not convey the right to play and juggle with every privilege of the common people.

I do not believe in such radical legislation. I believe in moderate laws that respect individual liberty, that are designed to add to the general comfort and satisfaction, not to impair it; that do not tend to drown one's existence in the dark depths of monotony and tediousness. And I will say in conclusion Mr. Speaker, that if there is one thing that I would like to see prohibited, it is prohibition itself.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to make a few remarks on the resolution before the House I would like to have it clearly understood that I have not a dollar invested in either race-tracks or race horses. I have, however, been closely identified with agriculture and stock breeding during all my life.

This resolution, as explained by its mover (Mr. Good) has for its object the prevention of betting as it is carried on on the race-tracks to-day. The mover and the seconder (Mr. Brown) state that it is not their intention to interefere at all with horse racing. It is a well-known fact that it is impossible at the present time to carry on horse racing without betting, and that it is very much better to carry on that racing under a well organized system than to have it carried on illegally, as is the case in some of the states to the south of us.

The provisions of the criminal code bearing upon horse racing have been amended several times during the last few years, but perhaps the most important move made in that connection was the appointment of the Rutherford Commission in 1919. At that time those opposed to racing, particularly with those with headquarters in Toronto, objected very strongly to the appointment of Dr. Rutherford, for the reason that he was a veterinary surgeon and knew something about horses. All of you who have followed the career of Dr. Rutherford, first as a private citizen, then as a representative of Manitoba in the provincial house, then as federal member from that province in this House, then as Veterinary Director General, when he organized the present Health of Animals branch and placed it on a sound basis; then as Railway Commisioner, will all agree that a better and more fair minded man could not have been found for the purpose in the whole Dominion of Canada. It affords me a great deal of pleasure to bring this to the attention of the House on this occasion.

The findings of that commission were to the effect that bookmaking should be eliminated; that the pari-mutuel system of betting should be adopted as the fairest that was known; that the races should be limited to seven per day; that percentages should be established on the basis of which those conducting the races could not collect from the public more than a certain amount of commission in proportion to the amount taken in in the betting during the day. This gave the public the assurance that they would receive all that was coming to them. It was rather hard on some of the small tracks, whose overhead expenses were practically as great as those of the larger tracks where the intake was very much greater. One of the sufferers in this connection was the Connaught Park Club situated across the river.

Another important point touched on in the report was that the Minister of Agriculture should have the power to accept or reject the type of machine used for the purpose. This was a most important provision. The clubs also were required to cover all the expenses of administration. Then it came to the point where it was necessary to select proper inspectors to see that the law was carried out, and after looking into the matter very carefully we assigned this duty to the Mounted Police. It was felt that that organization was quite capable of carrying on the work and that they could render first-class service. The commission also found that racing as it is carried on to-day could not be continued on a proper basis without betting.

Mr. McMASTER: Will the hon. member permit a question? Would he be good enough to develop that theme and state why it is impossible to carry on racing without betting?

Mr. TOLMIE I am glad to inform the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that that is my next note. In the first place, we have very strong competition on the American side, where according to the law they do not have any betting, but where, as a matter of fact betting is carried on freely—to a very much greater extent than it is carried on here. We find that you cannot get the proper number

of horses for the purposes of a really good meeting on this side of the line in the face of that competition unless you are able to attract them by large purses. Now, because I say we are getting some of these horses from the other side of the line, hon. members must not run away with the idea that they are necessarily American horses; some of the very best strains of racing horses on the American side and as far down as Tia Juana, Mexico, are Canadian horses, owned by Canadians. So that it is necessary for us to put up big purses in order to secure horses to take part in races on this side of the line, and the heavy expense involved in conducting races in Canada where the population is not very dense makes it necessary that we should have some other source of revenue than that which is afforded by the gate receipts.

Let us look for a moment at how racing is carried on in other countries. In New York state they are not supposed to bet on the races. There are five or six big tracks not very far from New York city where racing is carried on during a great part of the summer season and at those tracks they carry on what is known as the oral system of betting, which is illegal. Thousands of dollars change hands every day. The state does not exercise any control and where that kind of betting is carried on we find that quite frequently those attending the races are fleeced out of their money by book-makers of no standing. Down in New Orleans they also carry on an oral system of betting at the present time. In Nevada and some other states book-making is permitted. But in Kentucky and Maryland, which are two of the most important horse-breeding centres in the United States, they have tried both book-making and the pari-mutuel system, and they have now adopted the latter in both these states, finding it is the fairest way to conduct races. And they are securing a revenue from the racing amounting to several million dollars a year. In New Zealand and Australia racing is conducted under government control, and the pari-mutuel system is adopted. In France, racing has been under control for a number of years. They also operate under the pari-mutuel system, and the profits which are secured by the government are used for the improvement of live stock, for charities—for introducing water systems into small villages that have not enough money to provide their own water supply, for the restoration of farms in the devastated war area, for the building up of new model farms, and for the equipment of their agricultural colleges.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

In this country, if legal betting was stopped to-morrow we would have a great deal of betting going on illegally. In fact it is not difficult to step down town this afternoon—it would now be a quarter past two at Tia Juana—and if you know the ropes you can bet on a horse running a few miles out of San Diego, California, or on a horse running in New Orleans, or on horses racing in other states. So that making betting illegal does not control betting by any means, and I am quite safe in saying that there is no city of any size in the United States or Canada to-day where any interest is taken in horse racing where you could not obtain a bet of that kind. If you only want to find the place, it is as easy to find as a bootlegger in a prohibition area. Last year, as has been pointed out, Ontario received a revenue of some $4,000,000 as a result of taxes on racing. In Quebec, I believe, the amount derived by the government from racing was $850,000, the whole of which was devoted to charity.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions prevailing in Canada, where betting is under control and where racing is under control, are infinitely better than the systems I have just described existing in these states in the south where betting is not permitted. Far better to apply a law and have people betting out in the open than to restrict betting and have it carried on illegally behind a curtain. Speculation, I think I am safe in saying, is inherent in the British race, as it is in nearly all others. There is a tendency to spend your money with a view to increasing the amount, either by a bet on a horse race or by betting on stocks or on grain, or investing in real estate, and in many other ways; and I feel that if we stopped betting we would only be encouraging the system of so-called bootleg betting that is so prevalent at the present time. I claim that it is far better to apply remedies that would improve the conditions. I do not claim that the business is without abuse at the present time, but almost every business can be abused, almost any entertainment can be abused. I think we can attain a far better and a safer end by applying proper remedies to improve the conditions than by the application of a law which we cannot possibly carry into effect. Personally, I have never been able to see much difference between the man who wins a bet on a stock speculation and the one who wins a bet on a race track, except that in the one case he is credited as a successful business man and in the other some of our friends call him a gambler.

In Great Britain, racing has been carried on for centuries, and during that period they have created what is known as the thorough-

bred horse, a horse that is used for racing in all parts of the world to-day, a horse that has played a most important part in building up many other breeds and bringing them to their present state of perfection, a horse that has really been the foundation of our very best cavalry horses, and a horse that is very much in demand at a good price throughout the country. In addition, the thoroughbred to-day plays a most important part in the production of what is known as the saddle horse, and the hunter, for which there is a very brisk market in many parts of this continent. It was only a few weeks ago, when I was judging at the big winter fair in Toronto, that I saw in some of these hunter classes as many as forty, fifty and sixty head of horses in each competition. It was one of the finest shows I have ever seen. I might say that one of the best stables of hunter horses in the world is owned a few miles out of Toronto. They went down to Madison Square Garden, New York, a year or two ago, and were successful in winning a great majority of the prizes. You cannot obtain perfection in this particular class of horse without the thoroughbred horse being used in its improvement.

Another point. If you stop the thoroughbred from racing you will never get the same perfection as you have to-day. The race track is the only place we have to form a real opinion as to a horse's courage, stamina and speed.

Racing is more popular than ever in Great Britain. The races there are conducted in a clean-cut, sportsmanlike way, and if anyone is caught doing anything crooked, he goes to gaol if they can prove the case against him. Racing is patronized there by everybody from the costermonger to the King, and any one would be very cold-blooded indeed who could attend either the Derby or the race for the Ascot gold cup without being very much moved. I had the pleasure of attending in 1921, the Ascot races. People do not go there by the thousands, but by the tens of thousands. I saw acres of cockneys, more cockneys than I ever expect to see in my life again, on that race track. To give you an idea of the crowd, Mr. Speaker, and of the popularity of this sport, it required from ten-thirty in the morning till twenty minutes to three in the afternoon to travel in a first-class automobile thirty miles over the best roads I have ever seen. It was simply one continuous procession. The people take a very keen interest in the sport, and everybody appears to have a little bit on the big race or on some race during the day. I saw some of the finest looking people I ever saw in my life on that occasion.

Mr. DUFF: Ladies or gentlemen?

Mr. TOLMIE: And they all appeared to be enjoying the sport to the full. Let me quote what the London Times has to say about the Derby:

> Our people thrill to the Derby as to no other event in the sporting year. The great ones of the land are overshadowed by it into a just insignificance. A cabinet minister with double pneumonia would arouse far less concern than a Derby favourite with a cough. We are all apt in our own little worlds to think ourselves people of consequence. And so we may be. But we get our importance into better perspective when something happens that is really national—not the affair of any class or clique, but the feverish interest of everybody. Then we shrink to quite a wholesome size, and only become inflated again as Derby Day recedes. Next Wednesday, let us hope, will be a day of good sport. In any case, it will be a day when the noblest of animals will teach his masters their proper place.

That is an editorial published by, perhaps, the most prominent paper in the whole British Empire. Royalty not only attends races in Great Britain but also owns stables; and I may say here that I consider that where Royalty in the Old Country has taken an interest in live stock breeding—not only in horses but in other lines—it has been one of the greatest inducements to other people with money to invest along similar lines. Such encouragement as this has placed Britain to-day in the proud position where she has created, and maintains in a high state of perfection, more breeds of horses, cattle, sheep and swine, than the whole world combined.

In the Canadian West His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales owns a ranch where he breeds thoroughbred horses. Last fall he raced those horses and won some races, too. Great Britain has always been a great country for the encouragement of outdoor sports, perhaps the greatest country in the world in that particular line. And horse racing has been one of the greatest sports enjoyed by the people over there. This continuous devotion to sport and outdoor exercises has built up one of the greatest and best empires on the face of the globe. The people of Great Britain have made a record in business second to none. Their record in the late war is well known to you all. Their record after the war in meeting their liabilities, is perhaps one of their greatest achievements. Think of it for a moment. It is a country where racing has been carried on for hundreds of years and where—if we were to take the remarks of the mover and seconder of this resolution seriously—we might reasonably expect to find decay taking place as a result of the indulgence in that sport among all classes for hundreds of years. But what do we find? We find in Great Britain one of the best and strongest races physically in the world. It is

a country that has done more for the extension of—

Mr. BROWN: Has commercialized gambling been associated with horse racing for so many hundreds of years?

Mr. TOLMIE: All I know about it is that they go out there and bet, and I saw a string of book-makers at Ascot half a mile long. I did not ask them what they were doing, but they appeared to be trying to sell something. I am sure that this great country with all her achievements, and all her sins in the matter of horse racing, has done more to extend civilization, and Christianity, has done more to spread the word of the Bible than any other country,—and she has raced through it all.

Considering that we are descended from a stock like that in the Mother Land it is only natural that racing should be popular in Canada. The sport has been carried on here for many years. We have in the Ontario Jockey Club one of the oldest organizations in the Dominion, and one that races every year at the Woodbine track, where they put up a nice, clean show—as nice a show as anyone might expect to see anywhere on this continent. They have a race there called the King's Plate, the oldest stake race run on this Continent and one that was first brought into prominence by the late Queen Victoria having contributed the plate which is raced for at the present time. They have also done another valuable work in the distribution of stallions throughout the country—in fact one of the features of the big winter show recently held in Toronto was the nightly parade of the stallions owned by the Ontario Jockey Club, and distributed about the country for the improvement of live stock, many of which were brought from Great Britain at very heavy cost. As I pointed out before, these animals are doing a very great service in the country, and we are able by the use of such improved blood to produce hunter horses of high quality. These horses sell at from $500 to $5,000 apiece, according to their quality and their ability to perform.

Then we have, close to Ottawa, the Connaught Jockey Club. I have attended several of the meetings of this club across the river, and I want to say that while it is a small meeting it is one that will compare very favourably with any race meeting I have attended elsewhere. It is run and operated by business men of this city simply for the sport there is in the game, and I am quite sure that if their books were examined to-morrow it would be seen that under the present percentage allowed they are not making any very great profit. In this connection I might quote what the Ottawa Evening Journal has to say with regard to the meetings carried on at Connaught Park. In its issue of September 26, 1921, the Journal said editorially:

THE CONNAUGHT PARK MEETING

The Connaught Park Jockey Club is to be congratulated on the character of the autumn meeting. A week of splendid racing was provided and enjoyed by many thousands of people, men and women of all ages. There was no suggestion throughout the meeting or after it of dishonest racing. The patrons of the club appeared to get a fair gamble in their betting in the mutuel machines. Forty thousand dollars was given by the club in stakes and purses, these being of a size to attract some fine horses from a number of the leading racing stables of the continent. Canadian bred horses were prominent among the winners. It is understood that the Jockey Club kept in view local conditions in managing the meeting and that of a wage bill of $20,000 for the week a good part went to returned soldiers and practically all to local men.

Senator Belcourt, president of the club, Mr. Stewart McClenaghan, chairman of the management committee, Mr. T. P. Gorman, secretary, and others who were responsible for the conduct of the meeting, merit the appreciation of thousands of race-goers of the Capital. Good clean racing on well ordered tracks such as the Connaught Park Jockey Club presented, is the best opposition to the attempts of reformers to abolish the sport.

Now, I may say that racing is of the greatest assistance to some of our exhibitions held in the far West. In the first place racing has a distinct advantage over any other form of attraction at an agricultural exhibition, for the reason that if you hire certain attractions to perform during the week every daily performance is the same; but in the case of racing, no matter how often it is carried on, no two races are exactly alike, neither is one day's racing like that of the day previous. You therefore have an entire change of programme each day during the whole week. Racing seems to be the most popular sport that can take place in connection with agricultural exhibitions out in our country. We have had racing at the Victoria exhibition for a number of years. Last year, unfortunately, we elected a gentleman to high office in the city of Victoria who objected to racing. In the adjoining municipality of Oak Bay, another man was elected who also objected to racing. I suppose the two gentlemen put their heads together and decided that they would not have any races last summer in Victoria. The result was that a referendum on the subject was submited to the people of the city, and also of the adjoining municipality, as to whether we would have racing with pari-mutuel machines or not, and in both cases, when the votes were counted, the decision was decidedly in the affirmative. In the city of Victoria the vote in favour of horse racing with pari-mutuel machines was

something over two to one and the mayor of the city, who objected so strongly to racing last year, now stays at home, a majority of 3,600 having been cast against him in the municipal elections.

Racing is enjoyed by thousands of people in this country. Thousands of dollars have been invested in racing plants, and in breeding establishments and stables. I know of one plant in Canada the proprietor of which told me only last summer out at the Connaught Club races, that he had half a million dollars invested in his breeding establishment and racing stables. I claim that the right of these people should be protected. They have a right to ask that from the government of this country. I am quite sure that, after the futile efforts of the people to the south of the line, by certain legislation, to make the people in that country good, we should profit by the lesson, and should realize that you cannot legislate people to be good in this country any more than you can in any other. If the people are inclined to speculate they will do it, and if they cannot do it legally, they will do it illegally. It is far better, in my opinion, to have people betting out in the open, where everybody can see them, rather than to drive them to the pool rooms, to illegal betting and card playing. Let me quote an extract from a correspondent in the Citizen, speaking of betting. It reads:

> —It is intensely human and natural—if all the joys and amiable weaknesses were cut out, life would be scarcely worth the living, and anyway a sinless Eden would make Heaven a perfectly superfluous abode.

If that paragraph represents the sentiments of a portion of the people of this country, then apparently there are some friends of the racing game. Under these conditions, why not look the matter squarely in the face, and try to apply reasonable remedies, rather than to attempt the impossible. If the mover and seconder of this resolution will bring down any scheme which will improve the conditions I will be very glad to give them my hearty support, because I believe in straight racing, and have absolutely no use for crooked racing. What we need to-day is rather proper regulation. We should aim at something we can achieve rather than try to accomplish the impossible.

Mr. GOOD: Did the hon. member approve or disapprove of the order in council passed in the summer of 1917?

Mr. TOLMIE: I never came into politics till 1918. There are laws that I have pointed out prohibiting the betting on races anywhere except on race tracks, and I would ask the mover of this resolution, are those rules being observed? It is quite possible to get a bet on any race being run in the United States to-day by simply going down town and finding out where bets will be taken. If we cannot enforce the present law against illegal betting in pool rooms, how does the mover and seconder ever hope to accomplish any more, if the present legislation which they propose is adopted? Why not try and remedy this first evil as we go along, and when we accomplish that try and do something better, if something reasonable is suggested? Personally, I would very strongly favour federal control of racing from one end of this country to the other. It would guarantee a certain amount of uniformity. We can remove the abuses as they occur in the racing game, and lift racing to a higher plane even than it occupies to-day. Then, by the application of reasonable taxation, a good revenue could be secured, which could be devoted to charity and the development of research in connection with our contagious diseases. And in that connection I would suggest that tuberculosis, both in the human family and in animals, should be taken up very much along the line which France has adopted successfully for some time past. I would like to point out to the mover of the resolution, that he supports the government in Toronto, which government is using its best efforts to squeeze the last dollar out of the racing game. In fact, it has reached the point where it is little less than extortion at the present time. If they are really in earnest in their desire to eradicate horse racing, why do they not tax it out of business? They have the law right in their hands, and can do it if they wish. That would be far better and more manly than to try to throw the responsibility on the federal government. Judging from their actions, one can only conclude that the revenue from racing has a great many more attractions for them than the eradication of the sport.

With regard to paternal legislation which is going to tell us when to go to bed and when to get up, I may say that there is very strong resentment among the people throughout the country. There is no use attempting to force upon the people any form of legislation which we cannot carry out, and if we are going to ask British immigrants to come and settle in Canada, for goodness sake let us leave them a few things that they can do that they were accustomed to do in the Old Country before they came over here. I believe, Mr. Speaker, as I have said once before, that we can accomplish a good deal by taking hold of this matter and investigating it thoroughly, applying those remedies that will cure the condition, rather than by the application of im-

possible legislation. Therefore, I must oppose the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I desire, in rising to support the motion proposed by the hon. member for Brant, to deal with some of the—I was going to say the arguments, but I think I will qualify that remark by saying—the assertions made by those who are opposed to it. Let me first deal with the royalist argument introduced by way of interjection by my good friend the learned and hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). Does the hon. member for Brant not know, says the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, that the King of England is an owner of race-horses, a supporter of race meets and all that that means? If the hon. member desires to infer that the King of England is fond of seeing horses race, I do not doubt that that is true, but my recollection of all the public utterances of King George have been to the effect that he is a strong opponent of gambling, and I know his father was before him.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that an assertion or an argument?

Mr. McMASTER: That is an argument and an assertion, but the royalist argument used by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise members on both sides not to use the name of His Majesty in the present discussion. First of all, rule 19 states that no member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty. Of course this afternoon no member has used disrespectfully the name of His Majesty, but this rule must be interpreted, and I find in the authors that the name of His Majesty should never be brought into a debate in a way to influence the opinions of a deliberative body. I refer to rule 19. You will find in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules, under rule 19:

> Besides the prohibitions contained in this rule, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada that a member, while speaking, must not:

And I refer to paragraph (f) which reads:

> (f) Use the King's name for the purpose of influencing debate.

And whilst I have not in my hand Bourinot or May, I know there are any number of precedents where the Speaker has, during a debate, stopped members addressing the House when the name of His Majesty or His Excellency has been mentioned. Let me quote the following from Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, twelfth edition, at page 292:

> The irregular use of the King's name to influence a decision of the House is unconstitutional in principle, and inconsistent with the independence of parliament. Where the Crown has a distinct interest in a measure, there is an authorized mode of communicating His Majesty's recommendation or consent, through one of his ministers; but His Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion, apart from that of his responsible advisers; and any attempt to use his name in debate to influence the judgment of parliament, would be immediately checked and censured.

I would also refer to Bourinot, page 338, where it is stated that:

> The use of the name of the sovereign or his representative in debate, so as to interfere with the freedom of discussion, or for the purpose of influencing the determination of the House or the votes of members, with respect to any matter pending in parliament is out of order, being unconstitutional and an interference with the independence of parliament.

I must say that there was but a very mild use this afternoon, and there was nothing disrespectful. I am, however, just stating the principle which is accepted in England and in Canada, that is to avoid entirely mixing up the name of His Majesty in any debate. We must not forget that this assembly, like the House of Commons in England, is considered the first club of gentlemen in the land.

Mr. McMASTER: The argument used by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) was amplified and extended by the genial member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). In support of gambling at race-tracks, he called upon British and imperial sentiment. The British Empire apparently, according to the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) —and perhaps the portfolio which he held before is some excuse for the position he assumes—rests not upon the commerce of Great Britain, not upon the fact that John Bull is, perhaps, the greatest trader in the world, not upon the manufacturers or the shippers of Great Britain, but upon the racing of Great Britain, and it is because the British people are so given to racing, that they have been able to have their far-flung Empire upon which the sun never sets.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does the hon. member mean to say that I deliberately said that the progress of Great Britain and its commerce depended upon horse racing?

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say that the hon. member said that deliberately; but I say that that was the inference from his remarks, and that is a fair paraphrase of what he said. I can understand that prompt settling of liabilities may be encouraged by attendance at a race-course, and so far as that goes, per-

haps, my hon. friend is right. But that the spread of Christianity and of the Bible was in some way connected with the institution of betting at race-courses is quite beyond me.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is the hon. gentleman stating that I said I believed the extension of Christianity and of the Bible was due to horse-racing?

Mr. McMASTER: No, I will say almost exactly what the hon. member said. "The British people are a great people." We will all agree with that. "They have spread the Bible throughout the world, and they have been racing all the time." Was it inferred by my hon. friend that racing was deterrent to the spread of Christianity and the Bible, or was it in spite of racing that they were spreading the Bible, or was it because racing creates manly people and manly people were spreading the Bible?

Mr. JACOBS: I interject that they were racing to spread the Bible.

Mr. McMASTER: I am glad my hon. friend is interested in this subject. I tell him, he is interested in the Old Testament but not in the New. It would seem to me that what my hon. friend (Mr. Tolmie) has stated, has nothing to do with the greatness of Great Britain. I have a great admiration for the British people; but I have no admiration for the addiction to gambling and betting which is one of the failings of that great people.

Then we heard from the hon. gentleman who brought forward the imperialistic argument, the argument of vested interests. There are, he said, hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in racing plants, and as racing can be maintained only through betting, we must maintain betting in order to maintain racing, in order to secure the permanence of the invested capital in that business—for I take it that that argument is an admission that racing is not only a sport but a business.

Then my hon. friend spoke about "paternal legislation" which he denounced in unmeasured terms. If he will turn to the criminal code and look at the law on betting, 2 George V, chapter 19, he will see paternal legislation carried to the utmost degree. We are told how many days a week horses can run, and how many miles from cities race tracks may be established. If ever fatherly care was shown in connection with legislation it certainly is shown in the case of this statute.

Why am I in support of this resolution? Because I am a Liberal, not a Liberal of the age referred to by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), but a modern Liberal. When I see in our statutes that gambling, —that is to say, gambling from which someone makes a profit, is prohibited everywhere except on a race-track— I take objection. It is not attempted to touch, and this resolution does not touch, gambling between two friends who wish to put a bet upon a horse or upon the odd or even number of an automobile, or to adopt any other foolish way of wasting one's time or money. What is objected to is the exception made in favour of race-tracks by the law of the land in regard to common gaming houses. That is the point. Is it fair that two or three men, who wish to gamble, and who meet together and appoint one to keep the— what is the name?—"kitty" it would be in some games—to keep the table and to have a rake-off for keeping the table, should come under the condemnation of the criminal law, while other men are permitted by the law to go three miles outside of some city, maintain a race-course and run races so many times a week, and authorize someone to make money out of their gambling? I believe in equal rights for all and special privileges for none, and that is the main objection I have to the law as it is at present.

My hon. friends who have opposed this motion have spoken as though the motion were an impairment of individual liberty. Of course it is. But article 235, dealing with betting and pool-selling elsewhere than on race-tracks; article 228, defining what is the keeping of a disorderly house; article 227 of the criminal code, in which a common betting house is defined;—these are all infringements of natural liberty. The eloquent speech, which everyone enjoyed listening to, pronounced by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), was not directed against this resolution, it was directed against the criminal code of this country which forbids betting as a commercialized proposition. His whole speech was in favour of open betting; and if he were consistent with himself he would be as strongly opposed to the present law as to the resolution introduced in this House by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good).

Now, let me take up for a moment the proposition that horse-racing could not exist without gambling. I know very little about horse-racing. I have been fond of sport all my life, but what I enjoyed was playing at something myself and not seeing animals or other people playing. If horse-racing has attractions that draw the crowd merely for the love of seeing the horses run, it would seem to me that the gate receipts should be

great enough to enable prizes to be given sufficiently high to encourage competition in horse-racing. And if the existence of horse-racing is necessary to the development of a high class of blood animal, though I am all for economy and hate governmental expense, I would prefer to see the government offer a few good prizes for the best race-horses and do away with this roundabout method of obtaining money for the purpose of giving prizes. I would infinitely prefer to see the government give a few great national prizes for the best three or four or five classes than to have us depend on a weakness in human character and in human conduct, to call it no worse than that. I am one who believes that you cannot legislate men into righteousness. But you can, by legislation, remove a great many of the snares that beset the rising generation.

On motion of Mr. Carmichael the debate was adjourned.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE COLONEL G. H. BAKER, M.P.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate acquainting this House that the Honourable Messieurs Bradbury, Casgrain, Foster (Alma), Griesbach and Pope have been appointed to confer and act with a like committee of the House of Commons in further considering and determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the parliament buildings to the late Lieut-Colonel Baker, M.P., for Brome, who lost his life on the field of battle.

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

Thursday, March 1, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 37, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 38, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill No. 40, respecting a certain patent of Henry Mathew Wells and James Edward Southcombe.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

[Mr. McMaster.]

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 41, to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): This is a bill to amend sections 314 and 318 of the Railway Act, 1919. Section 314, which deals with equal tolls to be charged by the railways, contains two qualifying phrases which permit of all sorts of inequalities. It is proposed to amend this section by striking out these two qualifying phrases. The first phrase, in the first and second lines, reads "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions," and the second phrase, in the fourth line, reads "passing over the same line or route." Section 318 deals with facilities to be afforded for the movement of grain from the western provinces to Lake Superior terminals and destinations east. It is proposed to amend this section so as to make it apply to destinations on the Pacific coast also.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 42 to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. KENNEDY: This is practically the same bill as I introduced last session. I hope this time it will pass the House and become law.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the purpose?

Mr. KENNEDY: It is a bill to strike out an amendment to the Criminal Code passed in 1921, being section 20 of chapter 25 of the Statutes of 1921.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION—LEGAL EXPENSES

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. Did W. N. Tilley, K.C., render an itemized statement for $100,000 paid him for legal services?
2. If so, was the statement taxed?
3. How much per day was he paid?
4. How many days did he act for the sum he received?

5. What minister agreed on behalf of the late government to pay him for his services?

6. What were the total legal expenses, what amounts were paid, and to what lawyers were payments made in connection with or arising out of the Grand Trunk arbitration or taking possession of the Grand Trunk or any or all of its lines or properties?

7. On what dates were each of the lawyers retained in proceedings to take possession of the Grand Trunk and how many days did each act, and what fee per day was each paid?

8. Were any itemized statements rendered by these lawyers showing their expenses and disbursements in detail and what government official revised or taxed these expenses?

9. What were the items of expenses charged for and paid to these lawyers?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. W. N. Tilley, K.C., rendered an itemized account for the $95,880 paid him for legal services in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration and appeal.

2. Yes, by Department of Justice.

3. $400 per day while absent from Toronto. $100 per day while in Toronto.

4. 238 days.

5. The Minister of Justice.

6.

W. N. Tilley, K.C., Toronto	$ 95,880 00
H A. Lovett, K.C., Montreal	46,499 27
Hector McInnes, K.C., Halifax	23,910 00
J. C. H. Dusseault, K.C., Montreal.	9,164 05
E. F. Newcombe, Ottawa	9,640 00
Estate of Z. A. Lash, Toronto	5,000 00
Pierce Butler, Minneapolis	71,531 52
T. Ludlow Chrystie, New York	185 00
Lawrence Jones & Co., London, Eng.	158 41
Chas. Russell & Co., London, Eng.	2,427 49
Sundry accounts, legal books, printing, etc.	2,850 65
Total legal expenses	$267,246 39

7.

W. N. Tilley, K.C., retainer, $10,000; on or about Dec. 1, 1919, 194 days at $400 per day; 44 days at $100 per day.

H. A. Lovett, K.C., retainer, $5,000; Dec. 4 1919 to May 15, 1922, 90 days at $150 per day; 273 days at $100 per day; part of 1 day at $15.

Hector McInnes, K.C., retainer, $5,000; March 8, 1920 to June 3, 1921, 107 days at $150 per day; 6 days at $100 per day.

J. H. C. Dusseault, K.C., March 11, 1921, to Sept. 12, 1921; 39½ days at $150 per day; 32 days at $100 per day; part days, 9 at $35 per day.

E. F. Newcombe, April 5, 1920, to June 20, 1922; 5 days at $50 per day; 213 days at $30 per day; 80 hours at $5 per hour.

Estate of Z. A. Lash, Sept., Oct., and Nov., 1919, bulk sum authorized by O.C., P.C. 2741, Aug. 5, 1921, $5,000.

Pierce Butler, retainer, confirmed Feb. 9, 1920, $10,000; 140 days at $400 per day 7½ days at $100 per day.

T. Ludlow Chrystie, April, 1920, bulk sum, $185; Lawrence Jones & Co., bulk sum, $158.41; Chas. Russell & Co., bulk sum, $2,427.49.

8. Yes; charges taxed by Department of Justice.

9.

W. N. Tilley, K.C., living and travelling allowance, 194 days at $20		$3,880 00
H. A. Lovett, K.C., living and travelling allowance, 19 days at $20		380 00
H. A. Lovett, K.C., typewriting	$237 44	
H. A. Lovett, K.C., telegrams and telephone	29 78	
H. A. Lovett, K.C., express charges	37 05	
		304 27
Hector McInnes, K.C., living and travelling allowance, 113 days at $20		2,260 00
J. C. H. Dusseault, K.C., cab hire	$2 50	
express charges	1 55	
		4 05
E. F. Newcombe, living and travelling allowance, 130 days at $20		2,600 00
Pierce Butler, living and travelling allowance, 139 days at $20		2,780 00
Telegrams, etc., (no details)		51 52
Exchange on cheque issued in Canadian funds instead of New York funds		1,950 00

SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Mr. IRVINE:

1. What is the total expenditure of the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research from its establishment up to Jancary 31, 1923?

2. Of this total, what has been expended upon (a) salaries, (b) expenses paid in connection with meetings of the council, (c) expenses of meetings of committees, etc., (d) printing, stationery and general office expenses, (e) university professors and students grants, bursaries, etc., (f) to investigators other than those connected with universities?

3. What is the yearly rental value of the rooms occupied by the council and by the permanent staff?

4. What is the number of investigators or research workers that have been assisted by the council, and, if any, what number of results can be claimed to have been of national advantage?

5. What are such results?

6. Are any of those engaged in original research attached to the advisory councils permanent staff at Ottawa?

7. Is the advisory council arranging to establish a technical library in Ottawa and is the council purchasing technical and scientific books and periodicals?

8. If so, at what annual expense and are similar books and periodicals purchased by other of the government departments?

9. What moneys, if any, have the council paid or promised to pay for contributors to the press, and for assisting its propaganda in furtherance of their scheme which has for its objective the establishment of a National Research Institute under the direction of the said council, and to whom have such moneys been paid?

10. How many directors or administrators have, from time to time, administered the work of the council, what are the names of those who have occupied the position, what salaries were paid them, what was their immediate previous occupation, and what salaries did they receive therefrom?

11. How many university students and others have been assisted to study in universities situated outside Canada?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. $475,518.37.

2. (a) $116,891.61; (b) $27,511.60; (c) $29,-897.97; (d) $33,459.59; (e) 1. Assisted Researches granted to university professors, $49,539.99; II. Fellowships, studentships and bursaries awarded to university graduates, $105,875.00. (f) $87,901.88.

3. Rental value of rooms occupied is estimated at $2,508 per annum.

4. Grants for assistance to researches have been made to fifty investigators. In addition to this, in order to increase the supply of trained research workers in Canada, 27 fellowships, 65 studentships and 54 bursaries have been awarded to university graduates, the holders of which are required to engage in research work. Detailed information regarding these grants and awards and the results therefrom is given in the annual reports of the Advisory Research Council.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. No. The Advisory Research Council, as at present constituted, is an advisory body and does not maintain a scientific staff.

7. The Advisory Research Council maintains only a small reference library of technical and scientific books and periodicals, for its own use.

8. The average annual expenditure on the library of the Advisory Research Council during the four years ending March 31st, 1922, was $942.57. We have no information as to the expenditure by other government departments on scientific publications.

9. E. W. Grange, $600; J. L. Payne, $1000; B. B. Cook, 1,360.

10. Four gentlemen have occupied the position of Administrative Chairman: Dr. A. B. Macallum, formerly Professor of Biochemistry at the University of Toronto; Dr. R. F. Ruttan, Head of the Department of Chemistry at McGill University; Dr. R. A. Ross, Consulting Engineer; and Dr. Frank D. Adams, Vice Principal and Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science, McGill University. None of these gentlemen received any salary for their services with the exception of Dr. Macallum, who, while giving his entire time to the work of the council, was paid a salary of $10,000, per anum. We have no information regarding salaries which were not paid by the federal government.

11. Four in Great Britain, one in the United States.

[Mr. Graham.]

PROVISION FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. Referring to the following resolution:

"That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment with which the municipalities and provinces find themselves unable to cope, it is desirable that the federal government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation."

—accepted by the government through the voice of the Prime Minister in parliament, and passed by the House of Commons on the 24th day of April, 1922, what has the government done in the way of dealing effectively with the unemployment situation as called for by the said resolution?

2. Referring to a Conference on Unemployment, held in Ottawa on the 5th, 6th and 7th of September, what has the government done to give practical effect to any conclusions of the conference?

3. Is the provision for unemployment now in effect by reason of orders in council of the present government on as generous a scale as was in effect when the present government came into office?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. In accordance with what was understood to be the intent of the resolution in question, the whole matter of unemployment was taken up by the government for careful consideration. Since action taken by the federal government with regard to relief of unemployment had hitherto been by way of co-operation with the provincial and municipal authorities, these authorities having been deemed to be wholly responsible for dealing under normal conditions with questions of this nature, it was deemed that a conference between the federal government and the governments of the several provinces would be desirable for the purpose in view, and that steps taken to convene such a conference would be a means of dealing effectively with the unemployment situation as called for by the said resolution.

2. A Federal-Provincial Conference was held in Ottawa on September 5, 6 and 7, 1922. persons in attendance being members and officials of the federal government and of the various provincial governments, with the exception of the province of Prince Edward Island, which reported that it had no unemployment problem. The whole problem of unemployment, in the light of the latest information available in the various parts of the Dominion as to conditions then existing

and deemed likely to prevail during the then ensuing winter, was under careful review. Earnest attention was given to the question of action which might seem to be necessary on the part of the federal or provincial authorities individually or in co-operation and certain general conclusions were reached. The government continued to keep closely in touch with the various aspects of employment conditions in different parts of the Dominion, and after due consideration P. C. 220 was on February 5, 1923, enacted.

3. Yes, having regard to unemployment conditions as appearing during the present winter and by comparison with those of the winter of 1921-22.

GUESSING COMPETITIONS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

In view of the fact that at the last session of parliament section 235 of the Criminal Code of Canada was amended to read as follows: "Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment and to a fine not exceeding $1,000 who advertises, prints, publishes, exhibits, posts up or otherwise gives notice of any offer, invitation, or inducement to bet on, to guess or to foretell the result of any contest."

1. Is the government aware that at Vancouver, British Columbia, and elsewhere in Canada, corporations are printing, publishing and advertising on a large scale, in various newspapers, invitations and inducements to guess or foretell results of contests, and that immense sums of money have been for months past and are now being diverted from legitimate channels to gamble on the above described devices?

2. Is it the intention of the government to make the law more stringent in order to stop such abuses as above indicated?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. No.

2. The matter is under consideration.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

COST OF INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. BLACK (Huron):

1. What was the total cost of collecting the income tax during the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What was the total amount of rental paid for offices used in connection with the said work during the above-mentioned year?

3. What would the total amount of interest amount to on money invested in buildings owned by the government and used in connection with the collection of said tax during the above-stated years?

4. What is the total amount of salaries paid in connection with the said collections during the years mentioned?

5. What is the total amount of all other expenses incidental to the collecting of income tax during the said years?

6. What is the total amount of income tax collected during the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

REDISTRIBUTION—MR. W. M. IVEL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): May I be permitted to ask the government if it is a fact that they have employed Mr. W. M. Ivel, defeated Liberal candidate for Victoria, B.C., to map out a scheme of redistribution for British Columbia; if Mr. Ivel has already announced a plan of redistribution for British Columbia, which is rather complete in all its details setting out what the various constituencies will be; and in the event of this being true, if the whole thing is cut and dried beforehand, what is the justification for a committee of this House to inquire into redistribution?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I did not understand that the matter was entirely in the control of the government. I had an impression that it was in the control of parliament, and that the House has appointed a committee for that purpose. I do not think anything has happened to withdraw the matter from the consideration of the committee.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I think the hon. gentleman might directly answer the question whether this man has been employed or not.

Mr. FIELDING: I could not answer it because I have no knowledge of it. I think it is highly improbable. I have no knowledge of it myself.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The statement appeared in the press.

Mr. FIELDING: Sometimes statements appear in the press which are not accurate.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): May I ask if it is the intention of the government to introduce any measure this year providing for old age pensions? There was a resolution passed last year to the effect that the government ought to consider the advisability of establishing a system of old age pensions in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: No decision favourable to the movement has been reached.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McQUARRIE: May I ask the government—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman has exhausted his right to put questions on the Orders of the Day.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): With all deference, Mr. Speaker, I must object to that ruling. There is no exhaustion of the right to put questions on the Orders of the Day; there is no limit of this right on the part of any single member of parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are pages of precedents in Bourinot and May respecting the right of members to put questions to the government and offer personal explanations before the Orders of the Day are called. The privilege is one which must not be unduly encroached upon. Questions put to the ministry must be to the point and must be brief. One member may put a question, but if he submits a series of questions it would block the business of the House. I think I am very liberal and generous with regard to the putting of such questions, but I must not be over-generous.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to be understood as saying that there is not a strict limitation as to the character of questions that can be put. What I wish to say is, that there is no limitation as to the number of questions that can be put by any individual member so long as they come within the circumference of interrogations of a proper character.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): In cases of great urgency it has been the practice to allow questions to be put on the Orders of the Day, but it is a salutary and customary rule to follow—in justice to the government and in order that questions shall be of a proper character and that they shall be properly answered—that interrogations go on the order paper. That has been the practice for years.

Mr. SPEAKER: With regard to the practice of putting oral questions, without any notice given, let me call the attention of hon. members to paragraph 311 under rule 31 in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

> When the Orders of the Day are called by the Speaker and before they are read by the clerk assistant, it is the practice sanctioned by usage but not by any positive rule, for members to make personal explanations or ask questions of the government, in reference to an inaccurate report of their speeches in the official records, or in the newspapers; or in denial of certain charges made against them in the public prints; or in reference to certain remarks which had been misunderstood on a previous occasion, and which they had not before had an opportunity of explaining; or in respect to delay in obtaining returns or to the incompleteness of certain returns brought down under the order of the House; or relative to the state of public business, or other matters of public interest. But these remarks should be brief, as they are only tolerated, there being no question before the Chair when they are made, and no discussion should be allowed when a minister has replied to a question, nor after a member has made a personal explanation. In asking a question, a member must not attack the conduct of the government. If a member wishes to make personal explanations in reference to the remarks which have fallen from another member the latter ought to be in his place.

In the present case, there is nothing before the Chair as the Orders of the Day are called, and, therefore, if by tolerance the Chair allows a member to put some question to the government, and even to repeat the question, it should be strictly confined to public business. Besides, private members should confine themselves to one question and not multiply them; otherwise the business of the House will be blocked. I hope, however, that hon. members will not think I am lecturing them, because it is for the proper carrying out of the business of the House that I make these remarks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that the present case is so important that it should be pressed, but the principle is important. I venture to say it has never been ruled that any private member must limit himself to one question on the Orders of the Day. I know it is a matter of tolerance, and I am quite in conformity with the statement of the principle that there should be brevity in asking the question, that it should be of some immediate import, and that upon the reply being given discussion cannot follow. But I really must dissent, and dissent emphatically, from a ruling which says that no member can ask two questions on the Orders of the Day, provided they come within the well known rules of parliament, as set forth in the authorities.

HON. MR. LAPOINTE'S VISIT TO WASHINGTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I would like to put a question to the government which is of importance at the moment. Is it a fact that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has gone to Washington to sign a fishery treaty between Canada and the United States, and if so does it have any relationship to the report of the Fisheries Committee which I believe is in course of preparation but has not yet been brought down?

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has gone to Washington on public business. I would prefer that my

hon. friend should put his question on the order paper so that we may give him a precise answer.

RACE-TRACK BETTING

MOTION BY MR. GOOD TO AMEND THE CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from Wednesday, February 28th, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Good with respect to race-track betting.

Mr. A. M. CARMICHAEL (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue this debate on the important resolution that we heard discussed yesterday, I wish to state at the outset my position in regard to the resolution. I am unreservedly in favour of the resolution. I do not take that position because of any unfortunate circumstances, as far as I am personally concerned, in the past, in connection with gambling because my experience along the lines of gambling have been very limited indeed. I can recall one occasion being in our neighbouring country to the south of the international line, in one of their prosperous cities, and coming across what was called the nickel slot machine. Being young and foolish, I was induced to drop a nickel in the customary place, and I was very much surprised to see eleven nickels roll out. I do not know whether that was gambling or not, but my natural national instinct possessed me at that time, and I put the money in my pocket and went away. Outside of that experience, about the only other chance experience that I have undertaken was when, in the fall of 1921, I dared to presume to attempt to make a living in parliamentary life, and I venture to state that if certain hon. members in this corner of the House have their way I may not be even able to make a living in this line. I had hoped when this resolution was proposed that it would be carried unanimously and would not occasion very much debate, but I recall that yesterday afternoon there were very many cries of "lost," and two hon. members of the House made lengthy arguments in opposition to the tenor of the resolution.

The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) brought out some statements in connection with this resolution. His statements did not seem very weighty, but nevertheless they were made. One was that the tendency of the resolution was to introduce a new offence, that of race betting. He meant by that, I presume, that if we make the business of gambling on a race-track illegal, we would encourage gambling and there would be more of it. That is what one might call a "catch" statement. It is similar to the statement we so often hear that closing the public bars has led to more drinking than if they were left open, and it is just as erroneous and without any more foundation than that statement. The hon. member also stated that if we cannot have betting, we cannot have horse racing. I wonder why. Is it necessary to have a large number of Americans of the loose and immoral type of both sexes come across to Canada and go from one race-track to another in order to keep up horse racing? Is this the kind of patronage that good Canadians want in order to develop the horse-breeding industry? I should think surely not. The hon. member stated that he does not believe in prohibition, and that he would like to prohibit prohibition itself. I wonder if he was sincere in that statement. What about murder? What about stealing? What about pulling a gun on a man? Some few weeks ago we had in this city a case of one man pulling a gun on another man and shooting him dead. I presume that the hon. member would not interfere with personal liberty and prohibit a man from pulling a gun on another.

We listened yesterday to the argument, or some statements at least, of the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). He stated that in Great Britain he saw some of the finest looking people he ever saw in his life, and they were betting. The inference we draw from that is that betting improves the looks of a person. I presume the hon. member has bet a good deal in his time, and that is why he looks so much better than the rest of us. The same hon. member stated that it was possible to get a bet on the races in California or New Orleans in certain parts of Ottawa to-day, meaning yesterday. I should like to ask—should we establish the old bar and saloon system because it is possible, through some bootlegger, to get some home-brew to-day? I think not, and I think if the people of Canada had the say, a large majority would unquestionably say, no. The same hon. member stated that British settlers should be given the privilege of a few things to which they are accustomed. I fancy a large number of our best British immigrants are coming out to Canada in order to get away from those very things, saloons, barrooms, betting and gambling, which are all too prevalent in their home land.

Possibly none of us here to-day can fail to understand that there are certain good things in this world, and that there is a source from which all good things come. We have our different lines of industry; we have our differ-

ent industrial concerns, such as lumbering, manufacturing, agricultural pursuits, fishing, shipbuilding and such like. We have our labouring class of people, the labour that they perform, and the blessings that accompany honest toil. We also have throughout our land our different church organizations and all that they stand for. We have our different social reform societies, and we have our elaborate school system—our public schools, high schools or collegiates, and our colleges or universities; and we need not elaborate on what they stand for and the beneficial influence that they have on our national life. These different organizations or institutions tend to develop the individual. They tend to develop his personality, to improve and develop his intellect, his judgment, his reason; and they also, together, through the influences they exert, tend to promote, we might say, those finer qualities of citizenship, kindness and charitable feelings for other people. I think we are all agreed that from the source of good, emanate those good influences that tend to upbuild our citizenship, to strengthen the individual and to produce better characters in our land. One might think of this as a good tree which cannot bring forth corrupt fruit.

On the other side of the picture, we, I think, are quite able to understand that we also have certain evil conditions in this land as well as in other countries, and that these evil conditions emanate from an evil source. It is easy for us to understand what is meant by social upheavals, by distrust amongst members of society, by lack of confidence of man in man, or one member of society in another member of society, leading to social unrest and instability, it may be of government. All these tendencies emanating from the evil source tend to pull down and to destroy personality in the individual. They tend to lay aside reason, judgment, intelligence and willpower, and instead they develop and promote emotions and passions, so that we have following in this train, a long list of evil happenings, such as dishonest proceedings, cheating, embezzlement, forgery, debt, bankruptcy, and even suicide and murder. These all follow along the line of the evil channel, and this is equivalent to saying that an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit.

We might ask the question, where does gambling come in? Does it come in under the shade of the good tree, or under the influence of the evil tree. A short definition of gambling might be "a stake upon chance for gaining without labour." I do not know whether my opinion as regards whether gambling is an evil or not, would be accepted as being of very much account; but I recall that some few weeks ago we had the annual meeting of the Social Service Council of Canada in this city, and the venerable president, the Rev. Dean Tucker, made a statement which was very significant. He said that the three great evils in the world were impurity, intemperance and gambling. He classified gambling as one of the great evils in the world to-day. In addition to his statement I would produce some evidence taken from the journals of the House of Commons, 1909-10, Vol. 45, on race-track gambling, given at the time the Miller bill was under consideration. Certain questions are asked of Mr. Walter Duncan, who had been inspector of detectives for the city of Toronto for something like twenty-two years. He was asked:

> Would you classify whiskey and gambling as the two chief sources of the troubles that your department has to cope with?
>
> A. Yes.
>
> Q. Gambling generally?
>
> A. Gambling generally.
>
> Q. Including horse-racing gambling, whether it is gambling off the track or on the track, and every other kind?
>
> A. Every other kind.

I would also quote a statement that appears in the same volume by Inspector Archibald, who was chief inspector of the Toronto police force for more than forty years. In his experience something like 60,000 cases had come before him for consideration, and the question was asked him:

> Coming back to your own department of work, of these 60,000 cases that came to you by way of complaint, what was the principal cause at the bottom of the trouble in the majority of the cases?
>
> A. I have no doubt that directly or indirectly the inordinate use of liquor was the cause in the majority of cases.

Then another question was asked him:

> Q. What would figure second, where would gambling come in?
>
> A. Gambling came up pretty close to the liquor business. I think perhaps it would be second in order, but not nearly to the same extent as the liquor.

Let me quote from the same source a statement reputed to have been made by Mr. A. H. Clarke, a representative of South Essex, in this House. He made this statement on 1st May, 1905, and it can be found in Hansard of that year, at page 5138:

> I happen to reside in a city where we have horse races, where there is a great deal of betting, and I can say there is no greater curse to the community than this race-track. The horse races are incidental; the gambling and betting is the main issue. I know nothing that has ruined more young men in that vicinity than this very race track. It has been my experience to have to prosecute several young men who

were in trusted positions, but who had squandered the money of their employers, all traceable to this race track.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence of these gentlemen is perhaps more convincing than any statement or argument that I might put forth here to-day. While I have no experience of gambling on race-tracks, I have some knowledge of gambling conditions as they prevail in our prairie country. It might be presumed that the people out on the prairies are so busy growing wheat and trying to get a market for it that they have nothing else to think of. Well, that might be true with the majority of landowners. But we have a number of young people who come into that country, more especially in harvest and threshing time, and who earn good wages and then drift into the small towns and villages on towards the fall of the year. And, sad to say, they are relieved of their hard earnings in a very short time. It some cases it takes but one or two nights for them to lose some $200 or $300 of hard-earned money. Now, it might be wondered why this is not stopped. Well, it seems that there is a certain provision in the Criminal Code that makes it possible for this business to be carried on. In section 226A we have it stated that a common gaming-house is a house, room, or place kept by any person for gain. Then further on, in "B," (1A) it says that a gaming-house is a place where the whole or any portion of the stakes or bets is either directly or indirectly paid to the person keeping such house, room or place. There is just the little snag in this section of the Criminal Code which we find it difficult to get around. And it is of my own knowledge that I speak. In the town where I live we have known gambling to go on in one of our hotels for some time, but it was impossible to get any convicting evidence because it was necessary to prove that a rake-off from the game was going to the proprietor of the house. Finally, some two years ago, one of the gamblers had a quarrel with the proprietor of the house and informed on him and he was summoned and fined. But to-day in that western town, I venture to state gambling is going on, not only in this same hotel, but in a couple of Chinese restaurants. You might wonder whether it is possible for gambling to go on in a public place of that kind, and perhaps the question occurs, what is wrong? It seems to me that gambling carried on in a hotel or in a restaurant, in a poolroom, in a park, or on a race-track should all be included under the same head and be prohibited by Dominion statute.

Mr. VIEN: If I understand my hon. friend's argument, he says that notwithstanding the fact that a section of the Criminal Code prohibits gambling in a gambling house the practice still goes on as though there were no law against it. How is he going to enforce the provision of the Criminal Code which the mover of the proposed amendment suggests?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Gambling goes on in the case referred to because it is necessary, in order to convict, to adduce evidence to prove that the owner of the premises gets a rake-off from the game. If twelve persons were gambling together in conjunction with the owner of the premises they would not give any convicting evidence. My point is that our statutes should provide that gambling in any public place is illegal; just as it provides to-day that gambling on a railway train is illegal; and that any person gambling or taking money from any other person in any public place should be deemed guilty without any further convicting evidence. If our statutes provided that gambling publicly was illegal, all that the officers of the law would need to do would be to arrest any person caught gambling in any public place, and such person would be convicted without further evidence. I know that our parliament is limited in its powers. It is not possible for us to legislate so as to entirely annihilate gambling. If two people wish to put up a friendly bet, that is their own business; they may do so. We cannot legislate to change the heart of the individual so that he will no longer desire to bet; it takes higher authority than this parliament to accomplish that. But we can forbid betting or gambling in any public place. It seems to me that that is only what we should reasonably expect parliament to do.

I do not see that horse-racing need be dependent on gambling, although the statement has been made that it is. Perhaps I am not sufficiently familiar with the intricacies of the scheme to pass an opinion, but looking at the matter in an unbiased way, I do not see why there should be that dependence. However, if horse-racing is dependent on gambling, then I would call the attention of hon. members to the further statement we heard yesterday, that our boys and girls, our young men, yes, and our young women, are of far more importance than all the horses we can breed.

Some nineteen hundred years ago we had a great Teacher here upon earth. He did not tell us anything about gambling. In fact, I think the majority of hon. members will agree with me that the whole tenor of His teaching was in opposition to the very thing that this

resolution seeks to prohibit. That is why practically every organized church in Canada to-day is in opposition to gambling. And when it came to the final scene in His life, when He was near his last, His persecutors sat over and gambled to see who should possess His coat which was woven without seam. We might well ask ourselves to-day: To which class do we belong, to the class that to-day would seek to eliminate from our national life everything that tends to evil? Or do we belong to that other class that sat down and gambled nineteen hundred years ago—the class that was at enmity with the Founder of Christianity, and which to-day is at enmity with the church organizations throughout our land? In which class are we to-day? I hope Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will be adopted without the necessity for a division. If not, for my part I wish to see the name of each and every person recorded who has the courage of his or her convictions to show where he or she may stand on this all-important question.

4 p.m.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I desire to state my interpretation of the resolution offered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) and to give my opinion of what would be its effect if adopted.

To understand the resolution we must go back to 1906 and review the law then in force governing horse-racing. Section 235 of the Criminal Code, which the hon. member now proposes to amend, as it stood in the Revised Statutes of 1906, made certain prohibitions regarding betting, book-making, pool-selling, and the becoming custodian or depository of money, property, or other valuable thing staked, wagered or pledged. By subsection 2 of the same section it was provided:

> The provision of this section shall not extend to any person by reason of his becoming the custodian or depository of any money, property or valuable thing staked, to be paid to the winner of any lawful race, sport, game or exercise, or to the owner of any horse engaged in any lawful race, or to bets between individuals or made on the race course of an incorporated association during the actual progress of a race meeting.

In other words, every citizen was allowed to be the custodian or depository of money or valuable property to be paid to the winner of a lawful race, sport, game or exercise, or to the owner of a horse engaged in a lawful race; and betting was allowed between individuals without any restrictions as to their number or the amount of money wagered, so long as such betting took place on the race course of an incorporated association.

In 1910 the law was amended by the enactment of the provisions contained in what was afterwards known as the Miller Bill. Section 235 was amended in its first subsection by adding to the number of the prohibitions, and the second subsection was amended by adding to the exceptions. That is to say, all the exceptions in the law of 1906 were maintained and additional exceptions were enacted. Among those exceptions we find that betting was allowed on the race courses of incorporated associations during race meetings; that individuals were allowed to conduct book-making, etc., on such race-courses. There were also stipulations as to the number of race meetings to be held in each calendar year, the interval between such meetings, and their duration. In 1912 the same article was amended de novo, to provide that all these exceptions that I have just mentioned should be restricted to associations incorporated in any manner before the 20th day of March, 1912, and to all other associations incorporated by the federal parliament or by the legislatures after that date. In 1920, after that royal commission investigation which has been mentioned during the course of this debate had been held, another amendment was made to that same article 235. Section 2 of article 235 was amended as to running races by continuing the same exceptions that I have already mentioned, and making an exception as to betting, which was to be limited to the pari-mutuel. Provisions were made to put into force that new system and giving the Minister of Agriculture supervisory control of the administration of that act. We had last year some amendments of minor importance to article 235.

The resolution offered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) would involve the following changes in the law: First, the abolition of all special privileges now existing with regard to race-track betting for running races, pari-mutuels included; secondly, change the present exception of a private bet between individuals not engaged in any way in the business of betting to a private bet between not more than ten individuals not engaged in the betting business; and thirdly, remove the exception in favour of a stake to be paid to the owner of any horse engaged in any lawful race.

I have given you, Mr. Speaker, the law as we have it to-day with regard to horse-racing; I have given you the changes which the resolution of the hon. member would bring

about if it was adopted. Are we ready in this country to vote for what I would call such radical changes? Is there at this present moment any agitation in Canada which would justify such a change? I have not heard of any from the Maritime provinces; I do not know of any in the province of Quebec; I have not heard of any from British Columbia or the other western provinces. We have heard some from the province of Ontario. Yesterday the hon. member for Brant gave us some of the utterances delivered by the Attorney General for Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Raney. He quoted the Hon. Mr. Raney as his main authority, I would say, to justify his resolution. I am not sure that I shall surprise the hon. member for Brant, but I may tell him this, that the Hon. Mr. Raney has never asked for any such amendment as the amendment my hon. friend now proposes to this House.

I have had the pleasure of corresponding with the Hon. Mr. Raney on this very subject for a month or so, and not later than yesterday I had the honour to receive in my office the deputy Attorney General for Ontario, who came to me with the Crown Prosecutor for Toronto, at the special request of the Attorney General of Ontario, to ask me to submit to the consideration of the hon. members of this House certain amendments to article 235. They never asked, Mr. Raney never asked, that we should repeal section 2 of article 235, as the hon. member for Brant now proposes. I will read to the House the amendment suggested by the Attorney General for Ontario and by the Crown Prosecutor for Toronto.

Suggested amendement to section 235 of the criminal code as enacted by section 3 of (1910) 9-10 Ed. VII, C. 10.

(f) Advertises, prints, publishes, exhibits, posts up, sells or supplies, or offers to sell or supply (i) other than on the premises of an association lawfully conducting race meetings in Canada, and during the actual progress of a race meeting thereon, any tips, selections, odds, winning money prices, pari-mutuel payments, or any similar intelligence with respect to or applicable to any horse race, whether such race be held within or without the Dominion of Canada, and whether at the time of advertising, printing, publishing, exhibiting, posting up or applying such news or information such race has or has not taken place; (ii) any information intended to assist in or intended for use in connection with book-making, pool-selling, betting or wagering upon any fight, game, sport or race, other than a horse race whether at the time of advertising, printing, publishing, exhibiting, posting up or supplying such news or information, such fight, game, sport or race has or has not taken place.

This is to do away with the abuse against which we are receiving complaints. There is unquestionably ground for complaint about betting and book-making on races in the United States, where races are prohibited, and where they flourish more than ever.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask a question? The proposed amendment, as I understand it, refers only to sub-section 1 of section 235?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 1, but they were the only suggestions offered to our department by the Attorney General for Ontario. The Hon. Mr. Raney writing with reference to these suggestions in a letter dated January 26, says:

Referring to our conversation in Ottawa with regard to a suggested amendment to the Criminal Code to prohibit the publishing of racing information (section 235 (f)) I enclose two drafts marked respectively "A" and "B".

"A" is a re-draft of the present subsection (f) of section 235 and alters the present section by specifically forbidding the advertising, printing, publication etc., of tips, selections, odds etc., upon horse races, leaving the application of clause (f) with regard to other sports in the same position as it is now. The thought has been to drop the words "horse race" in part (ii) but otherwise to leave part (ii) in its present form. Clause (i) deals with horse races alone and specifically prohibits (with regard to horse races) publications of tips, selections, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed with great interest the debate which has taken place on this resolution. I have heard some very strong arguments in support of the prohibition which is advocated, but I have not heard any arguments which were not advanced in 1906, in 1910, in 1912 and in 1920. In a word, there was nothing new in any of the speeches delivered during the present debate which I followed very attentively. I repeat that to my mind there is actually no agitation in this country for so radical a change as the one which is proposed by the hon. member for Brant. Why should we not be satisfied with amending our criminal code in accordance with the suggestions which have come to us, the only sugestions which have come to us officially from the Ontario government? I am prepared to recommend to my colleagues that we should make a government measure of the substance of the amendments which I have just read to the House and with this, it seems to me, hon. gentlemen should be satisfied, leaving to experience the legislation of 1920 which was passed after mature consideration.

If the hon. member who has submitted this resolution intends to press it to a vote, and if we are at this session, or some other session, to consider legislation which will make legal the new prohibition which is now advocated, I would suggest, for my part, that we at least make it optional for the provinces to accept that prohibition if they so desire, or to refuse it if such is their wish. We have already had experience in another field on a question which has given some very good results; and I think that for the good

of the country, before imposing the change in whose behalf the resolution has been offered, we should leave it to the provinces to decide.

Mr. Speaker, we already have enough causes of difference in this country. Though that be the case I am not alarmed at them. I believe in the future of my country, and I know that ultimately all these differences will pass one after another. Nevertheless I deem it to be the duty of every man of good will in Canada to do nothing that will add to the number of our differences, and it is in that spirit that I would ask hon. members who believe in this new prohibition—and I respect their opinion—not to consider it important enough to impose it on the Dominion against the will of a large proportion, if not the majority, of its population.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): In rising to continue this debate let me assure the House that I do not intend to speak at any great length. I shall devote my remarks mainly to the ethical feature of the question that is now before us, but I shall allude to certain other aspects as well.

In the first place I want to make it very clear that in principle I am absolutely opposed to betting, and in the remarks which I shall offer I propose to hew to the line. I desire to be frank and explicit in my expressions of opinion; I believe in calling a spade a spade. The resolution has been very ably supported by the hon. member who introduced it, and by other members as well. Very substantial arguments and a mass of figures have been advanced in its favour. I do not wish to go over ground which has been so thoroughly well covered, but I would like to refer to points which have been raised by opponents of the resolution. One hon. member asked who were behind this motion, who were its promoters. In answer to that question I can produce the sworn statement of a gentleman who gave evidence before the Rutherford Commission as to who are behind the movement now and who were supporting it at that particular time. I will quote the statements of Mr. W. E. Raney, K.C., who appeared before that commission:

> Mr. W. E. Raney, K.C., appeared for the Social Service Council of Canada, which he stated was a federation comprising a considerable number of units, including,—the Church of England in Canada, the Methodist Church in Canada, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Baptist Church in Canada, the Congregational Church in Canada, the Salvation Army, the Dominion Grange and Farmers' Association, The Dominion Women's Christian Temperance Union, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, the Canadian Council of Agriculture and some dozen other organizations. He stated that the Social Service Council did not oppose racing either as a sport or as a test of the metal or endurance of the thoroughbred horse, but that it took objection to the exception made by the criminal code which legalized race-track betting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the force that is behind this movement, so far as I can understand. If that be true, the force that is behind the resolution that has been presented to this House by the hon. member for Brant, it is no mean element of the people of the Dominion of Canada. I want to refer to a statement made, I think, by the hon. ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) in regard to the necessity of this movement for keeping up the race-courses in this country. I quote from Hansard of yesterday:

> We find that you cannot get the proper number of horses for the purposes of a really good meeting on this side of the line in the face of the competition, unless you are able to attract them by large purses.

I do not know anything personally in regard to the amount of money the racing clubs give in the way of purses to encourage race-track enterprises in the Dominion, but I am going to quote again from the latter part of Dr. Rutherford's report, where he is referring to this aspect of the race-track enterprise. He says:

> While, as shown elsewhere in this report, certain racing associations have been reasonably generous in the giving of special purses for Canadian-bred horses at the regular race meeting others have not distinguished themselves in that respect. It is, however, apparent that, notwithstanding the large profits which have accrued, there has been but little inclination on the part of any of them, to offer direct financial assistance to the horsebreeding industry.

It has been presented very forcibly by some hon. members in opposition to this resolution, that racing is almost absolutely necessary, if I understood them aright, for keeping up thoroughbred horses in the Dominion of Canada. And yet we find that in summing up his report Dr. Rutherford does not give the race club organizations very much credit for giving of the money that they took in to any great extent by way of purses for the sake of encouraging this enterprise.

Yesterday hon. members referred to the necessity of having betting on race-tracks properly regulated. I quote again from the remarks of the ex-Minister of Agriculture yesterday, where he says:

> Far better to apply a law and have people betting out in the open than to restrict betting and have it carried on illegally behind a curtain.

To my mind, we are casting a reflection on the integrity, the honesty and the fidelity of the people of this great Dominion, if we intimate in any way that, if the people can-

not bet under regulated conditions, they are going to bet illegally behind closed doors. I have more faith in the people of the country than to assent to that suggestion. True, there may be, and is, illegal betting, but we know that crime goes on in spite of regulation. We have stringent regulations in regard to murder, theft and in a great many other things, anl yet these crimes go on, and the men who are guilty of those crimes are guilty of breaking the law. If betting is an evil and injurious to the best interests of the people, regardless of where it is carried on, whether in the closed room or on the race-track, the proper way to deal with it is to pass a law prohibiting it, so that it will be easy for men to do right and hard for them to do wrong. My judgment is that laws are made for the purpose of making it hard for men to do wrong and easy for them to do right. Take the case of the rattlesnake. How are you going to regulate that animal? I think there is just one way to regulate that very treacherous and dangerous reptile, and that is by cutting off its head. I believe that is just as true in regard to any social evil or any evil that has a tendency to divert men or women from straight paths of virtue and truthfulness, honesty and uprightness. As honest, truthful and faithful citizens of any country, if we are going to regulate those evils, the better way is to outlaw them rather than to try to legalize them as something honourable and something to be desired.

Mr. CANNON: Does the hon. member see any difference between regulation and amputation?

Mr. WOODS: In answer to the hon. member's question, I suppose there is a difference between regulation and amputation, but the way I would regulate a rattlesnake would be by amputation and the way I would regulate any evil in this country would be by amputation instead of regulation by law. I would make it illegal.

Touching on the ethical side of this feature perhaps for a moment, what is gambling? Is it not the fact that people are trying to get something for nothing? A man goes into your stable and steals your horse. He goes there to get something for nothing, but he goes there breaking the law. A man puts his hand into your pocket and takes out your money. He is after something for nothing, he is trying to get your money without doing anything for it; but he is breaking the law. But when a man goes into the betting arena and takes part in betting, he is looking to get something from somebody else for nothing, without labouring for it. We hear a good deal sometimes about loafing on the job and not wanting to work for what we get and getting something for nothing; but to my mind, if there is in this country anything that is a means of getting something for nothing, it is the gambling method, and on that ground I am opposed to the betting system as carried on at the race-tracks.

I have under my hand some figures that I got from the report of Dr. Rutherford and from the exhibits in his office; but many of these figures were quoted yesterday by the hon. member (Mr. Good) who introduced this resolution, and therefore, I am not going to repeat them to-day. I want, however, to draw the attention of the House to the difference between the amount of money made by jockey clubs under the pari-mutuel system and what they had been making under the bookmaking system. In the Hamilton Jockey Club, in 1915, under bookmaking, they got $67,200. In 1916, under the pari-mutuel system, they got $182,825.50; that is for two meets. In 1917, for one meet which took place in that year, they got $173,429.05. In connection with the Windsor Jockey Club a similar jump took place. In 1914, under bookmaking, they got $81,150, under the pari-mutuel system, in 1915, they got $196,650.50; in 1916, $300,332,25; and in 1917, $159,779.94. Therefore, under this improved method, as I suppose it will be called, of pari-mutuel betting, the clubs receive a larger amount of money than they did under the old bookmaking system. The Niagara Racing Association at Fort Erie, in 1914, under bookmaking, got $64,344; in 1915, under the pari-mutuel system, they got $131,988.55. This represents an enormous sum of money, when we take into consideration the amount of money that goes out of the pockets of those who take part in the betting and goes onto the race track for the purpose of betting, for these amounts represent possibly only about 5 per cent of all the money that passes through these machines. A club is allowed to take, on a sliding scale, from seven to three per cent, so that possibly 5 per cent would be a fair estimate of the amount of money that a club receives in this way through the machine betting. I am opposed to the betting system for the reason that it is a system whereby men try to get something without working for it, or something for nothing.

I am also opposed to it, because, as we understand the matter, it is not in the best interest of the home. In connection with betting, an hon. member yesterday referred to

the boys and girls. The boys and girls are the greatest asset this country has, and if we are going to safeguard them, we want to safeguard them to the very fullest extent by removing from them as far as possible every opportunity for indulging in anything that would have a tendency to draw them away. I believe gambling is a social evil. We believe in the social qualities of our human nature; we believe in social life; we believe in good healthy enjoyment, recreation and sport; we believe in all that kind of thing; but when these social enterprises go to the extent of being an evil, then it is time that we should rise up in opposition to them. My honest conviction is that betting, no matter how it is done, is a social evil, and we want to discourage it to the fullest extent in every regard, in every place and in every way, and to legislate so far as possible against that evil. There is something of the sensational in those gambling and betting affairs. There is something that appeals to the sensational feature in human nature.

Mr VIEN: Would the hon. member stop, by legislation, everything that is sensational in this world?

Mr. WOODS: No. I would not try to legislate to stop everything that is sensational; but at the same time, I would, so far as possible, stop an evil that was sensational and that appealed to what I might call the baser elements of our human nature.

Mr VIEN: If what the hon. member considers to be a social evil is, in the minds of others, not so, why should he impose upon others his method of viewing the thing?

Mr. WOODS: I think I have read in the Book that is the corner-stone of the foundation of our Christian civilization, something like this, that "in the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God." I want to tell hon. gentleman that along that line we should guard the social side of our nature.

I was glad to hear from the minister (Sir Lomer Gouin) the idea of giving provincial autonomy in regard to these things. I would be quite favourable to that. I think it is right that the provinces should have provincial autonomy in regard to social matters. If that were the case each province could deal with these matters as it saw fit. Let me say in conclusion that I am heartily in sympathy with the proposed resolution, as indeed I am with any resolution that tends to safeguard the youth of this land. I have here an extract which I might read to the House and which has some bearing on the subject under consideration. It is taken from the Detroit Globe of January 9, 1923.

Harry W. Reynolds' penchant for the "ponies" resulted in a divorce for his wife, Irene, granted by Judge Marschner to-day.

"The races even marred our honeymoon," Mrs. Reynolds told the court.

Mr. RINFRET: That is sensational.

Mr. CANNON: That man had no horse sense.

Mr. WOODS (reading):

The Reynoldses were married in September, 1920. The races were on in Toronto, the young wife said, and Reynolds suggested they take in the sport on their honeymoon. They did. But—

"Our honeymoon was short-lived. My husband lost all our money on the 'ponies' and I had to wire to a friend in Detroit for $50, enough to get back home on."

Mrs. Reynolds said her husband gave her but $20 during their married life.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I listened with much interest to the debate in connection with the Miller bill some years ago and also to the debate on the measure relating to Sunday observance, and I quite agree with the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) that the solution brought about in those cases was as equitable as this parliament could devise, of leaving the observance of the act to the control of each province. An amendment was inserted by the Senate, and the final solution was a happy disposition of a rather delicate question, as the views of the Sabbath differed in some provinces. They were different in Ontario and Quebec and in the Maritime and western provinces. We happily found a solution of the difficulty in leaving any infraction of the act to be dealt with by the attorney general of each province. The same is done to a certain extent with the horse-racing problem which was discussed so fully at the time of the Miller Bill. Any province in Canada can license horse-racing out of business at any time by merely putting the license so high as to be prohibitive. I understand that the race-track owners went to Toronto—I do not know whether it was last year or the year before—and discussed the matter with the provincial treasurer, who was desirous—even anxious—of putting the license fee as high as $10,000 a day. After some bargaining, however, he reduced it to $7,500. Now, the province of Ontario reaps some $4,000,000 out of horse-racing.

Mr. BROWN: Would it not raise a constitutional point if the license fee were fixed so high as to be prohibitive.?

Mr. MARCIL: The lawyers, I think, say not. I am not a lawyer, however, so I can-

not answer that point. I have no doubt that the province of Ontario has made good use of the money it has obtained through horse-racing; and I know that the province of Quebec, which gets $800,000, or $900,000, applies this money, under legislation, entirely to charitable institutions. Now, horse-racing is as old as the world; the old Greeks and Romans enjoyed it. And to-day it is a universal sport. What we should do, I think, is to regulate this sport, and the system adopted in Canada is the same as that which has worked splendidly in France and all the leading countries of Europe, except England, that is, the pari-mutuel system. The point this House has to decide is whether the present legislation we have can be in any way improved. Section 235 has been amended so often that it is questionable whether it is capable of further amendment without being wiped out altogether. The House has heard, through the Minister of Justice, from the Attorney General of Ontario. The Attorney General of Ontario does not ask that we do away with the present system; he asks for certain amendments. And I am glad to know that the Minister of Justice will press these amendments on his colleagues and bring down a government measure to do away with the obnoxious advertising features in connection with the horse-racing business. But I do not believe in trying to impose upon people such legislation as will inevitably be brought into contempt. The law to be observed must be respected; and unless it is backed up by public opinion it will fail of its purpose. The views on horse-racing may have been expressed truly by our hon. friends from the West. But the provincial governments of the West have it in their own hands to license these people out of business by making the license fee so high as to render the business unprofitable. Those who read the Ciitzen this morning no doubt saw a despatch from Montreal stating that the oldest race-course in Quebec, which has gathered together the cream of society and the leading people in our province for a generation, is going out of business because it has been a losing investment from the start. Wealthy men put their money into it for the sport of the thing and to encourage horse breeding. But it has not proved a paying business. I hear that the same state of affairs exists in connection with Connaught Park near Ottawa. The leading citizens of the capital invested money in that concern too, on which they have had no returns. We learn from the French government that one of the greatest assets which France possessed at the opening of the war was its remarkable supply of cavalry horses, which had been brought to their state of perfection through the encouragement given by the French government to horse breeding because of the revenues obtained through the operation of the pari-mutuel on the racecourses in France. I have not been convinced that any new reason has been advanced for a radical change in this matter. We are all trying to make the world better; that is our mission; and we would all wish that the world were what it was intended to be. But we must not pass legislation which will certainly fail of its purpose and of which no good can come. Having heard the explanation given by the Minister of Justice, and in view of the position of the Attorney General of Ontario, and the fact that this is a legal question, I am compelled to vote against the resolution before the House.

Mr. PRITCHARD: When the Minister of Justice was speaking I did not quite catch all his remarks. Did I understand him to say that he was willing to do away with the pari-mutuel system, and advertising and the giving of all information in connection with race-track gambling?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No. I said I was prepared to recommend to my colleagues that we should embody in a government measure the substance of the amendments suggested by the Attorney General of Ontario in regard to advertising.

Mr. BROWN: Would the Minister of Justice venture an opinion as to the powers of the province to fix a prohibitive license fee?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, but we will amend the code to the effect suggested by the Attorney General of Ontario.

Mr. BROWN: My question was as to the power of the province to levy a prohibitive license fee.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not see any objection; there is no limit to the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. E. J. SEXSMITH (Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, so much has been said both for and against the principles enunciated in this resolution that scarcely anything remains to be added. Therefore, beyond expressing my own attitude in the most unequivocal language, I have very little to say. I have watched from time to time with keen interest the attitude of parliament towards questions that are vitally important to our standards of citizenship or morality, and I have observed two entirely opposite schools of thought. One

seems to base its argument on the value of the dollar; the other on the value of citizenship. As I have always found myself sympathetic towards the latter I am obliged to support the resolution, although to my mind it may be a bit drastic.

Very full statistics have been presented during the course of this debate showing the profits of race-track gambling to those concerned in it—to the individual, to the company, and even to the province. Facts have also been adduced showing the baneful effects of race-track gambling upon our citizenship. I need not repeat the arguments based on these facts and figures, for they are before the minds of hon. gentlemen; I would only suggest that all social customs are judged by the effects they produce. It is not very difficult, therefore to estimate their value or the reverse. And in regard to race-track gambling, it may be safely said that its so-called benefits are mixed pretty generously with injustice and degeneracy.

5 p.m.

I would be sorry indeed to have Canadians get the impression that parliament is in any way indifferent to social questions of paramount importance. Of course, great caution must be taken in enacting restrictive legislation; extremes are to be avoided; but good statesmanship always avoids extremes. On the other hand, it is dangerous to yield to the much talked of principle of individual liberty of action. Our whole criminal code in many instances is based on the very sound maxim that such individual liberty of action is not always permissible, and may conceivably be decidedly dangerous to the community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I humbly urge parliament to in some way put greater restrictions on this particular menace which threatens our very civilization; for no nation can rise above its standard of morality.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this resolution, but in view of the attitude of certain hon. members towards this very important national question, I must do my duty and at least declare my stand in regard to what I consider to be of the highest moral as well as economic importance.

Our young people have held out to them the prospect of getting rich quick through gambling—of winning something for which they give no equivalent. The very idea is demoralizing and brings in its train untold evils. Young men, yes, and young women too, are induced to risk their all on something which is purely chance. Gambling, I know, is latent in humanity, and those who make their living by this vicious practice are generally adepts in reading human nature. A very small beginning is sufficient to start one on the downward road, the game of chance being extremely fascinating, and it is not long before young men and women find their earnings too small to satisfy their cravings to wager on bigger and bigger chances. Unfortunately, too often this leads to their appropriating the funds of their employers, fully intending, of course, to replace the money in the near future, but the more they wager on these so-called sure things the more they lose. Then what? They abscond and too often they commit suicide. I know whereof I speak. I have in mind two valuable lives snuffed out—suicides from gambling losses. Therefore I cannot treat this matter as lightly as some hon. members on the other side of the House appear to do.

To me it is folly to talk of controlling such an evil. It cannot be controlled in all its ramifications. I think it is a serious matter indeed that we as a nation should countenance such a national evil by giving it legal sanction. The pari-mutuel business has been made unlawful in Great Britain, and those engaged in it are looked upon as rogues and vagabonds. In nearly all the states of the Union the practice is criminal, and those engaged in it have been driven hither and thither—mostly to Canada. Is this country, then, to become a haven of refuge for such characters, in whose train vices of all kinds follow? All commercial concerns know the baneful effect of betting upon their employees. A senior official of the Civil Service in this city is responsible for the statement that the Civil Service itself is honeycombed with betting. Now, that surely brings this evil pretty close home to every hon. member who cares anything for the uplift of our national character.

It is strange that some hon. members fail to realize the evils of race track gambling, and it is stranger still that public men can be found to uphold such a practice. Even if moral reasons fail to appeal, surely economic reasons should be considered when deciding our attitude in regard to this resolution. The Quebec Board of Trade on its own initiative passed a resolution asking for the suppression of this curse.

Mr. VIEN: Would the hon. member tell me the date of that resolution? We have never heard of it in Quebec. The resolution must have been passed elsewhere.

Mr. EVANS: It is a fact, nevertheless. I had it on the authority of Dr. Shearer.

Mr. VIEN: I think his authority is badly founded. We never heard of it, and I doubt very much whether such a resolution was passed.

Mr. EVANS: Because the hon. gentleman has not heard of it is no proof that it does not exist.

Mr. VIEN: We will try to have it repealed if it has been passed.

Mr. EVANS: I am positive it was passed, and it was passed on economic grounds, "in the interests of business integrity and prosperity," to quote their own words. The manufacturers of British Columbia also passed a similar resolution, purely for business reasons. They had lost money. Many employees had gone wrong through this practice, and for economic reasons alone they thought it was time to call a halt. The retail merchants too of British Columbia passed a similar resolution; so did the merchants of the city of Windsor. They did it purely for business reasons. I do not think that hon. members of this House who oppose this resolution have really any idea of the extent to which this evil is carried on. It was calculated that in 1921 no less than $75,000,000 was wasted on the twenty-odd tracks in this country along with the races at some of the exhibitions.

Mr. CANNON: How does that amount compare with the amount bet on the stock market during the same year?

Mr. VIEN: Or on the grain exchange.

Mr. EVANS: I do not see the connection at all.

Mr. CANNON: I do.

Mr. EVANS: The hon. member will have a chance to get the floor after I am through. This great sum was wasted too at a time of unemployment and trade depression, the worst known in the history of Canada. The whole trend of the practice is towards embezzlement, and a number of men of fine abilities and possibilities have had to serve long terms in penitentiaries in consequence of indulging in betting. I say that it is no wonder that manufacturers and retailers have passed resolutions against it, for legitimate business is dislocated through the involvement of such a large sum of money. Credit has to be substituted for cash. Employees are absorbed in racing to the neglect of their own work.

The mails of this country are being used to distribute baneful literature containing racing information; they are used to carry sheets such as the Racing Form. I think the use of the mails for this purpose should be prohibited. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) speaking yesterday of the Connaught Park races here, said that they were run simply for the sport of racing. I have it here on authority that while these races are on, the Civil Service in this city is practically disorganized—

Mr. POWER: Then let us appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. EVANS: —and it is hard to get work done. I also think that his argument that betting is essential to the breeding of horses is most unreasonable. It is unreasonable from an economic standpoint, and unreasonable as well from a moral point of view. If there is any industry in this country that depends on the weaknesses of human nature for its success, upon the debasing of character with all the attendant evils of betting, I think the sooner such a business is abolished the better for all.

Mr. TOLMIE: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I had stated that the breeding of horses depended on betting?

Mr. EVANS: I said racing.

Mr. TOLMIE: What I did say was that you could not conduct races and pay large enough purses to induce horse owners to compete unless you had the betting along with it.

Mr. EVANS: I understood the hon. member to include both. Here are his words:

> Racing is enjoyed by thousands of people in this country. Thousands of dollars have been invested in racing plants, and in breeding establishments and stables. I know of one plant in Canada the proprietor of which told me only last summer out at the Connaught Club races, that he had half a million dollars invested in his breeding establishment and racing stables. I claim that the right of these people should be protected. They have a right to ask that from the government of this country.

He says that these people should be protected. By protection in this case I suppose he means that we should establish by law a practice the very nature of which is debasing. He says these people have a right to ask this of the government, but he says not a word about the rights of those whose lives are ruined by this debasing practice, of the women and children whose very lives are blighted through this curse.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) with some others sees no harm in extracting revenue from this debasing source, to be expended on public improvements. This means of obtaining revenue in my opinion, is the very lowest kind that we could adopt by legislation. I think it is a most unintelligent way of obtaining revenue. It is debasing alike to every citizen of the nation or provinces where it is practised, and

I hope to see the day when the affairs of this country will be run on the lines of equity and right, when no evil thing will be countenanced by law for the sake of revenue.

In answer to the hon. Minister of Justice, that this should be left to the provinces, I say that we should have a national law. He says that there are no new arguments. No, the old ones are quite sufficient, and they will come up in all their force time after time until some kind of prohibition is adopted. I do not think that this House has a right to look to Dr. Rutherford, even, as the dictator of the moral standing of this nation. I certainly shall vote for this resolution, and I hope to see more favourable consideration of it.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I wish to make a few remarks on this resolution before the vote is taken. I want to say at the outset that I am going to vote for the resolution. I am going to do so for two particular reasons, and I hope without offence to those who think differently from me. It is largely I find, Mr. Speaker, a matter of how we have been brought up how we look upon questions such as this that we are discussing this afternoon. I have been brought up to look upon gambling, whether on the race-track or elsewhere, as fundamentally wrong, without one redeeming feature. Now then, Mr. Speaker, am I at my time of life going to make myself over again and think otherwise? I may add that my constituents—and I think I can speak for Saskatchewan as a whole—do not want to see legalized gambling on the race-tracks established in that new land. It exists there to a small extent, but the time to nip these things is in the bud, not after large vested interests have been established when the plea is put up that the capital must receive from the state the protection that it is entitled to or supposed to be entitled to. Therefore I take the ground that now is the time to move in this matter as regards not only Saskatchewan but the entire prairie country.

The question has been raised as to whether there is any demand for this legislation or not, and attention has been drawn to the fact that there is no agitation for it in the Maritime provinces. Well, the records go to show that there are no gambling institutions of this nature in that part of Canada—no gambling associations, nor even a jockey club—therefore the people there are quite content the way the matter stands because it does not affect them. However, the records demonstrate that the practice is reasonably well established in the older provinces—in Ontario and Quebec and also in British Columbia—but has only gained a slight footing in the new provinces on the prairie. I must say that it was a matter of considerable surprise to me, when I was first asked to assume the responsibility of administering the Department of Agriculture, to find that this to me doubtful practice of gambling was so unequally yoked with the ancient and respectable business of agriculture and that I was to administer the whole of it. Well, I have done so to the best of my ability, and if we are going to have gambling on race-tracks and its supervision is to be attached to some department, possibly the Department of Agriculture is the one to which it may more properly be allied. At the same time I feel somewhat embarrassed sometimes at having to administer this kind of business with which I am so unfamiliar.

Now what do the records show with respect to this matter? The government of Sir Robert Borden in 1917, in the midst of the war, took the ground that if Canada was to do her best in that war she could not afford to dissipate her resources to the extent she was then doing in the matter of gambling on race-tracks, and the practice was prohibited by order in council in that year. That prohibition, if my memory serves me, continued up to 1920. Why? Because the country could not afford to spend such a large amount of money in that kind of pleasure at that particular time. Well, Mr. Speaker, can we, from a purely material standpoint, afford to do it now? Is there any evidence that the situation is any better financially? Can we not employ all our money to better advantage than by dissipating it in this way—not only the money but the time and the thought of the people? And, to some extent, every man that makes easy money deters others from honest toil and honest labour and makes them dissatisfied. It does not matter how the easy money is made—whether in real estate speculation or in any other form of gambling or in any other way. It disturbs others who are engaged in earning their living by honest toil; and if for no other reason than that I would oppose this practice at this time. Because, if there is one idea more than another that we want to inculcate among our people it is the fact that there is only one way to make good in this world, only one way to make a living, and that is by honest industry faithfully and intelligently applied. Gambling weakens that idea and places its realization further away; there is no question about that. We can recall, during the time when real estate gambling was at its height, that when many men who were tilling the soil and making their living in a laborious way on the farm

heard of some useless fellow who had bought some real estate and made a big chunk of easy money out of it, they were more or less disturbed; and there is no question but that the same remark applies to gambling too. Therefore I say that now, to as great an extent as in 1917, we cannot afford to dissipate our activities, our money, our time, and our thought in these questionable practices.

Now let me refer to the official records as I find them. Up to 1921 the amount of betting that had been placed through the pari-mutuel had been increasing year by year, but I will only give the figures for 1921 and 1922.

RACING STATISTICS BY DISTRICTS FOR THE RACING SEASON OF 1921

District	No. of associations	No. of meetings	No. of days racing	Gate receipts	Amounts wagered	Pari-mutuel receipts retained by racing associations	Total p.m. and gate receipts retained by racing associations	Prize money	Percentage of gate and p.m. receipts paid as prize money	Cost of supervision
				$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$ cts.	$	p.c.	$
Quebec	9	18	125	349,403 15	12,402,389	851,023 28	1,200,426 43	570,850	47	7,365
Ontario	8	16	112	2,001,215 10	56,818,594	1,917,780 71	3,918,995 81	1,147,850	29	7,245
Prairie Provinces	6	7	26	42,444 25	318,106	24,835 32	67,279 57	54,100	80	1,525
British Columbia	3	6	42	115,725 90	5,571,462	370,355 98	486,081 88	144,650	30	2,165
Dominion	26	47	305	2,508,788 40	75,110,551	3,163,996 29	5,672,783 69	1,917,450	33	18,300

RACING STATISTICS BY DISTRICTS FOR THE RACING SEASON OF 1922

District	No. of associations	No. of meetings	No. of days racing	Gate receipts	Amounts wagered	Pari-mutuel receipts retained by racing associations	Total p.m. and gate receipts retained by racing associations	Prize money	Percentage of gate and p.m. receipts paid as prize money	Cost of supervision
				$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$ cts.	$	p.c.	$
Quebec	9	17	119	268,490 90	10,699,182	731,291 75	999,782 65	518,500	52	6,797 30
Ontario	8	16	112	1,616,615 45	44,249,242	1,659,683 52	3,276,298 97	1,141,300	35	6,610 88
Prairie Provinces	7	9	38	98,197 97	857,523	64,833 16	163,031 13	83,350	51	1,142 85
British Columbia	2	4	28	134,722 55	4,059,676	261,417 83	396,140 38	104,600	26	1,340 00
Dominion	26	46	297	2,118,026 87	59,865,623	2,717,226 26	4,785,253 13	1,847,750	38	15,891 03

I may say that the Department of Agriculture has a certain control over the amount of prize money that is awarded, this being taken out of the profits of the racing association. It will be noticed that a column is devoted to the amounts paid out in prize money. Another column gives the percentages of gate and pari-mutuel receipts paid as prize money. As to the cost of supervision by the department, a certain sum is levied by it on each day of racing, amounting to $60, and that covers the cost of supervision.

Mr. BROWN: Is there anything which comes directly to the Dominion to pay the cost of that supervision?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, except by a voluntary arrangement between the federal authority and the racing associations by which they contribute $60 a day for the cost of supervision. A number of policemen are set aside for that work, they exercise close supervision and I must say that I think the business is conducted properly. As my hon. friend knows, it is not just exactly a Sunday school association meeting, competent police officials have to be there to see that the business is conducted properly, and I think, as far as humanly possible, it is conducted properly. It is well supervised.

But the point I wish to discuss is the proposition: Can we afford to dissipate this amount of money at this time? I am only taking the lowest possible viewpoint in discussing this matter. I have this year's figures, and I may say that the very pronounced levy by the provincial authorities in Ontario is discouraging the business, because the total falls from the round figure of $75,000,000 in 1921 to an aggregate amount wagered throughout all Canada of $59,869,000 in 1922, or a drop of $15,000,000. This is taken to indicate that the wagering public is discouraged, because there is less to be distributed to them, as a

result of the amount taken, first by the association, aproximately 5 per cent, and, second, the amount taken by the provincial government in Ontario, and, to a smaller extent, the amount taken by the provincial government of Quebec. In Ontario the amount taken from the two sources is about 10 per cent of the total wagering. That means that only 90 per cent—90 cents out of each dollar—is distributed to those who put their money into it. If that process is continued sufficiently long, you can see that the man who goes to the races and puts his money into the pari-mutuel, receiving 10 per cent less each time, that after ten such transactions his money will all disappear, if he loses every time. But it is a perfectly safe business from the standpoint of the association, because they get their levy first. The provincial government and the racing association get their levy by law, and that comes off the total.

Mr. CANNON: Where does the rest go?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: To the wagerer—you and I—the bettors.

Mr. CANNON: How can the hon. member say the money is dissipated?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In this way: 10 per cent of it is dissipated and goes into a non-productive enterprise.

Mr. CANNON: The government.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As far as this government is concerned, it does not, because we do not get it. We have no interest in what any other government gets. The 5 per cent goes to help keep the association going and if you bet frequently enough, your money will all go that way. That 10 per cent is taken off each time it goes through the machine. There is no question about that. We cannot spend our money in these avenues and have it at the same time to spend on productive enterprises. That is the proposition from a straight business standpoint. I take the ground, knowing something of the difficulties of financing at the present time, that we can spend our money to better advantage than in the proposition I have outlined.

I have a few notes in my hand with respect to some remarks made yesterday by hon. members that were exceedingly painful to listen to. I refer to the excuses made for continuing the practice of gambling. I have no objection to the man who takes the ground "I want to gamble," but I have an objection to the man who wants to sugar coat the pill, and wants to justify it with a lot of camouflage on the ground that we are going to develop the horse-breeding industry or something of that kind. I have not a word to say to those who want to gamble. They have just as much right to take that ground as I have to take the opposite ground, but I think no good thing comes out of gambling, taking the net results. I have read speeches about gambling, but I never expected to hear what we will have to call, by courtesy, arguments such as were advanced yesterday in justification of gambling. I have read of such things, but I thought a lot of these antediluvian ideas had gone to rest, because we have not heard of them for a number of years.

I should like to say a word in commendation of the report of Dr. Rutherford. I sat on a live stock commission myself with him. I know him to be an exceedingly capable man, and I think a just man, but I ask hon. members, is a man who is admittedly predisposed in favour of race-tracks, just as I am predisposed against them, a proper man to investigate a matter of this kind, or would either of us be fit men to deal with the question? I am quite sure if I were called on a jury in connection with this matter I would be challenged because my bringing up is against race-tracks, and I would not be able to give a fair presentation of all sides of the case. I feel the same way with respect to Dr. Rutherford, but in saying that I am not saying anything disparaging of him. I am putting him in the same category as myself. I can remember quite well that in the province of Saskatchewan we thought we were making an advance when we authorized and recommended pari-mutuel machines at the exhibitions in that province, as a vast improvement on the old bookmaking method of betting, but the world moves in respect to these matters. I can remember when it was thought to be a great forward movement when we had local option in the liquor traffic. But Canada was not satisfied with that. She moved on, and is moving on now in reference to restrictions regarding gambling. What was all right ten years ago or even two years ago, with regard to pari-mutuels is not necessarily what Canada wants to-day. She wants further restriction. What we had ten years ago was sufficient for that day, but the public conscience of the country, so far as the West is concerned, is very much against commercialized gambling on the race-track.

The argument has been advanced: What is the use of legislating against gambling when you cannot carry your legislation into effect? If that argument is carried to its logical conclusion, it will apply to anything and every-

thing. What is the use of legislating against murder? What is the use of legislating against bawdy houses, or against any form of wrong doing, because forsooth, you cannot carry it into effect? If that argument prevailed we should open up the door as wide as a barn door, and throw all restraint to the winds. That is the logic of it. It is not an argument at all against it; if it is wrong, it is wrong, and it is our duty to legislate and to see that our law enforcement officers carry out the law as far as humanly possible, but if you preach the doctrine of legislative inaction on the ground that the law cannot be carried out, you simply cut the foundation from all law enforcement throughout Canada. We also cast disrespect upon ourselves and upon the laws of this country by whispering such an admission as that.

Then the doctrine was enunciated by my good friend whom I respect so highly, the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) —and it did pain me to hear him do it—that these investments should be protected. That is to say, this business having continued so long and great strings of horses, stables and race-tracks having been established, it is not fair to those who have invested their money that their investment should be jeopardised by the prohibition of this practice. If we look back into history, we shall find that old cry, "Our craft is in danger," right from the time of Demetrius the silversmith onward. From his day to the present "Our craft is in danger" has been the cry in an attempt to justify the continuance of a practice that we know to be doubtful, if not actually wrong. Why, Demetrius would be at the job of making idols yet, if we took the ground that we must keep a man in his job regardless of the results. No, if a thing is wrong, it is wrong and the excuse or the reason advanced that we should protect money when invested in a wrong business will not hold water. I admit that my hon. friend made an exceedingly good presentation of an equally exceedingly bad case. I am prepared to compliment him to that extent; but just because he made such a good presentation, I feel it is my duty to show where the weak points of that case lie.

As regards my hon. friend's reference to Great Britain, I think the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) dealt sufficiently with that phase of the question. His covenanting disposition could not listen longer to the economic—almost religious—heresies that had been enunciated by my good friend the member for Victoria City. To associate the development of Great Britain, its civilisation, its Christianity and the extent of its teaching of the Bible in any way with race-track gambling—I can remember the old Scotch covenanting people of the Maritime provinces and, indeed, throughout Canada looked upon it as almost sacrilege to mention these things in the same breath. I know quite well this was not meant so; but nevertheless it grated terribly on the ears of some of us, and I want to dissociate myself from any such arguments as that enunciated by my hon. friend, I am sure, quite unintentionally. No, Great Britain is great in spite of these weaknesses of hers. That is the proper argument.

In regard to the question of horsebreeding, I remember Dr. Rutherford advanced that argument, and on the face of it, it seems somewhat plausible until you inquire into it. I did not understand the hon. member for Victoria City to take the ground that thoroughbred animals could be used to improve the horsebreeding business generally throughout Canada. I think I am right in that. But, at the same time, the argument has been used, in such a suggestive sort of way, that the thoroughbred has done so much good in the past. There is no question about the part which the thoroughbred has played during the last three or four hundred years in developing the various breeds in Great Britain. If I remember rightly, the thoroughbred was traced away back to Arabian horses, and it has come down to the present day. But certain strains have been introduced into many of the breeds of Great Britain and from there through Canada, just as the blood of the old longhorn cattle and even some of the black cattle has influenced the development of the present day shorthorn. All these have played their part in bringing down to us the various breeds of to-day. We can go into the plant world if you like. We know that what was called Abundance oats has a cross of wild oats in it to give it earlier maturity. But nobody is going to advocate the sowing of wild oats because there is a strain of wild oats in the variety know as Abundance. So, while the thoroughbred horse has played a great part in the past in developing the breeds of Great Britain, its work in that respect is done, and we cannot cross it with any of the various breeds of Canada without interfering with the right to registration. It can, of course, be used for building up remount stations; but how much attention do we desire to devote to that at this time? Hon. members know what the House felt like last year when we spoke of warlike expenditure, even in regard to ordinary defence or aircraft or the navy. We cannot spend much

money on remount stations. There is, however, a considerable sale for these animals, and because of that some attention is being paid to them; but so far as I can make out by the approximate estimates I have, the number of purebred stallions in Canada is about 9,000. Of that there are only 300 thoroughbreds, and we know that they are not used indiscriminately throughout Canada, but just in selected places where people want to raise saddle horses or hunters or remounts. That is the extent to which the thoroughbred can be utilised to develop the horse-breeding industry, so far as I understand the matter.

Mr. CANNON: As Minister of Agriculture does my hon. friend think that the abolition of horse-racing would interfere with the holding of agricultural fairs?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a matter of education on the part of the people. I believe at the present time some agricultural fairs prohibit horse-racing entirely. Some take the ground that they must have a certain amount of recreation and pastime. we have what are called the midway and general platform sports. In the East I believe they feel that horse-racing is required in order to secure the maximum revenue. But if maximum revenue is the chief consideration, probably for a year or two the revenues would shrink by the abolition of horse-racing. You cannot have the thing both ways.

Let me continue with regard to the question of the effect upon breeding horses. I think I had almost concluded that point. I am willing to pay a tribute to the thoroughbred horse for what it has done to the various breeds in England and also in Canada, although its work in Canada has not been done directly, but has come down to us by importations in the past. But that work has been accomplished, and now it is confined only to the very restricted activities to which I have already referred.

I take the ground, when you strip this business of gambling from all the verbiage surrounding it, you have to defend it, in the last analysis, on its merits. There is no other way. I can recall the time when the fight against the liquor traffic was at its height. It used to be defended on the ground that it was associated with hotel accommodation, and people would argue: "Well, if we abolish the bar, we shall not have hotel accommodation." They had the two matters connected together and you could not get a straight test vote as regards the abolition of the bar. So, we have this question of race-track gambling surrounded with a halo of glory inherited from the performances of the thoroughbred in former ages and people point to the accomplishments of the past as a justification for the continuance of race-track gambling. In my time I have seen horse races where there was no gambling. Surely, we do not appreciate the beauty and glory of the horse, if we take the ground that there will be no racing if the gambling feature is taken away. That is tantamount to making the statement that if any other domestic animal you could think of were put on a race-track, as long as you could bet on it, the business would be just as successful as if the racing were done by horses. I take exception to that. There is no other domestic animal known that creates admiration to such an extent as the horse. We have found as a matter of fact, from experience, that horse-racing can be and has been developed to a very considerable extent without the supplemental aid of commercial betting.

Mr. TOLMIE: Will the minister mention some of the tracks where such unaided racing has been carried on successfully from year to year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The race-tracks did not try to carry on under that condition; they simply suspended their operations. It is a pretty difficult matter to make comparisons in this connection. The race-track people, when the order in council was passed in 1917, took it as an intimation from parliament that they were required to stop the whole business, and they did stop. I think they felt that the conscience of the country was against not only the expense involved but the business itself at that particular juncture in our history.

I now come to the last note I took on the subject, and that is the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) with which I entirely agree, namely, that if we are to have further prohibition with respect to race-track gambling as well as to every other form of gambling—and, mark you, we have gone out of our way to legalize gambling on race-tracks while it is prohibited in other directions—then we should adopt it on a provincial basis. I want to say frankly that while I feel strongly on the question myself I should not feel justified in taking the attitude in the West that we should impose our will, even if we could, on the old established institutions of the eastern provinces; nor should I like to see the older provinces impose their views on the newer provinces that know very little about

the business but feel that it would lead to disastrous results. Last year we adopted that principle of tolerance with respect to the abolition of export houses in the seven dry provinces of Canada, and it went through the House with almost unanimous consent. There was no vote upon it, although there was some discussion. The right to deal with the export houses was conceded to the seven dry provinces and they can exercise that right. One province has taken advantage of it and another province, Alberta, is on the point of doing so. It seems to me that there is an avenue of solution whereby we can all get our own way provincially. And this principle can be worked out more satisfactorily in connection with race-track gambling than it can as applied to the export houses. The baneful effects of the liquor business can be felt all over the country, through some extraordinary process, notwithstanding the law. But with regard to race-meetings it is confined largely to the particular locality. I know there is a system to which my hon. friends refer, whereby, if you look around, you can get a bet in Ottawa, say, on a race-meeting in Kentucky. If that is so, and I have no doubt it is, it can be legislated against. But the point I wish to make is that although we feel strongly on this question, I am sure my hon. friends to my right would not wish to impose their modern views upon us with respect to race-track gambling, nor would we impose our old-fashioned views upon them. That is reciprocity, and we all believe in that principle. In the multitude of counsellors, we are told, there is wisdom; and there is no reason why this solution should not be invoked as successfully in this matter as it was in the other case last year. In the meantime I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. JOHN PRITCHARD (North Wellington): I rise to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). The matter has been pretty well debated and I think the debate has been largely one-sided. There are one or two comments which have been made to which I might reply for the benefit of those who are opposed to the resolution. Some hon. gentlemen opposite claim the moral right to do as they please in this matter, and I feel that they have a moral right to their views so long as they do not interfere with the liberties of other people. Our friends opposite sometimes accuse us of wishing to prohibit other people from doing what they want to do. On the other hand, we as farmers do not want to be injured in any way by men in the racing business. I am something like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell); while I have not suffered much from the evil influences of gambling, I would not want to see my sons buy fine horses and embark on the betting business or any other form of gambling. I do not think there is a banker in this country who wants to see one of his clerks engaged in race-track gambling, and undoubtedly that is the position of every other employer. The same thing might be said in regard to the liquor question. I believe that there is a certain amount of sincerity on the part of those who say that they have the right to a moderate use of liquor. But I do not think that a man has any right, while under the influence of liquor, to drive into Ottawa at the rate of thirty miles an hour regardless of whom he hurts. When he does so he interferes with the rights of other people and we have a right to legislate in the interests of the community at large. I happen to have been sent to parliament by a fairly representative body of people, and I should not be true to their wishes if I did not raise my voice in support of this resolution. I do not wish to detain the House on the question now, Mr. Speaker, and although there are several arguments which I might advance in support of it, as the subject has been fairly well covered, I shall not delay the progress of the House by any consideration of them.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. A. BRETHEN (East Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, stripped of its legal verbiage, what does this resolution proposed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) ask for? Not that racing be stopped—racing, free from gambling, is a good, clean, inspiring, healthful sport. Not that private betting be interfered with—it cannot be legislated out of business; moral suasion alone must be relied on to do that. But as Britishers who love justice and fair play we ask that the business of betting on race-tracks be constituted a crime, as the business of betting off race-tracks is now and ever has been both in Canada and England constituted a crime; and that the pari-mutuel be prohibited as have the book-makers and the pool-sellers.

Before 1910 race-track betting was intended and supposed to be unlawful, and book-makers and pool-sellers were prosecuted. Some doubt, however, having been cast upon the validity of the law, in 1910 Mr. H. H. Miller, then representing South Grey, introduced into this House a bill to remedy some of the evils

of race-track gambling. The bill was referred to a select committee of the House, and after taking very exhaustive evidence from those opposed to and those in favour of race-track gambling, the committee recommended to the House the acceptance of the Miller Bill. The bill was debated for over two days, and was defeated by the narrow majority of one vote, there being seventy-eight in favour and seventy-seven against. Thereupon the business of betting by book-making, pool-selling and pari-mutuel received legal sanction, but racing meets were limited to fourteen days.

What happened? Racing meets rapidly multiplied; and the law being defective in prohibiting publication of betting odds and racing tips a general carnival of racing and an orgy of betting followed. So bad had conditions become that in 1917, during a critical period of the war, the government of the day, by virtue of the War Measures Act, and in the interests of economy, national welfare and morale, passed an order in council suppressing race-track betting until the close of the war. As a result racing was suspended, and the number of prosecutions against illegal betting houses rapidly declined.

In 1920 this order in council was rescinded and the government appointed a commission under the chairmanship of Dr. J. G. Rutherford to investigate race-track gambling. After a thorough and careful investigation this commission recommended that instead of suppressing race-track gambling the following restrictions be imposed, namely; that no book-making nor pool-selling be allowed; that pari-mutuels only be permitted; that a lower percentage of rake-off be allowed to jockey clubs; and that race-tracks be under the supervision of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The government of the day incorporated these recommendations into a bill which became law in October, 1920. The effectiveness of this legislation can be judged by the returns for 1921, the first year of its operation. The amounts wagered on the race-tracks of Ontario during the first half of the year 1917 up to August 1, when the order in council came into force, was $12,500,000. During the year 1921, under effective restriction, the amount wagered in Ontario had grown to the enormous sum of $56,778,596; in Quebec to $10,852,000, and for the rest of Canada about $10,000,000; or a total of something like $75,000,000. With this increase in legalized race-track betting, we find the prosecutions for illegal betting keeping pace. In the year 1919, under restrictions, we find that prosecutions for illegal betting had fallen to the small total of five. In the year 1920, after this order was annulled, the number had increased to 26, and during the year 1921, under effective restriction, the number of prosecutions for keeping of illegal betting houses had increased to the number of 55. No stronger argument is needed to refute the assertion that the legalizing of race-track gambling under government regulation would do away with illegal betting, or that the suppression of legalized race-track gambling would drive people to the pool rooms and the betting houses to satisfy their speculative desires.

The debate, Mr. Speaker, we believe hinges very largely on the question as to whether the suppression of race-track gambling or effective restriction will best advance the national welfare. Some hon. members are very strong in their views as to the value of effective restriction and the evils of suppression or prohibition. I was somewhat amused to hear the arguments of my hon. friend from Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) in this connection. If I remember correctly, in the province from which he comes they have a very live race problem, of a somewhat different nature. Only a few days ago a debate was begun in this House in support of a bill to better regulate oriental immigration. I think hon. members will also remember the debate last session on a similar question, when the members from British Columbia cast all party affiliations to the winds and were a unit in demanding absolute exclusion of the oriental. Advancing by way of argument the international difficulties present, a member of the government brought in an amendment substituting the words "effective restriction" for the word "exclusion". I believe that every hon. member from British Columbia, no matter where he sits in this House, voted against that amendment. The hon. member for Victoria City on that occasion asked: why do we hold out so strongly for the word "exclusion"? Simply because, he said, restriction in the past had failed to restrict. That a year's acquaintance with the working out of the policy of effective restriction has not proved satisfactory to those people most closely in touch with the situation is evidenced by the introduction at this session of a similar resolution, or rather a bill to provide for the exclusion of orientals. The supporters of this resolution on race-track gambling take very much the same attitude as was taken by every hon. member from British Columbia on their special race problem, and when we find men of the physical and mental breadth of the hon. member for Victoria City advocating effective restriction in the case of orientals, in which an international question is involved, and opposing effective restriction in the matter of race-

track gambling we are led to exclaim, Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel!

I was also rather amused with the amiable address given by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret). His efforts were apparently directed to the reducing of the able argument of the mover of this motion (Mr. Good) to an absurdity and to accomplish this he travelled over a wide field ranging from silk socks to the Ten Commandments. He also introduced into this discussion the question of personal liberty. Without developing this idea at any length, I would like to make a few comments upon the relation of personal liberty to the welfare of the family, of the community, and of the nation. Only last evening with a few congenial friends I wended my way to the Arena, and there enjoyed a contest in skill, endurance and sportsmanship. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, every man of the twelve on the two opposing teams had very emphatic notions as to his personal rights and personal liberties, but I noticed in addition to the twelve men on the opposing teams, there were two other men whose business it seemed to be to teach every member of those two teams the fact that his personal liberty was subservient to that of the other members on the teams and also to the rules of the game.

Mr. RINFRET: Would not that be an example of regulating the game and not prohibiting it?

Mr. BRETHEN: I think it was a question of regulating, all right. If a man proceeded harmlessly to kick the puck with his skate he was promptly called back, or if he gave an opposing player the butt end of his stick, even in retaliation, he was promptly benched. Even that little piece of black rubber on the ice had apparently certain rights and precedence over the rights of the players. The player at all times had to give the right of precedence to Miss Puck, or be promptly called offside. My hon. friend has no doubt observed that in the operation of his automobile there are also certain restrictions upon personal liberty. There are certain conditions of traffic to which the driver of an automobile must conform; the rate of speed is limited to a certain mileage. The law says, "Thou shalt not drive on the wrong side of the street; thou shalt not pass a waiting street car." In the Ten Commandments, which I am glad to know my hon. friend makes the rule of his living, there is the prohibition "Thou shalt not kill" and there are other things which affect his personal liberty.

Mr. RINFRET: Is there in the Ten Commandments the prohibition "Thou shalt not bet"?

Mr. BRETHEN: No, but there is this admonition "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods." To argue for personal liberty is to argue for something that sounds ideal, but when personal liberty is gained at the sacrifice of family happiness, or community or national welfare, the person presenting the argument assumes a rather cheap position and the argument itself is scarcely worthy of any serious consideration. We are told in the Holy Writ "Whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant." What is asked for in this resolution is that the law be made consistent, that the business of betting on race-tracks be made a crime as has already been done in the case of betting off race-tracks; that pari-mutuel machines be prohibited as book making and pool selling have been prohibited.

Why do we ask for this? I have heard some hon. members stress the fact that betting is permitted in England. I would like to point out that betting by pari-mutuel machines is prohibited on the tracks in Old England. In the year 1871 two men were convicted at Wolverhampton of trying to operate pari-mutuel machines. Those men were convicted and the law has ever since held good. Last year the question was raised there but was defeated in the House. Forty-five out of forty-eight states in the American union prohibit the use of the pari-mutuel machine and commercialized betting. I think we were told to-day that three states of the union had tried other forms of betting but had gone back to the pari-mutuel machine. I am not sure that at all times the majority is right, but when we find forty-five states following a certain course, when we find them prohibiting betting on race-tracks, and that there are only three states in this instance, I am inclined to think that the majority is right.

We ask for this resolution to become law because of the immoral influences of this business, as disclosed before the Commission of Inquiry in 1910 and the Rutherford Commission as well. On those occasions many examples were given to show that characters had been ruined, reputations shattered, homes destroyed, women's hearts broken, and little children robbed of their right to a happy childhood and a fighting chance in life. Furthermore, legalized betting on race-tracks is undesirable on economic grounds, because of the loss and confusion in business due to the failure of clerks and others in mercantile life

to satisfactorily discharge their duties, their thoughts being far away on race-track gambling. I think it was mentioned by an hon. member here this afternoon that the Quebec Board of Trade had introduced a resolution opposing this practice. Manufacturers of British Columbia, and also the retail merchants of that province, I believe, have passed a similar resolution.

In the next place we are firmly opposed to legalized race-track gambling because it is a national scandal. Followers of the race-track have been driven out of forty-five states of the union and now find their paradise for racing in Canada and Mexico. I remember reading years ago that negroes in the country to the south of us, in order to escape from the trials and sorrows that were their lot as slaves, were willing to risk pursuit by blood-hounds, willing to risk any peril, in order to escape from bondage. And when they made their dash for freedom to what haven did they flee. They came to Canada, the land of promise in the north, and by underground railway, by riding on ice floes as Eliza did in Uncle Tom's Cabin, and in many other ways, they sought to escape into the land of freedom and of purity, Canada. I am sorry, Sir, that when we think of some of the plague spots in Canada at the present time we cannot thrill with that same pride in our country that we ought to feel. To paraphrase Goldsmith:

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where vice accumulates and men decay.

Comparing the conditions in regard to this practice in 1917, under suppression, and in 1921 under restriction, I can only say that in this House, where the spoken word is preserved for ages, I realize my personal responsibility to those whom I represent, and to those around me, and will take no chance that any spoken word or recorded vote of mine shall go otherwise than in support of this resolution.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the speech just made by my hon. friend (Mr. Brethen), I was undecided as to whether I was sitting in the House of Commons or attending a revival camp meeting. We have heard speeches on this resolution which could well have been delivered from the pulpit. This question has been treated by hon. members of this House as if it were a religious matter, and not simply a legal question to be decided according to the ordinary rules which apply to questions of that character. Really, listening to the last speaker, one would never think it were possible for a member of the United Farmers of Ontario to have anything to do with horse-breeding or horse-racing. I would refer my hon. friend to the Canadian Sportsman and Live Stock Journal, established in 1870. If he looks at the issue of the date Monday January 29th, 1922, I am sure he will be surprised to see on the front page a picture of Canada's iron horse, Jack Canuck, owned by Mr. Morrison, the secretary of the U. F. O. This is—for us—not a matter of religion and it is not a matter of morality. It is a question of common sense, and it is from the standpoint of common sense that I wish to discuss the resolution introduced by my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Good).

In discussing the merits of this resolution I do not wish in any way to criticize the hon. member. He holds most peculiar—most exceptional—views on certain subjects, but every man is entitled to his opinions and to his views. I respect his views and admire the courage with which he voices them in the House. I have heard, with great surprise, my good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) telling us that he was going to support the resolution on the one hand; but, on the other hand, being a thorough Liberal, he did not intend in any way to impose his views on eastern Canada. How the hon. minister could take that stand is beyond my comprehension. The resolution has to be debated and voted upon as it reads, and not as it may be interpreted by the mild-mannered Minister of Agriculture. This resolution does away with the existing law concerning race betting. It applies to the whole of Canada—the province of Quebec, the Maritime provinces, the province of Ontario, as well as to every one of the western provinces. Unless the resolution be amended, if it be adopted in this House, and if a bill is passed along the same lines as the resolution itself, we will have in Canada a law prohibiting race betting from the Pacific ocean to the Atlantic coast. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says that he would not interfere with the freedom of the citizens of the province of Quebec, or with the freedom of the inhabitants of the province of Ontario or of the Maritime provinces. If the minister casts his vote in favour of the resolution unamended, he will force upon these provinces legislation which these provinces do not wish to have.

The resolution on its merits could be considered I submit, Mr Speaker, from a four-fold viewpoint. First, it could be considered from the constitutional viewpoint. Secondly,

is it in accordance with sound philosophical views? Thirdly, is it a resolution that could be supported without amendment according to the elementary rules of law? And fourthly, would it have the effect that my hon. friend for Brant wishes a law based on that resolution to have? From a constitutional viewpoint, has this House of Commons, or has the federal parliament, the power to prohibit betting in Canada? If we examine the British North America Act, section, 92, subsection 13, we will see that all laws concerning property and civil rights are to be enacted by the provinces and not by Canada. Under the provisions of that subsection, laws have been passed in the province of Quebec and are still in effect in that province. Then I would refer my hon. friend for Brant to the civil code of the province of Quebec, sections 1927 and 1928, which makes race betting absolutely legal. How can we, as members of the federal parliament, enact a law which would be outside of our competency as legislators?

Mr. GOOD: Was the order in council of 1917 which was in operation for several years unconstitutional, and was it ineffective in the province of Quebec?

Mr. CANNON: In answer to that question, I may say that when I sat in parliament from 1917 to 1921, when the Tory or Unionist government was in power, many laws were passed which were absolutely unconstitutional and were never tested before the courts, on account of war conditions. Now, Mr Speaker, I raise this first point, as to whether constitutionally this parliament has the right to pass a bill which would be based on the resolution introduced. Secondly, admitting for the sake of argument that such powers belonged to this parliament, could we, examining the question from a philosophical viewpoint, be in favour of this resolution? If legislation is enacted with the object of becoming effective and resulting in an improvement of conditions as they exist when that legislation is adopted, that legislation must be in conformity with the taste, the customs and the usages of the people for whom the legislation is passed.

It is absolutely useless for any legislature in the world to pass laws which are against the prevailing ideas of the people for whom those laws are passed. What does history teach us as to the ideas of the human race concerning horse-racing? If the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) will read over the history of ancient times, he will see that, notwithstanding the prophets, notwithstanding the saintly people, notwithstanding the sanctimonious preachers who, in those times as well as to-day, were clamouring about the evils of horse-racing, horse-racing existed in the very old days of Egypt when this king whose body was recently recovered, was reigning in all his glory. Horse-racing existed at Babylon; horse-racing existed even amongst the chosen people of God, and never was any law passed to prohibit it.

Let us go further in the history of the world, and let my hon. friend for Brant remember that the Greek nation during the Greek civilization which was one of the best that the world ever saw, had horse-racing and sports, and that even to-day we have records of the great Olympic games which have been immortalized, games which have given their name to the international sporting meetings which are held even in these days. During the Middle Ages, horse-racing also prevailed, and in our modern civilization horse-racing is considered and recognized as being the greatest sport that ever was encouraged by any people.

You cannot change human nature by legislation, and notwithstanding the very best intentions of my hon. friend for Brant and his colleagues who sit around him, human nature is here to stay, and even if the Progressive party passes, human nature will remain the way it is. Not only has man, ever since history has recorded his activities, been a sport; but it suffices to look around oneself to see that everything in this world is speculation and gamble, gamble in industry, gamble in the professions, gamble, Mr. Speaker, even though you may be surprised, amongst the farming community. What does the farmer do who goes upon his land in the spring to sow the crop which he expects to reap when the sun has warmed the earth and helped it to produce? What does he do but gamble against adverse conditions, against the climate and against conditions which always vary? Life is a gamble, and as you know Mr. Speaker, it is on that account that the main rule of human life is the survival of the fittest. He who does not gamble is lost.

Mr. BRETHEN: Is it a fact that the little lambs gambol?

Mr. CANNON: I think the hon. member would be in a better position to answer that question than I am myself. Let us examine what law is. What is a law? Why do we pass laws? Law is nothing but regulated freedom. Law is the enforcement of social order, so that man may live according to the customs or the modes accepted by the members of the community wherein he resides. Law is noth-

ing but that. The law, as has been pointed out by speakers who have preceded me, prohibits murder, for instance; but a distinction has to be made, a distinction which is taught to us by sane philosophy. What is evil? There are two kinds of evil. There is evil which is essentially bad or, as we say in Latin, malum per se, evil fundamentally bad, and besides malum per se, there is malum per accidens, or evil accidentally. Malum per se needs no legislation. Malum per se is recognized throughout the world by every man who lives, and it is prevented by natural laws. Malum per accidens is sometimes prohibited, not by universal or natural law, but by written or local laws. I will give an example of fundamental evil. Murder is malum per se. We do not need any law to prohibit murder; natural law prohibits it, and it is forbidden throughout the world. Let me give an example now of malum per accidens.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the survival of the fittest forbid murder?

Mr. CANNON: Certainly it does, and that explains why my hon. friend is here. I was going to give an example of malum per accidens. We have in this country laws which enact that a man has to go about the streets decently dressed. This is a local law, which does not exist in Patagonia, or in Africa. To go undressed is not malum per se; it is simply malum per accidens. What about betting? Would any member in this House say that betting is malum per se? If it is malum at all, it is malum per accidens, and who is going to give us the standard? Where are we going to find it? In my church it may be that betting is no evil at all. In the church of my respected neighbour (Mr. McIsaac), it may be.

An hon. MEMBER: It is the same church.

Mr. CANNON: I will never admit that the church to which a good Scotchman like my respected neighbour goes can be the same church that I go to. If then betting is not an evil essentially, the question becomes a moral one, and moral questions are not for parliament, but for churches. It may be a sin to bet, according to certain religious tenets; but laws should be enacted in order to punish crimes, and religion should prevent sins. Let the religious bodies of this country so educate their members that they will not bet, if it pleases the preachers of these bodies so to do. But, Mr. Speaker, let not parliament become a pulpit for the rest of Canada.

I say that from the constitutional standpoint this resolution should not pass; from a philosophical standpoint it is not well founded, and, in the third place, if you examine it from the strictly legal point of view it should be cast aside. This is nothing but another piece of uplift legislation. I am not surprised that my good friends the Progressives, and especially my good friend for Brant (Mr. Good), should be eager to introduce resolutions of this kind into the House. But if my hon. friend had sat in the House when the Hon. Mr. Rowell was here he would be sick and tired of that sort of legislation. This is not the first time in the history of the world that a parliament has tried to moralize people. Let my hon. friend for Brant remember what the first settlers in New England did when they came to the American continent. They passed the blue laws. And what was the result? So long as those restrictions on private liberty were imposed on the pioneers of New England material progress was retarded; and it was only when freedom blossomed, as freedom could blossom under the American sun, that New England became the most prosperous perhaps of all the states in the great republic to the south of us. The Progressives have most peculiar ideas. Their main platform, one would say almost the whole of their platform, is the very broad plank of freedom of trade. Now, why should those hon. gentlemen who come here preach freedom of trade when they wish to deprive the people of Canada of every other kind of freedom? I am in theory a freetrader just as much as hon. gentlemen on the other side. But if I support the principle of freedom in the matter of trade I support the general principle of freedom in every direction, within the law. And I say that my hon. friends on the other side cannot support freedom of trade as the best possible arrangement between nation and nation if they deny, on the other hand, every kind and species of freedom and liberty to the citizens of Canada.

As to betting, Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side have also most peculiar ideas. When it comes to gambling and betting on the wheat crop they are prepared to put up their money. They asked us last year to pass legislation and institute a wheat board so that they might be sure to win on their bets and never lose. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) said that he would support the resolution because, if he voted against it, he would be false to the education he received as a young man. I may say to the hon. gentleman, with all due respect, that the education which a man receives is not limited to the years of his youth, and that he should be always open to improvement.

Now, let us examine this resolution—and it is my last point—from the practical stand-

point. Grant that the resolution is adopted; let us suppose that a bill is introduced and passed by parliament founded on the resolution, can that law be enforced? To ascertain whether it can be enforced or not, any hon. member who wishes to form a reasonable opinion should look around and see what has been the fate of similar laws passed in this country. Sanctimonious men have imposed on the majority of their fellowmen in the province of Ontario and elsewhere a law which is known as "Prohibition." How is it enforced? Can any man who sits in this House get up and sincerely say before this country that prohibition is enforced in Ontario? There is more liquor flowing in the province of Ontario than water in the summer time down the Montmorency falls.

Mr. GOOD: Perhaps that is not very much.

Mr. CANNON: Quite a lot; and I would invite my hon. friend to come and see for himself. These laws, when it comes to putting them into operation, as has been demonstrated, are a premium on hypocrisy. If we pass legislation of this kind we are simply creating a generation of hypocrites. Instead of having citizens who would openly and without fear go to horse-races and put their money on the horses that they think will win, you would have to-morrow a whole lot of people who would sneak behind doors to put out their money in the dark whereas now they put it out in the open daylight. What have you to-day as a result of prohibition in Ontario? You have a whole lot of hypocrites, who, when you meet them on the streets, you think are most respectable and law-abiding people. But if they are walking in a hurry, look at your watch, and if it happens to be around lunch time you can tell that they are hurrying along to have, before lunch, a little drink which they have hidden in the cellar. Laws of that kind are not good for the people. Instead of improving conditions socially they demoralize our population. Look to the south of us. My hon. friend who preceded me in the debate (Mr. Brethen) said that out of 48 states in the American union 45 had laws against betting. Has my hon. friend ever gone to a race meeting in the United States? Let him go where race meetings are held in that country and he will see that there is more betting done there than anywhere in Canada. But not only would a law such as the resolution proposes put a premium on hypocrisy; it would put a premium on lawlessness. Instead of having race-tracks which are properly controlled and properly watched you would have race-tracks where a whole lot of book-makers would hide around fences taking the people's money and robbing them, just as the bootleggers are prospering in Ontario and the United States, selling rotten liquor at exorbitant prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) said that he was in favour of this resolution because race-track gambling was a danger to the natural resources of Canada, and he quoted figures relative to the amount of money wagered at race-tracks. But my hon. friend has a most peculiar way of adding figures—maybe because he never went to a race meeting. He gives the figures as being what he terms exorbitant, but he forgets that the total wagered does not represent the actual money disbursed; that a man, for instance, may put down the same five dollars seven times in one afternoon—each time he wins he can take his money and bet it again.

Mr. GOOD: How can a man put down five dollars seven times if ten per cent is taken off each time?

Mr. CANNON: I am taking the case of the man who wins.

Mr. GOOD: He will have more.

Mr. CANNON: If he has won all the afternoon he can go home with maybe two hundred dollars in his pocket besides the five dollars he started with. I do not think the natural resources of Canada will suffer an awful lot in that case. Why, if this is a system by means of which people are robbed, how can you explain, Sir, that the jockey clubs do not pay any dividends and are in the most precarious financial condition?

Then another argument has been brought forward: we have been asked to vote in favour of this resolution in order to improve the type of our citizenship. I have no doubt that this argument is urged in entire good faith, but is it not the fact that races can have no effect whatsoever, on the character, standard, nature or calibre of our citizenship? When we go over to Connaught Park to see the races twice a year, whom do we find there? The best citizens in Canada. These races are always honoured by the presence of the Governor General and of the most prominent citizens of Ottawa. And not only are these citizens present but also their wives. Would any hon. member claim for one moment that the standard of citizenship of these people is lowered by their attending these races? I do not think that such a claim can be very seriously put forward.

During the course of this debate we have had quoted some very sad cases, the saddest, perhaps, being that of the unfortunate young man whose honeymoon was interrupted because he went to the races. Well, really, if this young man was married to a wife who objected to her husband seeing a horse-race, I do not think that to-day he regrets very much being separated from her. But even admitting that all these cases were not at all overstated, after all they are only exceptional cases, and there is a principle of law which is universally admitted, namely, that law is made to meet general cases, not exceptional. On account of this young man whose honeymoon was so sadly interrupted, on account of this grocer whose bills were so ill paid, on account of this poor unfortunate man in Toronto who gambled away his house, are we going to deny the rest of the people of Canada the pleasure of attending the races? I do not think the proposition is reasonable.

9 p.m.

The fact that a resolution was passed by the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec is put forward as a strong argument in favour of this motion. I do not know much about the Board of Trade in the city of Quebec, and I know less about the resolution. Most probably that resolution was proposed by a few members who had lost money at the races the day before. But if my Progressive friends are so keen in using as an argument for their view a resolution passeed by the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec, I would ask them as a favour to also take into consideration the resolutions that the same Board of Trade has passed requesting the West to send us their wheat instead of sending it to American ports.

This session, Mr. Speaker, we have heard some most mournful speeches about conditions existing out West; also respecting Ontario conditions. If we wish to improve conditions in Canada, we have to give to the people some relief, we have got to give them a little enjoyment. As Victor Hugo said: Qui n'a trouvé le repos dans un chant?—Who has not found entire repose in a song? Let us sing a bit and stop shedding tears. Let the people go to the races and hear the song of the horses as they go around the race-track. As those horses rush into the home stretch they give us the idea of friendly rivalry among the nations of the earth. And in that steeplechase of the nations, in that Derby of ideals, I will bet Canada straight on the nose every time.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I feel that perhaps I am imposing on this House by undertaking to prolong the debate. It has been very interesting in the variety of views presented. I am unable, however, to take an extreme stand either way. I have not unlimited faith in making our people good by law. If I could feel that this resolution would do all that the mover of it thinks possible, I would take a good deal more pleasure in supporting it. From conviction I shall support the resolution, but I do not do so without a great deal of doubt as to its wisdom at this time. I have been connected with an exhibition association for more than twenty years and have diligently done the best I knew how to help build up that organization to where it is at present. I believe it will be very hard on that exhibition if we pass this resolution and the government enact legislation in accordance therewith. I am not without doubt as to the result. As I have said, I am not a very great believer in making people good by law.

Mr. GOOD: Might I ask, just for information, whether the pari-mutuels have been operated in connection with the exhibition to which my hon. friend refers?

Mr. WARNER: We have had the pari-mutuel machines for several years; I do not know just how long. In my mind there is a doubt as to whether this betting could not be better handled through regulation of the pari-mutuels. I am not greatly interested in horse-racing myself. I have seen the time when by moving a hundred feet or more I might have looked at some very interesting horse-races, but I was interested more in the other features of the fair, and attended to my business and let the horse-races go on. I have never bet, and I do not ever expect to bet on a horse-race, but I do know this, that in that thinly settled country people come from a long way to the fair who are very much interested in horse-racing. If we have betting without regulation, I believe that a certain amount of betting will go on, but I am a little fearful as to the effects on our fair if this resolution is passed and legislation is introduced to carry it into effect. Those fears may be overcome, I think, if all these people who are good enough to ask us to prohibit betting, which does bring a good many people to the fair, will turn in and help to make the fair a success without the horse-racing. I believe that it could be done, but I find that the people who are perhaps the most religious and feel the need of this legislation most are the very ones who give us the least assistance in making the fair a success. I am not saying this to criticize them

particularly, but as a matter of fact they are not interested in that line. I have tried to be practical myself. Although I have not lent my assistance in any way to horse-racing —I have never been on the racing committee —I have tolerated it, knowing that we had to have the people there in order to make the fair a success, and I believe that that condition still exists in our district. I have to talk from my knowledge of the district where I live, although I believe that what I say is true of the exhibitions throughout Canada.

As I said before, I am willing to go the length of this resolution, but I want to impress on these people who are asking for our support that they are putting our exhibitions in danger. Perhaps some one will say that I am judging between the dollar and the welfare of the people, but an exhibition goes further than the money you take in. It means the welfare of the farming interest in that particular district where the fair is held. It is expected to mean that, and we try to have it mean that. So I would not like to be looked upon as putting the dollar before the welfare of the people and of the rising generation. With me it is a question of choosing between injury to the fair and benefit to the community where that fair is held. I shall have a certain amount of regret in voting for this resolution because of the fear I have of its result upon our association. I have helped to build up that association by long and diligent efforts, and if the government pass a law that would take away this support to our association, I would like to see them deal liberally with the association in the way of grants, and so forth, so that it might keep on its way doing the work for which it was intended, and a work that it can now do.

As a new force in politics this party has advocated more or less of moral reform, and as a member of that party I can go with our friends in voting for the resolution. We have asked for the abolition of gambling in our products, and we have asked that for a monetary reason. In that connection we have not talked of saving the men who speculate in our produce from hell fire and damnation; we have simply been thinking of the dollar we can save by preventing speculating in our products. So we are not altogether free from advocating something that will bring in a dollar. When we look at human nature, we are all very much alike. We do not get very much apart, but it makes a difference who is affected. But I repeat, as this party has been working along the line of reform, I think it would perhaps be inconsistent if I were to vote against this resolution, although I am quite convinced that it goes too far. On the other hand, there is undoubtedly a tendency among our young people to form spendthrift habits, and I am willing to help in any reasonable way to check the growth of irresponsibility and the spendthrift habits that our young people are forming.

I believe that if betting could be prevented it would have a good effect. I believe that if that were done it would steady our young people; but if horse-racing and betting are allowed to go on I think it will destroy and minimize the effect of stopping the use of the pari-mutuel machine and the practice of book-making, if the latter is actually in existence at the present time. From the experience that I have had I think that betting will continue if racing is allowed. If we could get not only the young people but the middle-aged persons interested in the live stock at exhibitions and induce them to concentrate on that feature it would have, in my opinion, a sobering effect. Unfortunately we have introduced another feature in connection with our fairs that the resolution does not deal with—a feature which I feel is more disturbing to the morals of the people than even horse-racing. I believe that today there is a greater interest taken in automobile races that are held in connection with our fairs than is manifested in the horse-racing, and in my opinion that feature is going to be just as injurious in its effects. All these things tend to upset the steadiness of our people. I am a firm believer in the idea that an industrious people are going to be a happy and contented people. I do not want to make slaves of anybody, but it is a fact that too many of our young people today will not stick to a job either in the city or in the country. They are so bent on pleasure, so bent on running here and there in search of excitement, that they neglect and do not think very seriously about their business or the job they are trying to hold. I believe that if we are going in for prohibition of this kind we should prohibit all along the line. I cannot but think that automobile racing is upsetting people just as seriously as horse-racing does or has ever done. The experience at Edmonton fair last summer confirms me in that impression. On that occasion automobile races took place only during two days and yet the people thronged to witness those races in greater numbers than they did at any time during the rest of the fair. Let us be consistent. The reason I am willing to support this resolution is that I believe it is an effort to try and curb

the irresponsibility of our young people throughout the country; to restrain them from forming habits that they cannot afford to cultivate; to check the extravagance that prevails; and to stimulate the practice of thrift—in a word to make them more useful citizens than they are at the present time.

I would be more strongly disposed to support the resolution if I had as much faith in reforming our people by legislation as most of the hon. gentlemen to my left seem to have. However, I do not agree with the sentiment which has been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite that we can permit people to go without regulation in certain matters. I believe that the best kind of government we can have is a government that will, by its legislation, grant a liberty which does not infringe upon the rights of others. In a truly democratic country laws are enacted in the interest of the majority of the people. If that be not the case then I do not think there can be very much liberty in that country. We designate some members of the community as socialists. A socialist, I apprehend, wants the government to take care of him and see that he gets a share of everything good that is going. Socialists and anarchists are sometimes classed in the same category, but the anarchist is an entirely different sort of person. The anarchist wants liberty to do as he pleases regardless of the rights of others. He does not want the government to do anything for him and in reality does not want any government at all. We must get somewhere between these two extremes, because a certain amount of regulation is necessary. Of course I do not want to over-estimate the amount of good that will result from regulation in this matter. I think we should attain the object aimed at if we did not build so much on what our exhibitions can do throughout Canada. These exhibitions undoubtedly have done a great work; they have had the effect of creating many better farmers than would otherwise have been the case. How are you going to make up for the number of people who pay for admission to see the horse-racing at our exhibitions? I would recommend the government to be liberal to these exhibitions so that they might operate and keep their business going even if they do lose a certain amount of patronage now derived from horse-racing.

Mr. GOOD: Is the hon. gentleman of the opinion that horse-racing at the Edmonton exhibition would be absolutely cut out by the abolition of the pari-mutuel system of betting?

[Mr. Warner.]

Mr. WARNER: I would like to ask my hon. friend the question whether he expects betting to continue unlawfully or to abolish it altogether?

Mr. GOOD: I think it is scarcely fair to ask me to answer another question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question may be put in a different form and answered if the hon. member so desires.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I will let the matter rest and deal with it at another time.

Mr. WARNER: I understand that betting in a private manner would be allowed if horse-races took place. If I am right in that assumption I fear the conditions would be worse than they would be under proper regulation. Let me say that if I did not feel that this is an effort to steady our people and get them into a frame of mind where they will realize the responsibilities of life better than they do at present I would not be so disposed to vote for the resolution. I believe that we should encourage all such efforts; we have evidence on all sides that they are needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I should delay the House by speaking at greater length, but I feel that this question is a live one in view of the important part played by the exhibitions in this country. These exhibitions are worth while, they have been most beneficial to our people and I think they should be encouraged in every reasonable way.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): It is not my intention to detain the House more than a few minutes, or just to the extent of putting myself on record on this question and perhaps incidentally saying a word in reply to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). I would have contented myself with asking a question while he was speaking, but he has a method of answering that is not very comfortable, and I chose the better part of valour. I want to say, however, that some of us on this side of the House have a very real admiration for the abilities of the hon. member for Dorchester, but we regret that some of his remarks tonight appear unnecessarily to cut into sensibilities that are supposed by common consent to be free from attacks of that kind. I may just refer to the first remark that he made, that he did not know while the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Brethen) was speaking whether he was in the House of Commons or in a revival meeting. Well, his subsequent speech did not betray any

very marked sign that he had ever been in a revival meeting and I felt like retorting at the time the hon. member was speaking that I did not know whether I was in the House of Commons or in the House of Bedlam. Did the hon. member from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) make a remark?

Mr. RINFRET: I just made a remark that did not call for a reply.

Mr. BIRD: I notice the hon. member for Dorchester began dissociating religion and morality from common sense and I think his speech in that regard was an example of common sense divorced from both religion and morality. I notice he began his remarks by confining himself to the sphere in which he is supposed to be very well versed, and that is the legal sphere. I presume he is a lawyer, but the procedure of his argument hardly followed the brave start he made, for I noticed that instead of giving us profound legal reasons against the resolution he speedily took refuge in that haven that is eagerly sought by bewildered lawyers on all occasions; I refer to the British North America Act. He took refuge in that act without any further explanation. I do not think that that after all was a very heroic thing to do. I noticed also that he proceeded to argue from the historical and ethical standpoints and that as he went down the list his accuracy of touch and his assuredness of demeanour seemed to have progressively vanished, and he seemed to be getting into deeper water all the time. He came to a point where his knowledge seemed actually to reach the vanishing point. That is where he touched upon ethics. His idea of ethics seemed to be involved in a mist of—I do not know what kind of Latin you would call it, but the kind of Latin that is often used to confuse ethical issues. The hon. member's philosophy amounted to this and only to this —and I was very careful to see what the mountain of his philosophical mind was bringing forth and what it amounted to,—it amounted to an old-time platitude that was in use when I was a small boy, and that is all there was to his philosophy. As to his history, I would ask where did he get it? He looked across here and asked "Have you read history?" I do not think we have, because we are only Progressives. You cannot expect us to have read history. Where did he get his history? Where does it appear he got it? From the Illustrated London News and the Sporting News, if there is a sporting news. It seemed to be a mixture of the two as far as I could see. He even dragged in King Tutankhamen, brought that ancient relic into this argument and quoted the precedents of defunct empires.

Then in reference to his admiration for Greece I fully share his views, but Greece, unfortunately for him, made her reputation along lines very different from those he asserts. Greece made her reputation through the soundness of her ethical philosophy. If it is not out of place I would recommend the hon. member to study Greek ethics. It might bring to his mind some clearness as to ethical matters. Latin is not a proper language in which to couch ethics. Greek is the proper language for ethics. Let me also refer to the hon. member's conception of ethics. It is all very well to quote Latin when you are in trouble, when you are likely to get deeper into trouble, and whenever the hon. member deals with ethics again, I advise him to use more Latin and use bad Latin that nobody can understand especially when dealing with people who understand ethics. His philosophy about murder and sudden death and all that is purely a creation of his own mind; there is no foundation for it in history, and it is about as reliable as his answer in regard to the question of natural selection asked by the hon. member sitting to my left.

I want to say that evil, whatever the hon. member says about it, is what the educated conscience of civilized man says is evil. That is what evil is, and it has no outward standard. It is relative to the state of your ethical education, and I leave it to your own judgment as to the point to which your ethical education has arrived. I am not setting up my standard as being perfect, but I do lay strong claim to my own view of what is ethical, and I have sufficient faith in my own ethical instinct to defend when necessary what I believe to be ethical, either in a personal or social sense. The hon. member is dealing with a subject that goes deeply into the convictions of many of us, and I would like to suggest that, when he deals with it again, he might, for our sakes and for the sake of everybody who takes these things seriously, adopt a more serious style of argument, knowing as he should know that he is dealing with convictions which are very much in the heart of all of us.

He said that all this must be left, not to a parliamentary, but to religious bodies; that is their province; leave it to them; let them teach these things. I want to ask the hon. member, who are the religious people in Canada? In the first place, if this question has to be left to a religious body, I want to know what the religious body he belongs to has been doing all these years on this question. I do not know what religious body he belongs to,

but if this question is to be left to a religious body, if it is responsible for the enlightment of the public conscience in this regard, I would like to know just where he has been receiving his education along those lines. My hon. friend says that this has to be left to the religious bodies of the land. Who are the religious people of Canada? Are not the religious people of Canada, all the people of Canada; and you can set the churches to the work—and I think the churches are not averse to the work; I do not think there is in this land an organized church that is averse to the work—of educating the people along ethical lines. We may sometimes differ and honestly differ as to what constitutes ethical advancement; but all the churches equally through all these years have been busily at work, at great sacrifice, educating the people along ethical lines.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Can the hon. gentleman tell me to what religion he belongs?

Mr. BIRD: I think the hon. gentleman's question is irrelevant to the remarks I was making. I was proceeding to say that the churches have never shirked this work, and they are not trying to foist upon parliament work that they themselves refuse to do. That is a fundamental mistake that many speakers have made to-night. They think the churches of the land have worked a device to inveigle members on this side of the House to bring this resolution in to get over something that they themselves have not been working at. That is false. For a generation or more, the churches of this country have been doing their best to educate people along these lines, and education must have an issue; some day it must be crystallised into something. What is the use of education if, at some point, you cannot express it in the formula of the laws of the land, and, while we may be mistaken,—the vote to-night will prove to what extent we are mistaken—we believe that the process of education has been going on for a good number of years at such a rate that the time is amply ripe for a legislative expression of this education that has been going on.

Just in conclusion, let me refer to the hon. gentleman's effort to preach to the Progressive party. He is very much averse to this House being used as a pulpit; but it is a long time since I have listened to anything that more nearly approaches preaching than the speech of the hon. gentleman to-night, and most of his sermon has been addressed to the Progressive party, for what reason, I do not know. The most astounding thing of all was that he advised us to sing.

Mr. CANNON: Do not do that.

Mr. BIRD: In that respect and others I think the Progressive party would certainly like to have had some say in the choice of its monitor, because the kind of song that the hon. gentleman himself displays is certainly not of that type that we would willingly emulate. We do not want to be perpetually indulging in the humorous; we do not want one eternal comic song. We delight in singing in harmony, but we are not going to commit ourselves to the tone and tenor of the hon. gentleman's speech to-night. As I said at the first, I have, since coming into this House ever had a strong admiration for the immense ability of the hon. gentleman; but to-night, perhaps, I misunderstand the tone of his speech; perhaps, I am taking it too seriously; perhaps I have felt a sting when no sting was intended. But surely the hon. gentleman is sufficiently accomplished in the art of public speech, so to modify what he says as to convey the right impression, at least at this short distance, and we hope when he ventures into this sphere again, he will so deal with the question as we would fain he would deal with it, and as we believe he is capable of dealing with it, in a rational, logical and dignified manner.

Mr. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this debate; but it seems to me, from arguments advanced recently, that there has been a good deal of wandering from the evil which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), by his resolution, proposes to correct. Speaking as a member from the province of Ontario, I have not heard a great deal as to the evils of the pari-mutuel system or of the evil of betting on the race-track. What does exist as an evil in the minds, I think, of the majority of the urban population of Ontario, is the handbook evil, which is an acknowledged evil by anyone who has studied the question at all. The Attorney General of Ontario has pointed out, as was outlined to the House this evening in the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), that this evil can be corrected or the enforcement of the law against the evil of handbook betting can be improved by restrictive legislation on the publishing of odds. It seems to me that in legislating further to restrict betting, when we have, against the greatest evil of betting, a law that is now not being properly enforced, we are taking on another piece of legislation which

is going to make the enforcement of the law still more difficult.

I think hon. members in this House who are familiar with the American tracks at Saratoga will agree that there is just as much "whisper" betting, "word-of-mouth" betting and "sign" betting going on as there was in the days of open books. The legislation in the American states that have ruled against open betting has not been very well enforced, and we have in Canada to-day more handbook betting than there is open betting under the pari-mutuel system. I do not think any hon. gentlemen who have studied the evil of handbooks will contradict me in the statement that not ten per cent of handbook offences are corrected by conviction. It is a known fact that in practically a large percentage of barber shops and poolrooms in Ontario, handbook bets are being taken, in spite of the fact that we have a law against handbooks.

I contend that the suggestion of the Minister of Justice is very much more in accord with correcting the evil of the system than is the resolution of the hon. member for Brant, for the reason that a day spent on a race-track, aside altogether from the betting that may take place, is considered by most good citizens to be a day's outing. It is to be admitted that on any day's outing, whether it be at a circus, or a picnic, or a race-track, a man spends a considerable amount of money, and that the figures compiled as to the amounts bet on the pari-mutuel system, do not represent the actual money spent in any way at all, because, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, money is bet and re-bet. If the hon. member for Brant would compile the amount of money spent at the thousand and one fairs, the midways that are held at the fairs, for which money no very great return is given to the citizens who are spending it, he would find that possibly the amount of money spent in this way for entertainment was just as great as the amount of money spent on the race-track. I contend that the betting of an odd day's sport by the citizens of this country is not an evil; but I agree with the hon. member for Brant that handbook betting which becomes a constant and every day source of gamble to the wage earners of this country, is one of the worst evils with which we have to contend. Therefore, I wish to record myself as being very much in favour of the recommendation of the Minister of Justice, at the suggestion of the Attorney General of Ontario, to frame laws to enforce the regulations against handbooks to the fullest possible extent. I think that if this parliament can legislate in that regard, leaving the pari-mutuel system in existence for a time, and enforce that portion of the law, we shall be doing a greater good to the working men and the community in general than by putting restrictions on the pari-mutuel.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) tried to show that if money were wagered ten times it would be entirely dissipated. He stated that ten per cent of the rate was taken as a rake-off from the total bet under the system. That rate which is taken by the Ontario government is in the form of taxation, and if by his day's sport the citizen does contribute to the funds of the Ontario government or any other government he is only paying a tax on amusement such as is paid in the form of the stamp tax in moving picture theatres.

Mr. GOOD: Did not the Minister of Agriculture refer to the rake-off taken by the association and not the tax of the government?

Mr. MALCOLM: The hon. member for Brant is aware that there are two rake-offs, the rake-off by the racing association and that taken by the provincial government. The minister referred to the total rake-off, because he said that if the money were bet ten times it would all be dissipated. I did not assert that the total amount of money went to the provincial government; I said that only a percentage of the rake-off went to them, and that it was in the form of taxation which the person doing the betting on the track paid to the government for his day's sport. Under the handbook system, against which I speak, there is no rake-off either to the provincial government, in the form of taxation, or to anyone else. The Minister of Agriculture went on to state that this money was all dissipated. I know there has been a great deal of criticism as to the total budget of the provincial treasurer, and if the money is dissipated after it gets into his hands I cannot say. That may or may not be true. But I did not interpret the minister as taking a slam at the provincial treasurer when he said that the money that came off the race-tracks was dissipated.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, in accord with the suggestion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who pointed out that if the resolution of the hon. member for Brant carried, and a law were enacted based upon it, that law should be a provincial option. I think that handbook betting is wrong. If this House decides that the pari-mutuel system is wrong, then, in the view of the people's representatives, the law is wrong. I do not think that this parliament should legislate for

any particular province; and if we think that a law is not a wise one for one province, I do not think it should be enacted for another.

Mr. JACOBS: We have done it dozens of times.

Mr. MALCOLM: It makes no difference whether it was done in the past. Two wrongs do not make a right, and I register my support for a general resolution. If the hon. member's resolution does carry I think it should carry for the whole Dominion. But in the meantime I make this suggestion, that we try if possible to assist the Minister of Justice in the formulation of a law against the greater of two evils. I think we should leave the pari-mutuel system in existence until we have wiped out the greater of the two evils.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I probably know as little, from personal experience, of the race-track gambling evil as any hon. member in this House. I attended one race in my life where money was being wagered, but I have had some experience of the results that accrue from race-track gambling. In former days, in various cities on this continent, I have seen and come in personal contact with some of the results of this gambling to certain citizens of this and our neighbouring country, results that have not been discussed, as I have observed, to any great extent to-night. I speak for the women and children of race-track gamblers. Consult the records of one of the neighbouring cities in the country to the south of us for the past few years and you will find, as I have read, that a considerable number of divorces have been granted to women who complained that their husbands insisted on spending all of their money in trying to beat the race-track game. In my judgment these women and children are entitled to some consideration in a discussion of this kind. I believe that parliament is not going beyond its proper and consistent sphere of effort when it undertakes to deal with a question of such prime importance to many mothers, yes, and children throughout the length and breadth of Canada and the United States.

I have heard considerable argument to-day from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and across the floor as to the right to let men gamble if they will. I know sufficient of human nature to be convinced that they will gamble. I am of opinion that if many of them did not get the opportunity to take a chance and bet their money on horse-races they would do so in shooting craps, playing poker, or something else. But I think I know something, from personal contact, of the results of race-track gambling; and I know that the fever of this evil gets into the veins of men and causes untold suffering to those whom in many cases they are sworn to protect. One hon. gentleman a moment ago said that a race-track day is a day's outing for some men. That is right. I have no doubt that it is correct. The one afternoon I spent on the race-track was for the purpose of an outing. But I wonder whether hon. gentlemen in this House will concede that for very many thousands of mothers and children such a day is one of tragedy, when they find those who have promised to protect them squandering, just because the fever of gambling is in their veins, the money that should be supporting the wife and children in decency and comfort. I do not know enough about the general question, Mr. Speaker, to go into it at very great length. I do know, however, from personal experience that many of the results of race-track gambling have been disastrous to women and children and many men too in the past. I shall certainly do what I can to remedy this evil by voting for this resolution.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I reply?

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil): The hon. member for Brant has the right to reply if he so wishes.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was out for a moment. The hour is late, but I feel that it is necessary to reply to some of the arguments which have been urged against my resolution.

I wish first to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) who alleges that the resolution proposes the making of a new offence, namely, betting. I dissent most firmly from that statement. The resolution does nothing of the kind. It simply asks for the abolition of the special privilege now enjoyed by racing associations operating what are defined under the law as "betting houses." I submit that we should recognize the distinct significance of the resolution, which is not aimed at all kinds of betting. I would also suggest to the hon. member that he has confused very seriously sin and crime. I had intended to quote in this connection the right hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition (Mr. Meighen) who spoke on the Miller Bill in 1910, but owing to the lateness of the hour I shall refrain.

10 p.m.

Mr. RINFRET: I may say that he is not my spiritual adviser.

Mr. GOOD: The right hon. gentleman at that time made a very good speech, and I

wish I had time to quote it. The hon. member for St. James also stated very frankly—perhaps in a special outburst of candour—that he did not believe in the whole philosophy of prohibitory enactments. I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. gentleman, but I would ask him: Where will that lead us? He himself said that we could not expect too much from human nature. Perhaps when we are all prepared to practise the Golden Rule we will not need the restrictive regulations with which in our better moments we have surrounded ourselves in our worse moments. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) put the matter very clearly I think when he asked the hon. member for St. James if he was prepared to move for the wiping out of the Criminal Code, which is simply a series of restrictions.

The impossibility of carrying on horse-racing without betting is alleged by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). Well, betting will be permitted to a certain extent and in a certain way—private betting. But I have witnessed a good many horse-races at country fairs that were carried on without any betting at all so far as I could see, although there may have been a few private bets. However, these races were very interesting and were enjoyed by all who attended the fairs, and it did not seem at all necessary that there should be handbook making or pari-mutuel machines to make the races a success.

I think it was perhaps unfair on the part of the hon. member for Victoria City to attempt to throw the glamour of outdoor sports over commercialized betting on race-tracks. I merely call attention to that part of my hon. friend's speech and pass on.

I desire more particularly to pay my respects to the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). He gave the House a pretty clear statement of the law as it stood in 1906 and of the changes which have been made in it since that time. But I would submit that—no doubt quite unintentionally—he left a false impression upon the House when he said, according to my notes here, that the provisions of the Miller Bill were inserted in the Criminal Code. An amendment to the Miller Bill was moved by Mr. McColl, and then subsequently a compromise was effected, it being found impossible to reach an agreement in regard either to the bill as originally introduced or to the amendment. I stated the facts in connection with this bit of history yesterday. The compromise was the amendment of 1910.

The hon. Minister of Justice also failed to explain that the 1912 amendment gave considerably more latitude to racing associations than had been permitted under the 1910 amendment.

Then he asks—and, if I may so style it, I think it is rather a threadbare question—are we ready for such radical legislation? We have heard that so often with regard to every suggested step in advance that one grows tired of it. But is it radical legislation? Is it not simply the removal of a special privilege which certain parties now enjoy to commit what, if committed by other people, would under our Criminal Code be a crime and be punished as such?

The hon. Minister of Justice also says he has not heard of any demand for legislation of this kind. Well, I am very sorry that he has not; but lots of us have heard an insistent demand for it for many years past. In that connection, I may say that the Social Service Council of Canada, so far as my information goes, has submitted to this parliament and to earlier parliaments the very same demand which is embodied in this resolution.

Now with respect to the amendment suggested by Hon. Mr. Raney, I submit that it deals with an entirely different question from that dealt with in my resolution. I am heartily in agreement with the amendment which the hon. Minister of Justice read, and I am very glad indeed that he has signified his willingness to recommend legislation in that direction, for it will be a great step forward in the control of the handbook evil as the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Malcolm) has already outlined. But this resolution of mine deals with a different question. The amendment referred to by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) applies to subsection 1 of section 235. My resolution has to do with subsection 2, the section which deals with the exemptions. The two matters are not at all in conflict, they are entirely supplementary.

The Minister of Justice also stated to the House that Mr. Raney had never asked for the amendment I have proposed. Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Raney has asked for this for years and years. He did not ask for it in the letter he sent to the Minister of Justice; of course not, because he knew this resolution was on the order paper. It was on the order paper last year. I know the Hon. Mr. Raney personally; I had a letter from him the other day. Would it not have been out of place for him to have suggested an amendment which was before the House and was to be debated in the near future? I think

Mr. Raney could not have done other than he did. The matter he referred to was one not on the order paper, and it was therefore quite proper for him to draw it to the attention of the government so that they might be assisted in the administration of the law in Ontario.

The Minister of Justice also stated that there was nothing new in the case presented on this occasion, that it was just the same situation as existed in 1906 and 1910. That is partly true. This matter has been discussed in this House on several occasions. The principle involved is pretty much the same; the discussions that have taken place from time to time are pretty much the same, but since 1912 we have had a good deal of experience. We have had the experience that I quoted yesterday as to the effect which the 1912 legislation had upon racing associations and upon race-track gambling generally, and the effect that the order in council of 1917 had. In view of the additional information which we have gathered during these years and the experience we have had, we are in a better position now to know what is the proper thing to do than we were at that time.

As I said, I am very pleased indeed to know that the government is likely to take action along the line suggested by the Hon. Mr. Raney in connection with the publication of betting odds and that sort of thing, all of which goes to encourage the hand-book evil.

Now with regard to the contention of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that the provinces can put race-track gambling out of business by making the license fee high enough, I am inclined to doubt whether that is the case. I do not know, but I understand that the constitutionality of that procedure is in question.

So far as the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) is concerned, I found it almost impossible to take him seriously. I fancy he had a wink and a glint in his eye which betokened that he had to put up a good argument for a bad case and was making the best he could out of it. If I were to enter into a discussion of his philosophy it would take us rather far afield, but I do not think that any of us took him very seriously on this occasion. He entertained the House very pleasantly, and I am sure we are not sorry for that.

There have been put into my hands to-night a couple of clippings from United States newspapers dated February 23 and 24, in which reference is made to movements both in Italy and Spain for the suppression or control of race-track gambling in those countries. The headings are "Signor Mussolini Combats Gambling" and "Spain will close up Gaming Houses."

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Bull-fights.

Mr. GOOD: In conclusion I wish to say that the issue before us is very plain. There has been extended to a number of people and organizations a special privilege to do what is defined under our criminal code as a crime. The object of the resolution is to take away a special privilege which we consider to be injurious to the national welfare. Do not let us confuse it with horse-racing, private betting, and a whole lot of other questions which have been dragged in during the course of this debate. The question is a very simple one, and I sincerely trust that the House will vote largely and heartily in favour of the resolution.

The House divided on the resolution (Mr. Good) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Baldwin,	Lewis,
Bancroft,	Lovett,
Bird,	Lovie,
Black (Huron),	Lucas,
Bowen,	MacKelvie,
Brethen,	Macphail,
Brown,	McBride,
Caldwell,	McKillop,
Campbell,	McMaster,
Carmichael,	McQuarrie,
Charters,	Martell,
Coote,	Maybee,
Denis (Joliette),	Millar,
Drummond,	Milne,
Elliott (Dundas),	Morrison,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Motherwell,
Evans,	Munro,
Fansher,	Murdock,
Findlay,	Putnam,
Gardiner,	Reed,
Garland (Bow River),	Robinson,
Good,	Ross (Simcoe),
Halbert,	Senn,
Hanson,	Sexsmith,
Hatfield,	Shaw,
Hocken,	Speakman,
Hoey,	Spencer,
Humphrey,	Stansell,
Hunt,	Steedsman,
Jelliff,	Stewart (Humboldt),
Johnston (Last Mountain)	Stewart (Leeds),
Kennedy (Edmonton),	Thompson,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),	Thurston,
	Wallace,
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),	Ward,
	Warner,
King (Huron),	White,
Knox,	Woods,
Leader,	Woodsworth—76.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,	Benoit,
Archambault,	Binette,
Baxter,	Black (Yukon),
Béland,	Boivin,

Bouchard,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boucher,	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Bourassa,	McGiverin,
Cahill,	McIsaac,
Cannon,	McKay,
Cardin,	McKenzie,
Casgrain,	McMurray,
Chaplin,	Malcolm,
Chevrier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chew,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm,	Mercier,
Church,	Michaud,
Clark,	Mitchell,
Clifford,	Morin,
Copp,	Ouimet,
d'Anjou,	Parent,
Déchène,	Pelletier,
Delisle,	Porter,
Denis (St. Denis),	Power,
Desaulniers,	Prevost,
Deslauriers,	Rankin,
Desrochers,	Raymond,
Dickie,	Rhéaume,
Duff,	Rinfret,
Fafard,	Roberge,
Fontaine,	Robichaud,
Forrester,	Robitaille,
Fortier,	Ross (Kingston),
Fournier,	Ryckman,
Garland (Carleton),	St. Père,
Gauvreau,	Savard,
Gendron,	Séguin,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),	Sheard,
Hammell,	Sinclair (Queens,P.E.I.),
Harris,	Spence,
Jacobs,	Stewart (Argenteuil),
King (Kootenay),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Kyte,	Stork,
Laflamme,	Tobin,
Lapierre,	Tolmie,
Lavigueur,	Trahan,
Léger,	Vien,
Macdonald (Pictou),	Walsh,
Mackinnon,	Wilson—96.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

For	Against
Messrs.	
Stevens,	Kay,
Boys,	Ethier,
Kellner,	Hughes,
Forke,	Marler,
Carruthers,	German,
Sinclair (Oxford),	Low,
Pritchard,	Robb,
Hudson.	Euler.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved. that it is expedient to amend the Canada Temperance Act, chapter one hundred and fifty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by addition thereto of Part V, and to provide for the prohibition of importing, sending, taking or transporting into any province in which the prohibitions hereunder are in force, any intoxicating liquor; to further provide penalties for the violation of this act; and to provide for the revocations when such have been declared revoked by an order in council of the Lieutenant-Governor of a province affected.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. McKenzie thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 43, to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Lomer Gouin the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Friday, March 2, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Copies of Orders in Council under the various Peace Treaties deposited with Secretary of State for External Affairs.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 44, to amend the Yukon Act.

He said: The object of the proposed amendment is to increase the classes of actions in which litigants may have the right to appeal and may have the right to have issues of fact determined by a jury. Before the Yukon courts litigants are limited to appealing from final judgments only; there is no right to appeal from interlocutory judgments. Members of the House who are lawyers will realize that is a most unnecessary limitation. The right to appeal in Yukon courts is limited to actions where the amount in controversy is $500 or upwards; where the title to real estate is in question, where the validity of a patent is affected, or the matter in question relates to the taking of an annual rent, a customary or other duty or fee, or a like demand of a public or general nature affecting future rights, or in cases of proceedings for or upon mandamus, prohibition or injunction. Strange to say, cases which most frequently arise there do not come within the list of those in which the right of appeal exists, namely: Actions for the recovery of mining claims, both placer gold claims and quartz claims; actions to establish the title to mining claims and actions to settle boundaries of mining claims. The court has jurisdiction to try actions for divorces and judicial separation, but there is no right of appeal. The same limitations apply to the right to have questions of fact

determined by a jury. In that respect actions over mining claims are omitted in the same way. Those for the recovery of mining claims, or to establish boundaries of mining claims, or to establish titles to mining claims do not carry with them the right to trial by jury; nor have litigants the right to have questions of fact in actions for divorce or judicial separation determined by a jury.

I realize that the bill is late in getting on the order paper. I called the attention of the government last year to the necessity for these amendments, and I was hoping that a government bill would be introduced for the purpose this session. However, that has not yet been done and I trust that the government will see its way clear to providing time for putting this measure through. The matter is not contentious, and will take up very little of the time of the House.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

Hon. C. A. STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved to introduce Bill No. 45, respecting Chinese Immigration.

He said: There are several new features in this bill. One is that we are by statute limiting entrance of Chinese to Canada to members of the diplomatic corps; to children born in Canada but who have left this country for the purpose of being educated; and to merchants and students.

It is rather a difficult matter to define the word "merchants" and we have not made a very definite description of the individual to be known to a merchant who will be admitted to Canada. Undoubtedly there will be a considerable amount of discussion on this particular section when the bill comes up for consideration. The definition of "students" is restricted to students coming to Canada for the purpose of attending any Canadian university or college authorized by statute or charter to confer degrees. While we have had some difficulty in connection with the definition of "merchants," we have defined students very clearly.

These are the two important clauses of the bill. There are many other regulations to be dealt with, but they will come up for consideration in Committee of the Whole and will be dealt with there.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Black.]

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Penitentiaries, $1,670,500.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to some things that have happened during the past year in connection with capital punishment. We have had capital punishment in this country for a long time, and it is possible we shall not abolish it at the present time. We had a case during the last year, in the county in which I live, of a man being executed in such a bungling manner that it was commented on, I think, by all the papers in Canada. I know there is a very strong feeling in my province, and I think in other provinces of Canada, that capital punishment should not be carried out at the county gaols, but that some provision should be made for executing prisoners who are condemned to death in the penitentiaries or at some central place in the province where proper arrangements can be made to carry out the law in that respect. Living in the county in which this bungling occurred last year, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I let this opportunity pass without calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter. I have no doubt that he has received communications on the subject, and I should like to know whether it is the intention of his department to make arrangements to have executions caried out in future at the penitentiaries in Canada.

Mr HANSON: I would like to add a word along the same line as the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton. This matter has been brought very forcibly to the attention of the country by reason of the terrible bungling that took place in an execution in the county of Carleton, New Brunswick. A capital crime of some enormity was committed down there, and the death penalty was imposed upon the accused. I quite appreciate the fact that under the constitution the carrying out of the punishment for that offence is imposed upon the provincial authorities, and that in consequence a constitutional question arises in connection with my hon. friend's suggestion. The sheriffs are appointed by the provincial government, and for the most part they are very fair officials and carry out their duties with a certain degree of exactness; but in the case of capi-

tal punishment almost invariably we find that they refuse to perform their duty. I am not casting any reflections upon the sheriff of Carleton county. He probably did what any other sheriff in the country would have done. He endeavoured to get some other person to perform the task that the law had imposed upon him, and so far as he failed to do it himself, he failed to perform his duty. At the same time, he employed a person who was evidently wholly unqualified with the result ,that the whole community, the whole country, in fact, was shocked at the manner in which the punishment was inflicted in that case. It is not perhaps any business of the Dominion, strictly from a constitutional point of view, but it does occur to me that a convention or arrangement might be made with the provincial authorities whereby the imposition of capital punishment might very well be carried out by officials of the Dominion in the penitentiaries at the various centres. I hope that the Minister of Justice to whom I have already spoken about this matter will give it his very best consideration. The country will not stand for a repetition of what took place in Carleton, New Brunswick, last year.

Mr. MICHAUD: I want to emphasize the remarks made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) in connection with a hanging that took place in New Brunswick last summer. What took place on that occasion was very unfortunate; somebody is to blame, and I hope the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), in the near future, will have the law of our province altered so that a man convicted and sentenced to be hanged will be hanged in the yard of the penitentiary, and not in the yard of the county gaol. Moreover, the sheriff of a county is not a competent man to hang one of his fellowmen. The man who should look after these serious matters ought to be appointed by the government of this country, and he ought to be the only man required to assume this duty.

Mr. CALDWELL: In view of the discussion that has taken place regarding where the blame is to be attached for bungling the execution of a man in Carleton county, I should, perhaps, say another word. Our sheriff spared no effort to get a competent hangman and he secured a man recommended to him by the sheriff of Montreal as being competent. On the day before the execution was to take place, the sheriff received a telegram stating that on account of an accident, this man would be unable to attend. Our sheriff would not hang the man, and I would be very sorry if he had to undertake such a duty. I do not think the sheriff of a county should be compelled to do the hanging for that county. He is an official who must perform his official duties and meet the people of his county in his every day official work.

Mr. BOIVIN: This is part of his official duties.

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes; but we should change it so that it should not be part of his official duties. Later on, he had the sentence postponed, because otherwise, under the Criminal Code, should the execution not have taken place on the day appointed, the man would have got off and could not be hanged afterwards. The sheriff came to Montreal and, for fear of a slip-up the next time, employed two men, each recommended to him as being competent to perform the hanging. He took them both down, and I believe the hanging was carried out in a very efficient manner. The trouble was that the man was cut down before he was entirely dead. An investigation was held and the sheriff was exonerated from all blame in the matter. I think the investigation did not go deep enough; it did not place the blame where possibly it rightly belonged. Several surgeons were present who were testing the man to find out whether he was dead or not; but whether the surgeons pronounced him dead and he was accordingly cut down, was not made clear. As the sheriff would not perform the hanging and had to employ another man, he must pay that man out of his own pocket. This is not fair. I do not think a sheriff is a competent man to hang a person; he is a man selected to do the duty of sheriff of a county in enforcing the law, and unfortunately this is, at the present time, part of his duties. If executions were carried out at provincial penitentiaries, it would be well to have an efficient man to officiate for a province, or, possibly, for two provinces. I would not say as to that. You cannot expect every sheriff in every county to be an efficient hangman. Capital punishment is part of the law that I have never approved myself; but as it is on the statute books, if it is to be carried out, it should be carried out in an exemplary manner without a hitch, and this is not always the case at the present time. I hope the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) will see to it that this is arranged.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN: No one regrets more than I do this painful incident which was referred to; but as has been admitted by all

hon. members who have spoken, the carrying out of capital punishment is a matter in the jurisdiction of the provinces. We are told that it should not be the duty of a sherriff to carry out capital punishment. That may be so; but that is for the province to decide, and it is for the province to see that the sentence is carried out. A proposition is made that the executions should take place in provincial penitentiaries. First of all, there are no provincial penitentiaries. All our penitentiaries are Dominion. It has been suggested that, if possible, one penitentiary, where executions should take place, should be chosen for each part of the country. This is another matter that must be decided first by the provinces, and if the provinces ask us to lend a penitentiary for such executions, this is a matter which we might discuss and agree upon. I am disposed to do anything possible to prevent a repetition of such an incident. I understand that an investigation has taken place to find out where the responsibility for it rests. I have no comment to make as to the decision which was reached; but it is my intention to communicate with the different provinces and to try to find some way to give satisfaction to the people of Canada on this point.

Mr. COPP: Can the Minister of Justice give us a short statement with regard to the item under Dorchester penitentiary: "Land, building and equipment, $80,000"? What does that comprise, and what buildings are being erected. Is it a continuation of the same work, or new work?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This item covers the cost of continuation of construction and provides for the purchase of necessary land. There is a decrease of $3,000 from last year.

Mr. COPP: If it is not the same work, what work is being done?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The item covers:

Completion of hospital	$20,000
Sewage disposal plant	25,000
Officers' row	10,000
Water main and sewers	10,000
Deputy warden's house	10,000
Equipment of new school and hospital	5,000
	$80,000

Mr. COPP: Is that $10,000 for the purchase of a house for the deputy warden?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The construction of a new house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is apparently no building maintenance work in Alberta, but there is an amount for the salary of an accountant. What need is there for an accountant?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The accountant has charge of the reserve, looks after different leases, and collects the rents and the royalties from the coal mines.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the receipts?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We receive on account of royalties about $4,000, $400 for the rent of a farm of two acres, $300 for a piece of agricultural land, and $100 for the rent of a house.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then, for the administration of $4,800 of receipts, it costs $3,000?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. The books were closed a month ago; and as the hon. member may see, there is a decrease in the estimates of $2,000.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In connection with the Saskatchewan estimates, I see that the maintenance of inmates has increased by $5,000, while salaries and retiring allowances have increased $10,500. There seems to be an undue increase in salaries there in relation to the increase of business.

Mr. BOIVIN: "Business" is good.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The increase is made up as follows: To cover statutory increases of officers: 1st quarter, 14 at $60, 2 at $120; 2nd quarter, 17 at $45; 3rd quarter, 8 at $30; 4th quarter, 2 at $15; and to provide for increase of officers who may be permanently appointed before January, 1923, and salaries of extra officers on account of added population received from Kingston.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In connection with the Alberta item, I think the minister might save the country some money if he would secure the services of some local accountant instead of paying the enormous sum of $2,280 for the comparatively small amount of work done.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: He is a local gentleman and is not only custodian of the reserve but accountant as well. I do not think it would be possible to make any further reduction in this expenditure.

Mr. KNOX: After the prisoners were brought to Saskatchewan from Kingston and a number had been transferred from Alberta

it was found that the farm was not large enough to provide work for the convicts. Has any provision been made for further acreage in connection with the Saskatchewan penitentiary?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: An order in council has been passed for the purchase of an additional farm which I have reason to believe will soon be ready for use.

Mr. BANCROFT: I have visited the Manitoba penitentiary at Stony Mountain and thoroughly inspected it, and it is a pleasure to know that there has been a great improvement in the methods pursued at this institution in the last few years. The people are very much gratified at the fact. The minister might explain the increase in the salaries and retiring allowances in this item.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The increase is statutory. The details are: 1st quarter, 15 officers at $60 and 2 at $120; 2nd quarter, 11 at $45, and 1 at $90; 3rd quarter, 7 at $30 and 1 at $60; 4th quarter, 5 at $15. There is also provision for increase of officers who may be permanently appointed before 1st January.

Mr. BANCROFT: It is a fact, then, that the increased improvements in the interests of the prisoners have not entailed any increase in the cost of administration.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It has not.

Mr. LEWIS: The item of maintenance in Saskatchewan shows an increase of $5,000, while in three other items in connection with other penitentiaries there has been a decrease. Has there been an increase in the number of inmates in the Saskatchewan institution and a corresponding decrease in the other penitentiaries? Or has the standard of living been lowered in the other three and not in Saskatchewan?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The other penitentiaries remain about the same. We removed from Kingston to Saskatchewan about 75 inmates.

Mr. BROWN: When a prisoner is discharged from a penitentiary in midwinter, say, is he provided with suitable clothing or anything to keep him going until he gets work?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: When convicts are discharged they are furnished with one suit of clothes, one cap, one suit of underclothes, one shirt, one pair of shoes, one pair of socks, one tie, one pair of braces, one handkerchief, one overcoat between October 1 and May 1, and one pair of gloves. They are also paid railway fare to the place of sentence or an equal distance, and given some money besides to cover their expenses en route. The average cost of equipment, tickets, etc., is $60. During the month of December last 140 inmates were discharged from the penitentiaries, other than Manitoba, from whom no report has yet been received.

Mr. BANCROFT: The warden of the Manitoba penitentiary told me that he is working in co-operation with different organizations all through the province, and that no inmate leaves the institution until a job has been found for him. In the past year 50 inmates have been discharged of whom only three were re-arrested.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is right.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is that general scheme being carried out at all the penitentiaries?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. WHITE: What is the number of convicts confined in each of the penitentiaries, and what are the figures for the last two years?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: On 1st April, 1921, there were in custody 2,150 inmates; on 1st April, 1922, 2,640.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does the minister account for this alarming increase of convicts in these times?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I can give no reason for the increase.

Mr. FORKE: Might I suggest that the increase is due to the change of government!

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not think so.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I understand that criminologists and social service workers generally recommend a classification of corrigible and incorrigible convicts. Has the Department of Justice under consideration the adoption of such a classification, so that those convicted of first offences may be given a better opportunity to reform?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have such a proposal under consideration.

Mr. McBRIDE: In the case of Saskatchewan, does not the minister think that prohibition is responsible for the increase of the number of convicts?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I could not answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. CALDWELL: I presume that a prisoner at the present time gets no share of the proceeds of his labour during the time of his incarceration?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have always thought that it would be a wise provision, especially in the case of married convicts with dependents, that a portion of their earnings should be set aside for the maintenance of their families. When a man is convicted and imprisoned we often find that his family immediately become a public charge. It is possible that the responsibility falls on the right shoulders now, but I have always thought that a prisoner should be entitled to some share of the proceeds of his labour. When a convict is discharged he is very apt to drift back into criminal ways if he is totally without funds, for he is very much handicapped in getting a job on account of being branded as a gaolbird. I think this might very well engage the attention of the department.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: A similar recommendation is before me and I am inclined to favour its adoption.

Mr. SEXSMITH: In connection with the increase in the salary and retiring allowances of the Kingston penitentiary staff, how is the increase accounted for?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is mainly the statutory increase.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Have all our penitentiaries farms? And, if so, what percentage of the inmates find outside employment on them?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Every penitentiary has its farm, and we also work quarries. The proportion of the inmates employed in farming depends, of course, on the size of the farm. As an example I might give the results of last year's farm operations in connection with the Saskatchewan Penitentiary: Oats, 14,000 bushels; barley, 2,000 bushels; wheat, 589 bushels; peas and oats, 201 bushels; hay, 106 loads; hay, cultivated, 175 loads; green feed, 8 loads; cabbages 4,000 heads; potatoes, 7,000 bushels; turnips, 1,000 bushels; carrots, 800 bushels; carrots, white, 70 bushels; beets, 650 bushels; parsnips, 200 bushels; mangolds, 70 bushels; corn, 60 bushels. Green vegetables such as radish, lettuce and onions, were furnished during the entire summer to the prison steward, and he was also supplied with all the pork used during the year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Are the proceeds of these farms used in the maintenance of the institution?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: For the maintenance of the institution. They are treated as revenue.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understand that modern criminologists are agreed that most crimes are committed either because of certain mental deficiencies, largely inherited, or because of unfavourable social surroundings. It would seem to me, in view of this heavy expenditure if for no other reason, that it would be well worth while to set apart sufficient funds for the study of these cases and the setting at work of forces which would prevent such an increasing amount of crime. Is anything being done along this line.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, every inmate is under the care of the warden, the chaplain, the surgeon and the alienist of the penitentiary.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I notice that the superintendent of penitentiaries in his report says:

> With sufficient government work to keep the inmates continually employed the burden of supporting the penitentiaries would be removed and wages could be paid to inmates as well, thus enabling those with dependents to send money thus earned to needy ones at home while the head or wage-earner of the family is incarcerated.

Is suitable work of this kind contemplated in order that those incarcerated shall be able to support their families and develop their characters?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. The hon. member will find in the report that we have increased the revenue from $50,000 to $150,000. As to giving work to the inmates, that recommendation is before me, as I have already stated in answer to another hon. member.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In regard to the increase of prisoners during the year, what proportion were British-born and what proportion were foreign-born?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: At page 7 of the report the hon. member will find the answer to his question:

Nationality (Place of Birth)

British—	
Canada	1,605
England and Wales	182
Ireland	36
Scotland	59
Other British countries	29
	1,911
Foreign—	
United States	246
Austria-Hungary	109
Russia	108
Italy	89
Roumania	28
China	20
France	9
Norway and Sweden	14
Other foreign countries	106
	729

Mr. KNOX: I see there is a large increase in the British Columbia item. We have had an explanation as to the increase for Saskatchewan, but when the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) put the question a moment ago it occurred to me that he might have put it the other way and that an explanation might well come respecting the increase for British Columbia. I would like to know whether the income from the work done on the farms and in the shops of the penitentiaries is credited to this item, and whether the amount voted is the requirement for upkeep over and above the receipts from that work.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The increase is to cover the construction of a boundary wall already commenced, and of a new kitchen and hospital. It is also required to purchase material. It does not cover the cost in connection with work done by the inmates.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): What provision is made for the education of convicts who are illiterate?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have qualified teachers in every penitentiary who are charged with that task.

Mr. SALES: I do not think the minister has completely answered the question of the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox). Does the income derived from what is produced on the farms go into the consolidated revenue fund?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It goes into the consolidated revenue, and what they use in that work is charged to maintenance.

Mr. SALES: So that it really costs more than the amount here stated to keep the farm going?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: (Humboldt): I know that the inmates of the penitentiaries do certain work for the Post Office department in the way of making and repairing mail bags. For how many departments of government is that kind of work done, and what cost is charged against such work?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Work of that kind is done in three institutions, Stony Mountain, Kingston and Dorchester. The Postmaster General provides the material and we charge 50 cents a day for each convict engaged in the work. That is the contract.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is work of that kind done for any department other than the Post Office Department.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Very little. We do some little work for the Interior department.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): It might be well to consider the desirability of having uniforms, for example, such as are used in any of the departments, made in the tailor shops of our penitentiaries.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is a recommendation that is before me. I am inclined to be in favour of it.

Mr. MILLAR: I notice that for the year 1921-22 the estimate for lands, buildings and equipment, British Columbia, was $10,000; in 1922-23 it was $20,000, and for 1923-24 it is $28,000. There seems to be quite a substantial increase.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Two years ago nothing was done but some small repair work. Last year the construction of the boundary wall was commenced; this year that
4 p.m. work will be finished and a new kitchen and hospital will be built.

Mr. SHAW: Are convicts in every province entitled by law to the benefit of remission of sentence in lieu of good conduct? If not, what provinces have not yet taken advantage of that provision?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Every inmate is entitled to such remission. It is a Dominion law, applying to all penitentiaries.

Mr. SHAW: It applies also in some provinces to convicts in provincial gaols. I would like to know if all the provinces have taken advantage of that provision.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have nothing to do with provincial gaols. I could not give an answer to that question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Serious charges are made in the report of the Superintendent of Penitentiaries with regard to the conditions in local gaols. He states:

> Many of the inmates coming to the institutions are found to be in a most unsatisfactory condition. Numbers of them suffer from various diseases and vermin. Although they are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, they are in many respects worse treated while awaiting trial than after their removal to the penitentiary.

Is anything being done by the Department of Justice to see that men charged with crime are protected from bad surroundings in the local gaols?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That note is put there especially to direct the attention of the provinces to the matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It also says, "A word to the wise is sufficient,"—or its equivalent. But is it "sufficient" that a note should be made of the matter in this report? It seems to me that if there is a Justice department in Canada it is the duty of that department to see that people charged with a crime should be protected while they are awaiting trial.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If the present means are inadequate we will have to have recourse to other measures; we must make progress.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): What reading matter is supplied to the inmates of the penitentiary, and what was the amount expended last year for this purpose? I would further ask, whether the regulations permit the use of tobacco by penitentiary inmates, and whether they are supplied with tobacco.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There was a very large increase in the number of books supplied to the penitentiaries last year. The reading matter is selected by the warden, the chaplain and the school teacher. Magazines to the value of $1,400 were given the inmates. They are entitled to tobacco and are supplied with it weekly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the reading matter supplied include daily newspapers?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is good.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like, by way of a little bit of healthy contrast, to call the attention of the minister to the hundreds of thousands of poor, honest and decent people in Canada who have to buy their own magazines and their own tobacco, and have to get along with very little help from the people who are so immensely anxious for the welfare of those who have struck sometimes at the very roots of society and are undergoing a just punishment. I think it is just as well, once in a while, to realize that it is the poor, decent, honest toiler—who sometimes has to live under a leaky roof and sit down to a table not very well furnished—who has to bear his share of keeping up these luxuries because our country, like others, is cursed with too great a sense of uplift. We are getting just a little too finicky in these matters. There is too much of a tendency at the present day on the part of some people to say "Oh, poor fellow, you got into gaol. It is true you only slashed your wife's throat; you tried to kill her, but did not succeed. Let us send some women to read to you and give you magazines. There will be some nice literature for you and plenty of tobacco, and we will try to get your sentence shortened. We hope now that you will be a good fellow." That is all very nice, it is a first-rate thing, but just let us stop once in a while, as men who have some common sense, and think of the poor, decent, honest toilers who are keeping this thing up.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to express appreciation for the kind advice we have received from the hon. member who has just sat down. I want to say, however, for the information of that hon. gentleman that to my knowledge the people who help the poor, as a rule, are the poor themselves.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister give us some information as to whether the inmates of these institutions are temperate or intemperate in their habits?

Mr. CALDWELL: They do not have bars in the penitentiaries.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: According to the record there are 151 abstainers, while 1,401 are classed as temperate and 588 as intemperate.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has any record been kept in order to ascertain whether the present treatment of the inmates of the penitentiaries of Canada is having a good effect?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no special record kept but the "repeaters," who numbered about 20 per cent ten or twelve years ago, have fallen to less than 4 per cent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the cost of the maintenance of each prisoner in the penitentiary?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Two years ago the cost was $2 a day. Last year it amounted to $1.55. That covers the entire expenditure, including the cost of land, building, heat, lighting and so forth.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, $2,587,999.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not quite sure whether the observations I have to make come properly under this item but I presume they do. I desire to bring to the attention of the minister the question of the inadequacy of the pensions awarded to the veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, who were retired prior to the advances in pay which have taken place in recent years. In former years the mounted police received a very low rate of pay. When they were discharged

they were given only a small pension and this amount, in view of the increased cost of living nowadays is altogether inadequate. On previous occasions I brought this matter to the attention of the predecessors of the present minister.

Then there is another grievance—shall I say? —that the old veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police have, and that is in connection with the veterans who served in the Riel Rebellion. All those of other branches, outside of the Mounted Police, who served in that rebellion received a land grant or scrip, but the officers and men I have referred to were not given any such recognition. This grievance has been brought to the attention of various governments and in calling attention to it now I do not do so in any spirit of criticism. I want the minister to recognize the fact that I am bringing it forward because I consider it to be a just claim. There are not, perhaps, very many of the survivors of that force left, most of them are pretty well advanced in years, but during all the intervening time they have made this claim and, in nearly every case, I think, have appealed to deaf ears. I think that we could well afford to do justice to these old veterans of this splendid police force. I am well aware that there are those in the country to-day who have some criticisms to offer of this force, but with that sentiment I have no sympathy whatever. But in order to meet their possible objection let me remind the committee that in relation to those in whose behalf I am pleading with the minister this afternoon there can be no such sentiment held. They were the pioneers in this great service, the men who, as practically every hon. gentleman from the prairie provinces knows, rode the plains and maintained law and order. In many cases they were government, judiciary, police force, and general help for the settlers all through the West, and in my experience of some thirty years passing backwards and forwards over the prairies, and living also in the extreme West, I have witnessed the extraordinary influence that these men gained over all classes of the community. Their deeds read like a romance; we all know that, and it is unecessary for me to bring forward any proof of it. I think, however, that the government of Canada should do justice to the remnants of this force, to those veterans who in their old age still feel that they were very unjustly treated.

Let me just bring forward one further argument; I do not wish to labour the point. One of the reasons, it is alleged—and I have looked over the record pretty carefully, and while I would not choose to pass a very decided opinion, I am inclined to sympathize wholly with them—one of the reasons alleged why they did not receive this scrip was because there was a little jealousy between the military commanders and the police force. There were strained relations to some extent, and the result was that while the police did perhaps some of the most difficult work in connection with that rebellion they received no recognition in the way of scrip, whereas all other branches of the service did. Years afterwards, it is true, a meagre attempt was made to do justice to them by striking a medal, which they all value very highly, but which certainly did not give them justice. I wish to ask the minister if he will again take their claims into consideration. I believe it is a just claim and one that ought to be granted. I just leave the matter in that way, and ask for his consideration.

Before sitting down I wish to refer to a kindred subject, and that is the meagre pension which is being paid to the widows of those who were in the service for many years. I have in my hand at the moment the case of the widow of a former superintendent, Mrs. Joseph Howe. Her husband was in the force for twenty-three years. He died in 1902. He went through the Riel rebellion and the South African war, and gave magnificent service all through his career in the force. His widow to-day is receiving a pension of $29.16 a month, and that is the widow of a man who attained the rank of superintendent while in the service. It is true that a very slight increase was made to this, perhaps, because of some action that was taken about a year ago. But I am not basing my claim on this one case, I simply mention this as a typical case. There are widows, not a large number, it is true, who are receiving this meagre pension, which is based upon the very low rate of pay received by the force in those early days. I think the government could very well consider the claims of these persons for an increase in their pensions. The only argument against this claim that is worthy of any consideration at all is that if parliament were to raise the pension in conection with the Northwest Mounted Police force, we would have to raise the pension of all civil servants who are retired. In reply, I would submit to the minister that most of the civil servants who have been retired were retired under a very much higher rate of pay than the Northwest Mounted Police force. What I said two years ago, and also three years ago, when I spoke on this subject was that we should bring up the pensions of the

veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and of their dependents who are drawing pensions, to some minimum standard at least, a minimum that would be in advance of what they are getting to-day and in some degree commensurate with the conditions that obtain now as compared with the conditions that obtained at that time. I bring the matter forward at this time for the attention of the minister, and hope that he will give it not only consideration, but, also that action for which he is known. I heard one of his friends describe him the other day as a man of few words but prompt action, and I believe that that virtue might very well be applied in these instances at this time.

Mr. KNOX: Before the minister replies, I should like to endorse everything that has been said by my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). This matter has been before the House on several occasions. I know I have spoken on it once or twice. I happen to know some of the old veterans in my own constituency, and I know that the conditions prevailing there are such that they certainly require a little looking into. I understand that the number of these veterans in the Dominion at the present time is very small. These men gave the best part of their lives in the interests of opening up western Canada, and I think anyone who reads the history of the Northwest Mounted Police will admit that their record is hard to beat in any country. Some way, I think, could be found of getting around the difficulty mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, that the pensions of these men might be increased so as to make the evening of their lives a little more comfortable than it appears to be for some of them at present. It is not necessary for me to go into any details as my hon. friend has dealt with the matter fully, but I heartily endorse everything he has said and I trust that the minister will give the matter his very careful consideration.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As the hon. member has said, this is a pretty difficult question. It has been brought to the attention of all the governments we have had for the last twenty years. A few days ago the commissioner in charge of our Mounted Police brought me a memorandum on this very question. There were two propositions: One was to increase the pensions paid to the officers and to their widows by fifty per cent, and the other to pay them a pension based on the pay of to-day. This matter I have now under consideration. I intend to study the record, and if I find that there is an injustice, and that it is possible to remedy it, and if the House is of the opinion that something should be done for the officers and their widows I shall be happy to do it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Might I call the ministers' attention to the fact that I have on the order paper a resolution looking towards the re-organization of the Mounted Police. On several occasions, at the request of the Minister of Justice, I have allowed that resolution to stand. It would seem to be rather unfortunate that these estimates should be brought up before there was a general discussion of the whole question. I simply submit the matter to the Minister of Justice.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I asked the hon. member on one occasion to adjourn consideration of his resolution. After I informed him that I was ready, I was expecting that he would proceed with it. I do not see how we could suspend consideration of this item and wait for the consideration of his resolution. The hon. member might very well bring this matter now to the attention of the committee and make any propositions which he may have.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the House is in a better position to consider a serious matter such as reorganization of this force when it is prepared for a resolution and knows that one is going to be brought forward. I wish to support the contention of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) that we might, perhaps, with the permission of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), turn to one of the other many items in the Estimates and deal with it. I cannot see the necessity for rushing this item through at this time.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not see why we should suspend consideration of this item. The hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth), when his resolution is called, will bring forward his arguments; and if the House were to decide that we should adopt the views that he brings forward and make the amendment that he proposes, we would have to legislate to that effect. The passing of this item to-day would not change matters as regards such an amendment. We need this money for the current year if we continue this system. If we change it by legislation, we shall make the necessary change in the expenditure.

Mr. HOEY: The minister is doubtless aware that several bank robberies occurred last year in the southern districts of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, bank robberies that led to tremendous losses on the part of men holding

victory bonds. These bonds have been lost, and the holders have not been compensated, I understand, either by the banks or by any other agency. Has the Dominion government any policy as regards the better protection of those districts? That is to say, does the Dominion government act only when requested to do so by the districts concerned? If so, by which government is the expense borne? This is a vital question, because many of these robberies have been perpetrated by men coming from south of the international boundary. Will the minister express an opinion regarding this matter?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As the hon. member knows, the maintenance of peace and the protection of property are under the control of the provinces. Whenever we have been asked to assist in such protection, our men have gone and have done the best they could They propose to do the same in the future.

Mr. HOEY: In that case is the expense borne by the Dominion government?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Ordinary expense is paid by the police and extraordinary expenditure is paid by the province.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Under the heading of "Pay of Force" the sum of $1,381,532 is given as the estimate for 1922-23. Will the minister explain why this amount is not the same as the amount given in last year's estimate under the same heading?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is a reduction of $186,028.50.. In 1921-22, we had in the force 1,726 men; in 1922-23, 1,423; in 1923-24, 1,150; or a decrease of 576 men since 1921-22.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The question I asked was, how it is that in last year's estimates you asked for an appropriation of $1,456,532, and in this year's estimates, you put the amount of $1,381,532 as being the amount of the estimate of last year. I cannot make those figures jibe.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The estimate of last year was $1,381,532.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I have before me the estimate of last year as asked for, and the amount is given as $1,456,532.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That amount was reduced during the session, because we decided to reduce the number of men, and we did so.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The question which the Minister of Justice has just answered covers the first part of what I was going to ask him. Is this reduction in the estimate consequent upon the provincial police undertaking part of the duties formerly performed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have closed certain posts, and we have decreased the number of men in Ottawa and in other places.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I appreciate that, but my question was whether the minister was able to make the reduction because provincial and other police were undertaking part of the duties formerly performed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, we do the work with fewer men.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would the minister kindly give the details for the $100,000 item, the last item?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This item, which appears as an increase in the summary of the estimates, cannot truly be classed as such in the accepted sense of an increase. Heretofore, expenses incurred by the force in the enforcement of federal statutes has been repaid to this department by the department concerned. To meet this unforeseen expense, provision had naturally to be made in our estimates; but as it is the intention hereafter to perform these duties without charge to the departments concerned, the money hereby requested for this purpose has been deducted from the sub-heads under which they were formerly voted, such as railway transportation, travelling expenses, hire of conveyances, contingencies, and therefore appear in this estimate as one complete item. In other words, these amounts were taken from their sundry sub-heads and placed, as a whole, under the column of "Decreases". On the item "Maintenance", the estimate of last year was $815,945, whereas this year we ask for only $673,301.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I presume that this item would include charges for legal services in connection with prosecutions?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understand that a legal gentleman, Mr. Donald Downie, of Vancouver, who of course is a very strong Liberal supporter, has lately been appointed legal adviser to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police there. He attends police court prosecutions in that city although there is a city prosecutor who conducts all cases. Mr. Downie does not take any part in the prosecutions at all, but sends in his bill to the department for attendance in all these cases, and is paid. I understand further that when a case is taken to a

higher court, whether for speedy trial or otherwise, this same gentleman attends on behalf of the department, although there is a crown prosecutor who is paid by the provincial government to conduct these cases. Mr. Downie does not take part in these trials either; nevertheless he sends in his bill to the department and is paid. I have heard some objection raised to that practice, and it has been suggested that some economy might be effected in this connection. It is contended that there is no necessity for having a representative of the department appear in the police court or any other court when there are officers of the city and of the province present to prosecute. My information may not be correct but I believe it is, and if there is any explanation the committee should have it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If there is no necessity for our employing Mr. Downie, I am of course disposed to dispense with his services. In any event, however, Mr. Downie could not be employed by the Department of Justice if he acted for the Health department in these cases mentioned by my hon. friend. I will see my colleague about the matter.

Mr. McQUARRIE: He acts on behalf of the Mounted Police.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, the Health department.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understand also that Mr. Downie was appointed contrary to the recommendation of the Vancouver Liberal Committee.

Mr. DUFF: Too bad!

Mr. McQUARRIE: And there is some objection to that, too. The minister might inquire into the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. The minister has stated that this matter does not come under his department but under the Department of Health, which has nothing to do with this item.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister said he would look into the matter and I only thought he might wish to make his inquiry complete.

Mr. SHAW: How many men are engaged in guarding the parliamentary and other government buildings in Ottawa?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: About 118.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do I understand that the increase of $100,000 in this item is offset by a reduction in some other item?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes; it is not properly speaking an increase. We were charging different departments with expenditures made by them, and provision is made for that in an item "Maintenance" under which $800,000 was voted last year. This year we are asking for $600,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What was the amount of refund from each of the departments of government to the Department of Royal Canadian Mounted Police last year?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amount refunded last year was $93,779.50, contributed to by the Departments of Agriculture, Customs and Excise, Finance, Health, Immigration, Indian Affairs, Interior, Justice, Marine and Fisheries, Militia and Defence, Mines, Post Office, Secretary of State, Soldier Settlement Board, Commissioner of Taxation, Air Board, Trade and Commerce and Public Works.

Mr. GARLAND: What was the amount of each department?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amounts are:

Agriculture	$15,701 96
Customs and Excise	16,515 56
Finance	8,353 98
Health	17,243 93
Immigration and Colonization	279 09
Indian Affairs	12,066 17
Interior	5,620 59
Justice	1,200 00
Marine and Fisheries	1,526 67
Militia and Defence	91 80
Mines	1,098 11
Post Office	3,000 00
Secretary of State	7,733 83
Pensions	142 98
Soldier Settlement Board	217 65
Commissioner of Taxation	2,809 88
Air Board	53 55
Trade and Commerce	117 75
Public Works	6 00

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the item under Secretary of State include naturalization of aliens? I understand that a considerable amount of work is done in that connection.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And the amount is only $7,000 odd.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is for the extra work done by the Mounted Police for the Department of Secretary of State in connection with naturalization.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many outside investigators are employed by the Secretary of State's department and other departments?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The whole work is done by the Mounted Police. This is an extra charge made to the Department of Secretary of State. In the report will be found

the number of investigations made in connection with naturalization.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What are the precise duties of Major Hamilton?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: To make a weekly summary of reports from our officers for the use of the commissioner, and to conduct correspondence with police departments all over the world.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On whose initiative are investigations undertaken?—that of the Minister of Justice?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: All investigations are made at the request of the various departments. The Minister of Justice has never asked for any investigation.

Mr. SPENCER: Do the naturalization fees cover the cost of naturalization?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That would be for my colleague the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) to answer.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the size of the police force maintained in our larger cities, such as Montreal, Toronto, Fort William?

An hon. MEMBER: And Hull?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, by all means let us have Hull.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have no man in Hull. In the provinces of Quebec the total is 41; Ontario, 288; Manitoba, 71; Saskatchewan, 274; Alberta, 173; British Columbia, 175; Yukon Territory, 51; Northwest Territories, 27.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It takes only 27 men to police the Northwest Territories, as against over ten times that number to police Toronto with the help of the provincial force.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The O.T.A.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have only 16 men in Toronto. In Ottawa we have 118 men engaged in the protection of our public buildings, and about 40 instructors. All the men are available for outside duty.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many are stationed in Fort William, and what are their duties?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have 28 men there. They are engaged on general investigation work, and are useful as a reserve for service in any part of western Canada.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: According to the newspapers the Quebec government is preparing to enforce the Narcotic Drugs Act. Are the Dominion police co-operating with the provincial and municipal police in this connection?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We co-operate as much as we can with the provincial and municipal police; but this is a federal statute, the enforcement of which is in our hands.

Mr. LUCAS: Where are the Alberta men stationed?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: At Edmonton, 22; Peace River, 7; Grouard, 2; Jasper, 1; Athabaska, 2. In southern Alberta: Lethbridge, 50; Banff, 10; Calgary, 12; Canmore, 2; Coutts, 3. There are also men stationed at various other places such as Drumheller, Fernie, Field, Kingsgate, Medicine Hat, Michel, Pincher Creek, and so on.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the revision of the Dominion Statutes, $20,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When will this revision be available?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We shall try to have it for 1926. We had one in 1886 and one in 1906; that is to say, one every twenty years.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses of litigated matters, Department of Justice, $33,000.

Mr. LUCAS: What is that item for?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is to cover the expense of litigation conducted by the Dominion, not provided for elsewhere. The amount varies greatly from year to year and cannot be accurately foreseen. The expenditure for 1920 was $7,655; for 1920-21, $13,000; for 1921-22, $37,514. The usual vote is $13,000. The additional sum of $20,000 is asked for this year in order to provide for the expenses of the reference to the Privy Council of the Newfoundland boundary question, a case which is now pending.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses under Pecuniary Claims Convention with U.S.A., $10,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister kindly explain?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Pecuniary Claims Convention between Great Britain and the United States, providing for the settlement by arbitration of pecuniary claims outstanding between the two countries, was signed at Washington on the 18th of August, 1910. The first schedule of claims was prepared and several cases were argued before the tribunal in 1914, and awards were made.

A second schedule was in course of preparation when the war interrupted the proceedings. The United States national arbitrator is Mr. Chandler Anderson; the Canadian arbitrator, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick; the umpire is Mr. Fromageot, of Paris. The Canadian government is responsible for the payment of half the expenses and remuneration of the two arbitrators and the umpire at $40 per diem during the sittings of the tribunal. As negotiations are pending between Great Britain and the United States for the preparation of the second schedule of claims, and resumption of the activities of the convention may occur during the year, it becomes necessary to provide for working expenses.

Mr. STEVENS: What was spent last year?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amount was $347.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the administration of the Bankruptcy Act, $4,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Considering the enormous increase in bankruptcies, I would like the minister to explain the reason for the decrease in this item.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amount covers the cost of sending the statutes and the Canada Gazette to trustees and the registrars of the different provinces. The number of failures has no bearing on the matter.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Justice—salaries and contingencies, including $2,000 for Solicitor General's Office, $243,270.

Mr. STEVENS: May I direct the attention of the minister to the statement made the other day by the Finance Min-
5 p.m. ister (Mr. Fielding), which we took as a promise, namely, that he would extend to the committee the courtesy of providing details of civil government items in the form of preceding years?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that copies of these details have been put in the boxes of the members.

Mr. STEVENS: They certainly were not there at three o'clock; they may have been put there since. However, this item is very small, and I have no objection to its going through.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Trade and Commerce—bounties on crude petroleum, administration of the act, $3,000.

Mr. JELLIFF: I would like to call attention to what I regard as a very grave injustice in the administration and distribution of bounties. There are three provinces in which we have productive oil wells, Ontario, New Brunswick and Alberta. In Alberta we have five producing oil wells, and there are nine more being drilled at the very extreme southern end of the province, with great prospects of success. New Brunswick has seven yielding oil wells, and Ontario had 3,015 in 1921. Now, let me draw attention to the fact that in the distribution of bounties Ontario received $90,751 in 1921, whilst New Brunswick received $3,926. On the other hand our men, who are operating under especially difficult conditions and are endeavouring to develop the oil resources in the Alberta fields, are receiving absolutely nothing. They have brought this matter to the attention of the department on several occasions in recent years but have received no consideration and no allowance. It seems that under the law a standard is fixed of specific gravity, and if there is any variation from that standard the producer gets no share in this bounty. This seems to me to be directly contrary to what our policy should be. The drilling of these oil wells and the production of oil is one of the most important enterprises devolving upon this country at the present time. Last year, for example, we imported over 366,000,000 gallons of crude oil whereas Canada itself produced only between five and six million gallons of oil. The needs of Canada for oil are very great. The country which produces and has an abundance of its own oil in future years is certainly going to take the lead in our civilization. This is a matter which we must not neglect and therefore these bounties should be granted in equal and equitable manner to all the provinces in which efforts are being made to develop this great resource. For the present I shall be satisfied with bringing the matter to the attention of the minister, and urging him to look into it and see that the bounty for the production of oil reaches the Alberta producers to the extent which they merit. When the budget is presented I shall deal with the question at greater length.

Hon. Mr. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No later than yesterday my hon. friend brought to my notice some changes which he thought would encourage the development of oil wells in western Canada. These will be taken into consideration by the government and a statement in that regard made when the budget is presented.

Respecting the matter of the bounty paid in different provinces the reason for that is this. The bounty is based upon the specific gravity

of the oil produced, and those districts where the oil is not of such a standard as to entitle them to receive the bounty, are protected under the tariff. We will take my hon. friend's observations under consideration.

Mr. JELLIFF: I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the crude oils we are producing in Alberta, regardless of the slight difference there might be in specific gravity as compared with other native oils, are available for all our uses in this country. We have our own refinery at Okotoks, and we are getting there the very best grade of gasoline, kerosene and all the various petroleum products. Under the circumstances I do not think we ought to be discriminated against in the manner which now obtains.

Mr. ROBB: The reason which I have assigned explains why no bounty is given. However, we will look into the matter.

Mr. COOTE: I would urge upon the minister the advisability of changing the specific gravity tests under which the bounty is paid. In Alberta the oil wells are drilled under very great difficulties. They are a long distance from the plants where the machinery and well casing are made, and the expense of putting down some of those wells runs into many thousands of dollars. I am sorry I have not the figures here. The wells are also very deep, in many cases reaching over three thousand feet. I think these facts should be taken into consideration when comparing the Alberta wells with the Ontario wells. I am told that the Ontario wells are comparatively shallow and that the drilling apparatus needed for them is very much cheaper. In Alberta a lot of men have had to give up drilling operations because of the great expense involved. I think the minister should take into consideration these facts, and either change the specific gravity test so that the Alberta oil wells may get the benefit of the bounty, or else do away with the bounty. I was told by an oil operator that some of these oil wells miss coming under the provisions of the bounty by only a very slight percentage in the specific gravity test, and it seems to me very unfair that the Alberta oil men should be deprived of this assistance bearing in mind the very great disadvantages they are labouring under. In my opinion this is a case where the law needs revising, and if the government wishes to encourage the oil industry in Alberta it should make the change which we are suggesting.

Mr. McQUARRIE: While I am in favour of the bonuses provided for under this item, I think the government might spend some money in another direction, more particularly in endeavouring to curb the operations of bogus oil companies which are selling, or endeavouring to sell, stocks to the people of this country. I know that out in our province we have a great many companies which are reporting in the newspapers from time to time that they are just about to strike oil. However, they have never struck any, yet they keep on taking money out of the pockets of the people. Now I know that there are hon. members who think that the people should be relieved of their money in some way—either by horse-racing, or by stocks, or otherwise—but I think this kind of thing is doing a great deal of harm, and the government should take steps to see that the public are not defrauded in the bare-faced, cold-blooded manner that a great many of these oil companies are guilty of.

Mr. ROBB: I quite agree with some of the observations of my hon. friend, that there is a need for controlling the sale not only of oil stocks but of other wildcat schemes.

Regarding the observations of my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote), the Department of Trade and Commerce has only the administration of the act, which was passed in 1904; but I can see from what my hon. friend has said that there is reason for looking into the matter. Possibly some revision of the act is required, and we shall give that very careful consideration.

Item agreed to.

Canada Grain Act, administration of, $1,478,839.

Mr. HOEY: Is there any itemized statement with regard to this?

Mr. ROBB: The item is presented in the usual form, but if there is any information my hon. friend desires I shall be glad to answer any questions. The Grain Commission publishes an annual report. The 1922 report was presented some time ago, and the most recent report is now in the printer's hands.

Mr. SHAW: What happened to the appeal case which was going to be taken up before the Supreme Court of Canada in connection with the validity of the Canada Grain Act?

Mr. ROBB: It is still in the courts.

Mr. SHAW: Has it been taken up before the Supreme Court yet?

Mr. ROBB: It has gone to the Supreme Court, but it has not yet been called.

Mr. SHAW: My recollection is that the House was informed last session that an effort would be made to bring on the case at the earliest possible date. Two sessions of the Supreme Court have been held since that time.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for the increase in this item?

Mr. ROBB: It is partly due to the statutory increases in the salaries. There is also the fact that our experience in other years is that we have not always voted the amount required in the Main Estimates and had to ask for a further amount in the Supplementaries. We expect this amount will cover all the requirements this year. This estimate was prepared by the Board of Grain Commissioners and sent down to the department some time ago. It is their estimate of the amount that will be required to administer the act this year.

Mr. HOEY: With reference to the case in the courts referred to by my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), are there any firms to-day contributing to the government with regard to overages?

Mr. ROBB: All but one firm in Canada have paid.

Mr. HOEY: In full?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, but one firm contends that it is illegal.

Mr. SHAW: Can the minister answer my question as to the reason for delay in bringing on that case before the Supreme Court?

Mr. ROBB: That, of course, is in the hands of the Justice department and I really could not give my hon. friend the reason. I remember the circumstances he refers to and it was stated that we would try and rush the case through, but after the wheat board legislation was put through the necessity for hurrying that case along was not as great and that is perhaps the reason for the delay. On February 16 the Justice department reported that the case was practically ready for trial and it was hoped to have it disposed of some time in the month of March.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to draw the attention of the minister to one phase of the grain trade in western Canada which is very much to the front in all discussions which are taking place there regarding the administration of the act, and that is with reference to dockage. I think possibly in our province at all events we had more dockage than usual this year because we had an unusually good crop of weeds. I want to bring to the minister's attention the treatment I personally received in regard to dockage of wheat, because it is typical of many cases that have happened this year. I shipped two cars of wheat to Vancouver in September and the dockage on both these cars was four per cent. I thought the dockage was excessive, and I wrote to the company who handled this grain and asked them to secure from the inspectors a statement showing how the dockage was made up. I was informed in reply that the first car was a little better than two per cent cracked wheat and approximately two per cent seeds, the cracked wheat weighing up a little heavier than the seeds. The inspector's sample of the second car showed more seeds than the sample of the first car. The proportion worked out a little less than three per cent seeds as against a little over one per cent of cracked wheat. According to the statement which was sent me of the proceeds upon this car, we were paid the large sum of one dollar per ton for these screenings. This wheat was shipped to Vancouver and cleaned there, and I am told there is no better market for chicken feed in Canada than Vancouver. Cracked wheat ought to be good for chicken feed, yet this dockage was sold for only one dollar per ton. I made a complaint about this, and we afterwards received a money order for $8.50 covering these screenings at the rate of $4 per ton. On the other car, which I mentioned first, where there was something over two per cent of cracked wheat we have not received anything over the one dollar per ton. I certainly think this is a matter demanding very thorough investigation by the department. I am not very well informed as to how this dockage is handled, but I have been told that in some of the government elevators there are two bins into which the dockage is put. In the one bin the dockage belongs to the government, that is, dockage under a certain percentage, which goes to the government elevator to pay for the cleaning. Where the dockage is over that percentage, it goes to the shipper of the grain and he is paid for that dockage according to the price at which it is sold. This goes into a separate bin. If that is the case, it rests with the management of the elevator where these screenings shall be put. I know that the charge is sometimes made that the management of the elevator will take screenings which may belong to some car where the dockage is over the percentage which would entitle them to take the screenings for cleaning charges, and this dockage may consist largely of cracked wheat and wild oats, and put that dockage into their own bin, and switch dockage from some other car which has weed seeds of no value, into the other bin. Possibly the minister would give

us some information regarding that. I should also like his promise that he will have a thorough investigation made as to the working of the elevator in Vancouver to see why so many shippers are being paid only one dollar per ton for good screenings.

As regards this question of dockage, I have had resolutions from three different farmers' associations in my constituency asking that it be made compulsory for country elevators to install proper cleaning facilities, so that all the wheat might be cleaned at the country elevator, and the dockage kept there and returned to the farmer. I know there are some objections to that; but I should like the minister to promise us that he will have the Board of Grain Commissioners make a very thorough investigation into this question of dockage and report to the House, at least by next year, whether that would be a good procedure. I saw in the Calgary Herald some time ago that it was estimated that the farmers of western Canada would pay freight, on screenings on 1922 crop, amounting to $5,000,000. Some means should be devised of saving freight on dockage, and I am quite convinced that if grain were cleaned at country elevators, the dockage that would be returned to the farmer would much more than pay for cleaning the grain. In some cases the dockage amounts to seven and, in odd cases, to ten per cent, so that, if the dockage were removed, hon. members can easily realize the saving to the railway companies in the fall in the number of cars required for hauling this grain.

I wish to emphasize again the question of dockage on grain that went to Vancouver this fall. I have had many complaints in my district in regard to it. We had a very dry summer; the wheat was unusually dry and brittle, and I believe it cracked worse than usual. Of course much of the cracked wheat is caused by inefficient threshers. When you have a separator cracking wheat, it is almost impossible to take the weed seeds out, as the cracked wheat will cover up the weed screens. There should be returned to the farmers of Alberta many thousands of dollars just from dockage that was taken out of their grain this fall and for which they were paid, in many cases, as I was in my experience, as low as one dollar per ton. It is nothing less than downright robbery that screenings of the class I have spoken of should be paid for at the rate of one dollar per ton.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I think the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) is very fortunate in getting one dollar per ton for his screenings. I received only twenty-five cents per ton for mine. I cleaned my wheat in the elevator and shipped it to Fort William after it was cleaned. On 2,142 bushels of wheat I had a dockage of 86 bushels and 40 pounds, for which I got 56 cents. I asked for a re-inspection; but in the location where I live, namely, on the Canadian National going south from Winnipeg to Emerson, a branch goes direct to Port Arthur. My wheat leaves my home town and goes to Emerson and then direct to Port Arthur, and it is almost impossible to get a re-inspection unless wheat passes through Winnipeg. Can the minister state whether or not one can get a re-inspection when wheat does not pass through Winnipeg?

Mr. ROBB: It might be difficult to have an inspection after grain had passed an inspection point; but if the bulk had not been broken and the inspector advised in time, and the car held, I can see no reason why there should not be a re-inspection. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien) have brought up a question of great importance to all Canada. No question causes more trouble in the administration of the Grain Act than this question of screenings. Not only is this question of interest to the people of western Canada, but I call the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) as a witness that it is of interest to the people of eastern Canada, because the good farmers of eastern Canada object very strenuously to having these dirty seeds, mixed or sold straight, and dirtying farms that are fairly well kept. I have considerable sympathy with the idea of having grain cleaned at the original point of shipment; but I am not sure that could be carried out in a new country, nor am I sure that the government would be wise, in the administration of the act, to make it obligatary upon all country elevators. It costs money to put in cleaning machinery, perhaps not so much to put it in as to operate it, and to clean fast enough so that the grain can be taken care of as it comes into the warehouse back in the country. I am told some modern threshing machines are now equipped with cleaning machinery that cleans the grain fairly well. I think I should say to my hon. friend that I have already been discussing this on two different occasions with the Board of Grain Commissioners, and we have tried to work out some plan whereby we might arrange to have grain cleaned economically, leaving the screenings back on the farm where they could be used near the point of produc-

tion and thus saving the man who owns the grain the cost of freight shipping this to Fort William or to Vancouver where it is cleaned. There is not much sense in paying freight on screenings that are of comparatively small value.

The hon. member for Macleod brought up the question of the returns he had received, and I was astonished that he would only receive one dollar a ton for cracked wheat, because my experience has taught me that feed is worth considerably more than that. I agree with him that there should be some demand on the Pacific coast for, at least, a reasonable amount of chicken feed and a considerable quantity of mill feed. I have had brought to my attention a statement sent to us by the grain commissioners, a statement that was reliable and supported by a telegram from would-be customers. We did for a time find a very good market for these screenings in the United States. It was represented to the commission that the screenings were used largely for feeding sheep. We had men follow the screenings along, in the years past, to their point of destination, and we discovered that Canadian screenings were put into various grades of feed, some of them selling at very high prices under a fancy name. The United States, like Canada, in recent years have passed drastic legislation controlling the product that goes into different feeds, requiring an analysis, and the result of all this has been that they have destroyed the market for that sort of grain, grain which the hon. member for South Oxford called "rubbish." I have in my hand a memorandum from the Board of Grain Commissioners. I think I had better put on record the statement of the grain commissioners on this matter. They point out that the market for screenings is now limited, and I may say that it is not the operator of the elevator but the inspector who determines what dockage there shall be to bring wheat up to standard grade. The grain commissioners make this statement:

> To-day the price paid is $1.50 per ton for general run screenings of which the proportion of anything better than refuse runs from 10 to 20 per cent the average percentage based on actual cleaning test being practically 15 per cent. As an example, take to-day's purchase price of $1.50 per ton, plus $2 per ton, cost of cleaning, equals $3.50; 15 per cent, better than refuse equals 300 lbs. per ton, at a price at which thousands of tons could be obtained, namely $9 per ton, equals $1.35, which shows a cost to the elevator, or an absolute loss of $2.15 per ton, as refuse screenings are offered f.o.b. cars free to any party who will take them away. As a matter of fact an entire boatload was offered recently to the Globe Elevator Company, Duluth, plus 50 cents per ton, providing they would take them from the elevator by boat. This company replied under date of October 13th as follows:
>
> "Impossible work screenings to pay cost, even basis 50 cents per ton credit, so will pass it up."

The actual facts—and I am citing now the conditions on lake Superior at Fort William and Port Arthur—show that the grain commissioners offered a bonus of 50 cents per ton if the screenings were taken away and their offer was refused. This refusal came from a market where heretofore we sold screenings by the boat load. I am therefore entirely in sympathy with the view of my hon. friend that something should be done to have grain cleaned at point of loading near the producer. I thank him for bringing the matter to our attention and I shall submit it again to the grain commissioners to see whether, during the year, we cannot work out some scheme. But it must be an economical scheme so that we shall not close up the elevators and in that way do more harm to the producer.

Mr. MILLAR: As the minister points out, the question of deciding where the grain should be cleaned is one that is difficult to settle. A good many people will remember that years ago the cleaning was done largely in the country elevators, but the very difficulty the minister has spoken of was experienced there. The grain is usually rushed in at certain hours of the day. There are hours of the day when very few loads arrive, and at other times there is a great rush; and if farmers thresh and haul their grain from the threshing machines to the elevator it is a considerable inconvenience to them to have to wait an hour or two before they can unload. I am not sure that it is practicable to have the cleaning done in the country elevator, although it would be a considerable economy if the freight could be saved and all the trouble referred to avoided. I have in mind two cases, in which I could give the names and addresses, of farmers who made the same complaint that has been raised by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). In one case the farmer received 50 cents a ton for cleaned oats taken out of grain grown on new land, and in the other case $1 a ton was paid for cracked grain which was considered quite clean. I believe that what the minister said in regard to prices of screenings generally and the lack of market for them is true. But I think it is simply a case of screenings and screenings. There are some screenings that are worth very little. By the time they pass through the terminal elevator, where there are facilities for putting them over the screen several times, they are practically nothing but wild oats and dirt and are worth little. A great

deal of good grain, of course, has been taken out of such screenings. But the complaint is not in regard to that sort of screening, on which no one places very much value. The complaint is in reference to such cases as I have referred to and that mentioned by the hon. member for Macleod, where for cracked wheat and clean oat screenings that are worth $15 a ton 50 cents or $1 is offered. But this is only one of many complaints which I hope will be thoroughly investigated and remedied by the grain inquiry commission which we hope will be appointed later on.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is it not possible to have machinery in the threshing outfits that would take the great proportion of the small seeds out of the grain and thus solve the difficulty at the very point where it can be done most easily and at least cost?

Mr. MILLAR: Probably the time will come when that will be done generally, but at present it is not practicable. There are very few threshing machines that are so equipped as properly to clean grain in the field, and I am inclined to think that for a number of years to come the difficulty will be this, that with the screenings a considerable quantity of good grain will be taken out in the field, which could be made use of in the terminal elevators. This grain could be extracted at the elevators but it cannot be separated in the field. These are difficulties for which I do not pretend to offer any solution offhand. I do not know what the solution will be, but it is a matter that calls for a great deal of care and thought because the farmers lose a good deal as things are.

Mr. COOTE: I should be glad if the minister would promise to have the Board of Grain Commissioners make a thorough investigation into this matter of dockage at Vancouver. Many of us would like to get a few dollars out of the dockage which someone out there has kept from us. They have paid $1 a ton where the dockage was something worth while. In the particular car I referred to more than one-half was cracked wheat. The minister might see that the commissioners endeavour to get some justice for the men who had dockage that should have been adequately paid for and for which they were given only $1 a ton. When I received my statement I said I would rather they had not offered me anything, because I considered it an insult to be offered a dollar per ton for screenings of that kind. I want to put on Hansard a statement which I got last year, through the Department of Trade and Commerce, from the Board of Grain Commissioners giving an analysis of the dockage on wheat received at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur for the crop year 1920-21. I shall read this statement in order to bring to the attention of the House and the people generally the amount of dockage that is being taken to Fort William and which should be left at home.

Analysis of Dockage on wheat received at Public Terminal Elevators, Fort William and Port Arthur crop year 1920-21

Total Number of cars received..	73,846
Total Gross contents of same.. .. .. bus.	95,885,152½
Cars having no dockage..	9,735
Cars having dockage of less than 3 per cent	35,603
Cars having dockage of 3 per cent or more	28,508
	73,846

	Lbs.
Total gross contents of 28,508 cars having dockage of 3 per cent or more..	2,158,249,1[illegible]
½ of 1 per cent of same retained by Elevator Company..	10,791,25[illegible]
	Lbs.
Total dockage on 28,508 cars having dockage of 3 per cent or over..	106,807,620
Less ½ of 1 per cent of gross contents retained by Elevator company to cover invisible waste and loss in cleaning.. ..	10,791,250
Balance returnable to shippers.. ..	96,016,370

One other question. A year ago, if I remember correctly, I was told that we could not have our screenings reshipped from Calgary to local points, on account of regulations prohibiting their movement. Are such regulations in effect; and, if so, are they issued from the minister's department?

Mr. ROBB: In answer to the first question, the deputy minister already has a note of my hon. friend's complaint regarding the price paid at Vancouver and will to-morrow write the Grain Commission for an explanation. As to the second question, no such regulations have been issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce; but I think the Department of Agriculture issues regulations covering the shipment of noxious weeds.

Mr. SHAW: During the course of the year I have had several complaints from farmers that they are not able to purchase screenings from the government elevator at Calgary. What disposition is made of these screenings? And why is it that local farmers are unable to purchase them?

Mr. ROBB: I imagine if there is a market for the screenings in Calgary the elevator operators will be glad to sell them to local farmers. I shall draw the attention of the grain commissioners to this matter. Of course, where there is no local demand, screenings are sometimes used for fuel.

Mr. JELLIFF: Apropos of what my colleague from Macleod (Mr. Coote) has been saying, I would call the attention of the minister to the value of these screenings in our mixed farming operations. I doubt if their value is sufficiently comprehended. We produced in what we call the Lethbridge freight district 22,000,000 bushels of wheat last year, constituting over one third of the entire wheat product of Alberta, and figuring the screenings at two per cent we would have about 450,000 bushels available if we had a storage elevator at say, Lethbridge, with proper cleaning facilities. I know three or four of our big sheep men have been sending their flocks to Fort William for the past two seasons to fatten them on elevator screenings. They figure that it takes about 250 pounds of screenings to carry a sheep through the hundred feeding days. On the basis of the re-cleaned screenings which we could have at Lethbridge, they figure we could increase our sheep by 76,000. In addition to that great benefit for the people of that part of the country, there would be the additional advantage of their being able to feed more poultry, pigs and other stock. It is costing us about $60,000 in freight to send these screenings to Fort William—an entirely unnecessary expense. I do hope the minister will communicate with the Board of Grain Commissioners and see if some method cannot be devised for cleaning a good deal of this grain nearer to the point of production, so that the mixed farmers and sheep growers of the locality may get the advantage of the by-product for their stock.

Mr. ROBB: I will.

Mr. EVANS: This cracked wheat business is becoming very acute at times; last autumn the condition was the worst that I had ever known. As the minister is himself a miller, will he tell us if it is detrimental to the quality of flour if cracked wheat is mixed with the whole wheat?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend can quite understand, I am sure, that the admixture of cracked wheat makes a dark flour which I doubt very much if he would care to buy for his own family needs. Sometimes wheat is cracked in the thresher by incompetent threshers setting the cylinders too close. The miller will not buy cracked wheat simply because he cannot sell the flour produced from cracked wheat.

Mr. MILLAR: Would it be practicable to grind the cracked wheat by itself for flour?

Mr. ROBB: There is a world market for flour, if any person thinks there is money in dark flour he has every opportunity to try to create a demand for it.

Mr. SALES: With regard to the proposal of the minister to have the Board of Grain Commissioners inquire into the practicability of cleaning screenings at country elevators, we have had this subject under discussion for about eleven years. At first we hoped that we would be able to clean all our grain at the country elevator, grind it into flour there, and let the local farmers have the screenings. We have found that project to be absolutely impossible. In the first place, no country elevator can make anything like as good a job of the cleaning as the terminal elevator with its complicated machinery. The work is very slow and would hinder the farmers at a time when they are threshing. We have been willing to try any device. If a man comes along and says, "I have a cleaner which will do what you want;" we reply, "Put it in, and if it will do what you claim for it we will equip all our houses with it." We have tried one cleaner after another but have not found any of them satisfactory. So that before the minister makes any rigid regulations in connection with cleaning in country elevators I would advise him to look carefully into the matter; otherwise, by bringing about congestion at the country points, he may inflict greater hardship on the farmers rather than bring relief to them. There are many different kinds of these cleanings. You may have wild oats; there is some feeding value in that. You may have black-seed, pig-weed, mustard seed. and so on; there is no feeding value in any of these. The ordinary thresher can take out pig-weed and he can take out mustard seed; I know I can in my own threshing machine. But I am going to say this—and I know it will not be very palatable to my farmer friends at home: it is very often their own fault that they do not get a lot of this black-seed cleaned out by the thresher. On many occasions after threshing I have had a great pile of pig-weed underneath my thresher and have had to get a man to take it away. Now, it costs just as much to pick that up in the field and put it through the machine as it does to work with the wheat. But when you say to the man for whom you are threshing: "I will have to charge you for this pig-weed," he will say, "Oh no; I am not going to pay for that." Well, the next time I would simply close the door and let the pig-weed and all the rest of it into the wheat; then he will pay for it, and the freight also on his screenings down to Fort William.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is the way it works.

Mr. SALES: That is exactly the way it works; I know by practical experience. In many cases it is the man's own fault because he will not be reasonable and have the fair thing done to him by the thresher. So far as the value of screenings is concerned, I would simply confirm what the minister says. At our own terminal at Port Arthur we burnt as much of it as we possibly could; we had more of it than we could use. As the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) will remember, down at the head of the lakes they had been dumping the screenings around the trestle work supporting the railway approach to the elevator. Well, the water got in there; the material decomposed, and you could not go within a hundred yards of the elevator without holding your nose; it was worse than any rotten brewery or anything a man could imagine. We had to pay to have that stuff taken away and dumped into the lake. So that the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) will see that when he receives a dollar a ton for his screenings, he is probably receiving more than they are worth.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Alert Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Canadian Niagara Bride Company.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 34, respecting the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Ottawa. Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill No. 36, respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill No. 37, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 38, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill No. 40, respecting a certain patent of Henry Matthew Wells and James Edward Southcombe.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item 363 "Administration of Canadian Grain Act." Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. GARDINER: I believe it is understood, and I think it is provided in the act, that the grain commissioners shall be residents of Fort William or Port Arthur. Does the minister know whether the present commissioners reside in either of these places?

Mr. ROBB: It is quite true that the act provides that the residence of the grain commissioners shall be in Port Arthur or Fort William, but in practice it has been found of advantage to the producers of grain for one of the commissioners to be moving about in different places, and to spend more or less time at Winnipeg. I understand that they have their official residence at Fort William, just as a member of parliament has his residence at Ottawa while the House is in session, but I cannot tell my hon. friend whether they spend all their time there. I should hardly think it practicable that they should.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that the commissioners have to devote all their time to the duties prescribed for them under the Grain Act. Can the minister tell us whether they are doing so?

Mr. ROBB: That is my understanding. If anybody knows anything to the contrary, I shall be glad to hear of it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does this item provide for the salaries of the commissioners, and if so, what are their salaries?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, $6,000 to each of the commissioners and $6,500 to the chairman.

Mr. STEVENSON: What is the reason for the increase of $178,839.

Mr. ROBB: It is partly due to statutory increases and, as I intimated this afternoon, in past years the item in the Main Estimates has usually not been sufficient and we have had to bring down a supplementary estimate. It is hoped that this item will cover the whole expenditure for the year.

Mr. MILLAR: How much has been received this year from overages at the terminal elevators?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will remember that during the afternoon there was an intimation made that this matter is in the courts

and has not yet been determined, so the accounts have not been made up.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics (including sixth census), $300,000.

Mr. STEVENS: To what extent has the plan progressed for bringing the statistical branches of the various departments under this Bureau of Statistics? I am under the impression that the bureau is doing good work, but this sum is a heavy one. I presume that the statistical work connected with the census is diminishing. Would the minister give us an idea of the requirements making up this large sum?

Mr. ROBB: It has been the policy, which was inaugurated a few years ago, gradually to bring in all the statistical branches under the one head. That is almost completed now. Only last week, I think it was, we took over the statistical branch of the Labour department. There are the usual statutory increases. My hon. friend will note that there is a reduction of $115,000. The work in connection with the census of 1921 is gradually diminishing, but there is still some work to be done. It might interest the House to know that the population of Canada, according to the census of 1921, was 8,786,483.

Item agreed to.

Grant to Canadian Engineering Standards Association for the promotion of uniformity of standards in metallic and other products, $10,000.

Mr. STEVENS: What I have to say on this item might as well apply both to this and the following resolution on the same page with reference to the Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. There has been under contemplation for some time the establishment of a Bureau of Standards or a Central Research Institute, and personally I think that is something that we should establish in a very definite manner as early as possible. It would appear from the estimates that we are spending a great deal of money indirectly in this connection, but we might have more efficiency and better results if even a little more money were expended and the bureau or institute established in a definite manner.

With reference to the work of the Research Council, I know of nothing of greater moment to the country at the present time than the fuel question. I listened the other day to a most interesting address by Sir Clifford Sifton and also had an interview with the fuel commissioner of the province of Quebec, Mr. Wanklyn, both of whom have given a great deal of thought and study to this problem. The suggestion was made by them—it is not in any sense original, and I am not advancing it as such—that this body should devote itself during the coming year to research in connection with the fuel problem, and some very practical suggestions were made. For instance, it was pointed out that we were dependent upon anthracite coal from south of the line, and that repeatedly during the last two or three years efforts have been made in Congress and in state legislative bodies to put an embargo upon the exportation of coal to Canada. These are warnings that should not be disregarded. As a matter of fact, the shortage of coal this year has, I might say, narrowly escaped being a tragedy in some instances. It seems perfectly clear that we cannot, in Canada, hope to depend, for fuel purposes, only on anthracite supplies from the United States. We have an abundance of soft coal, and while it is quite true that soft coal is not as suitable as anthracite for domestic use, it certainly will produce heat and, if properly handled, will serve, perhaps, almost as well as anthracite. On the Pacific coast we use nothing but soft coal; we get along very nicely with it and have no difficulty whatever. On the east coast there is an abundance of soft coal; in Alberta and British Columbia there are unlimited supplies of soft coal; yet in the great central district of Canada, where the industrial concerns are located and where you have congested populations, there is no coal. The function of government, it seems to me, is to solve a problem of that kind. I do not mean to say that the minister or his department should take that responsibility; but we are spending a large sum of money on this research work, and it seems reasonable to suggest that a problem of that kind should be immediately referred to this body with a definite request that some action should be taken.

I might recite, for a moment, a suggestion made by Sir Clifford Sifton and Mr. Wanklyn. They suggested that there should be established, contiguous to the large centres, such as Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and so on, coke ovens with the necessary equipment for saving the by-products; that soft coal from the Maritime provinces should be brought to those centres and out of that coal the gas made which, I am assured by some experts, could be supplied very cheaply to those centres for use as fuel; that the coke could also be used for fuel—and coke makes an excellent substitute for hard coal, as it is smokeless and fairly dustless—and in addition to that, various by-products would be produced which, we all know, are of great

value. That is a problem which, I suggest with great earnestness to the minister, might be referred to this body, and if the appropriation proposed is not sufficient, parliament ought to vote a larger sum for that purpose. I look with a great deal of anxiety to the future, if we are to have each year a recurrence of this fuel problem, each year getting more acute and fraught with greater danger to the public, to industry and to the welfare of the community generally. I throw out this suggestion for the consideration of the minister now that we have these two items before us.

Mr. MILLAR: Would a discussion on standardization of machinery, particularly farm machinery and the parts thereof, properly come under this head?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MILLAR: Then I should like to deal with that matter just for a few minutes. This is a matter of considerable importance, and I should like to see it fully discussed in parliament. In past years, a great deal of difficulty has arisen owing to the fact that even the same kind of implement manufactured by a firm in different years, has parts that are just a little different. For instance, if you break a part of a binder purchased in 1921, you may find that the part you would buy for 1922 would, perhaps, not just quite fit. If you buy a wagon of a certain make, and a nut or a bolt is lost, you will find that the same part from another wagon will not fit, will not serve as a repair. I have no hesitation in saying that those who manufacture the machinery are not anxious that these parts should fit. We often find ourselves in this position. A part of a binder or a wagon or some other farm implement is missing, or, perhaps, more than one part; we find that those parts are not in the repair shop; we cannot get them, and we are under the obligation of throwing the implement aside altogether, although it may not be nearly worn out, and purchasing a new implement. If something were done to cause the various parts of farm machinery to be standardized, so that nuts and other parts of one implement would readily apply on another as far as practicable — and I think a great deal could be done that is not now being done—much loss and expense would be saved. This is something in which farmers are very much interested. I do not know that I have any positive proof except from conversation with those who should know much more about this matter than I do; but they have told me and given me sufficient proof that those who are manufacturing those implements are not anxious that the parts should be standardized, and are not likely to standardize them unless they are compelled to do so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In reply to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), I might say that in the Mines department, we are taking active steps to test low-grade coals, just by the method as outlined by my hon. friend and as suggested by Sir Clifford Sifton. Early last fall we began to be interested in this question on account of the probability of a fuel shortage in Ontario and Quebec. We have made considerable investigations, and officials of the Mines branch are working on the technical aspects of this problem, in close association with the work of the United States bureau of mines. The problem, as it would appear at the moment, is one of transportation and supply. According to statistics available regarding supplies in eastern Canada —and I speak particularly of the Nova Scotia fields—the probable maximum output of the fields of Nova Scotia would be, if the mines were run at full capacity, about 8,000,000 tons. If a plant were established, say at the city of Montreal, for the conversion of this bituminous coal by the coking process, and the by-products utilized in that city, this would just about supply the necessities of the province of Quebec. Therefore, the more pressing problem, that of the fuel supply for Ontario, will have to be found from some other source, and we have turned our attention to those bituminous fields of the United States that are within three or four hundred miles, say, of the city of Toronto, where a similar plant might be established. Plants might be established also at the other larger centres throughout Ontario.

I should be pleased if it were possible to utilize an all-Canadian supply, but we believe at the moment that that is rather a difficult matter owing to transportation, because the supply would have to be brought from the western coalfields, entailing a haul of over 1,200 or 1,300 miles, if not almost 2,000. The haulage would add so much to the cost that it would render the price practically prohibitive.

The Scientific Research Council has instituted experiments in the briquetting and treating of coal in Manitoba. The Manitoba and Saskatchewan governments, joined by the federal authorities, have for some years been carrying on experiments in the attempt to carbonize and briquette that product. Some-

thing like $800,000 or $900,000 has been expended in this experiment and there is a complete plant established at Bienfait, in Saskatchewan; but so far that experiment has not been successful. Within the last month our attention has been directed to an experiment that has been in progress at the University of Dakota, and we have shipped two carloads of coal from the Bienfait district to that plant. One of our fuel experts witnessed the experiment and reports that they were successful in carbonizing our coal at that particular point. To construct one of these units is not nearly so expensive as the units that have been constructed and which have proved to be a failure at Bienfait. About $1,600 will construct one of them. But one of the practical difficulties in the carbonizing process is briquetting, and that problem has not yet been solved. True, in the initial experiments carried on by the Mines branch in a small way on two or three ocassions they were successful in the briquetting process. But so far the development of these experiments has shown that on a large scale these tests are not reliable, and a good deal more remains to be discovered in connection with briquetting.

What my hon. friend suggests has been tried in North Dakota and in the western states, where they have been experimenting with a grate that can be placed in the stoves to burn the carbonized product in its powdered state without briquetting. Of course, they can purchase that product at greatly reduced prices; but after all it is hard to keep for any considerable time. The technical work in connection with these experiments will be carried on. With regard to the problem of coking the bituminous products of Nova Scotia and the area that is contiguous to the central portion of Ontario, that in our opinion at the moment would seem to be the method of solving this somewhat serious problem, so far at any rate as Ontario is concerned.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What success has been achieved in briquetting peat in Ontario? I believe that experiments have been conducted for a number of years. Have they been successful to any extent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Experiments carried on with respect to the utilization of peat as a fuel are not new from the point of view of the methods employed in the older countries of Europe and in the United States. You do hear from time to time that it is possible to dry peat artificially. I am not prepared to deny that. But I may say that Mr. Camsell has visited Germany this year, has examined the operation in England, and has consulted with the Bureau of Mines of the United States, and the advice we have received is that it is a somewhat expensive process. Therefore at Alfred, where experiments have been carried on, attention has been directed to the sun-dried process. That involves the perfecting of machinery to obviate manual labour as far as possible in order to cheapen production. This year, while they have not such machinery as they would like to see installed, they nevertheless have sufficient knowledge, from the experiments that have been conducted over a period of two or three years, to warrant them in the statement that they can successfully manufacture peat and air-dry it at a cost of about $3.50 per ton delivered at the station. One of the difficulties again is the matter of transportation, because the commodity is bulky; and, quoting from memory, I think the rate from Alfred to Ottawa, a distance of some fifty miles, is about $1.40 per ton. It is evident therefore that it cannot be conveyed over very long distances. As a subsidiary fuel of low grade, however, there is no doubt that it would be of immense value to the province of Ontario where there are so many large peat bogs all within fairly close reach of the larger centres. Experience shows that with the machinery now in existence it is possible to manufacture peat at the price I have quoted, namely, $3.50 per ton. Of course, it must be remembered that no very large output can be produced, because the season is short, and as the product must be sun-dried, it must be produced and manufactured during the midsummer months. So that if we happen to have wet weather or dark days the output is accordingly reduced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to take the opportunity of impressing on the government the imperious necessity, not of experimenting with this thing or that, but of making certain that we do not in Canada face another winter in the perilous condition we faced this. It is all right to have a lignite board trying various chemical experiments with briquetting and carbonizing lignite. It is proper also to be testing coke ovens, and we may perhaps expect a little there. We may look, too, with a little hope to our peat bogs. These may be all right. In time possibly, in time almost certainly, one or more, maybe all of these will be of real value. But the chances of any one of them meeting a really acute fuel famine next winter are practically nil. This year we came to the verge of winter, in fact we stumbled through it, merely trusting to luck. There was no provision made. We had no definite, reliable understanding with the United States; and we

found ourselves in the middle of winter with children dying. Unquestionably many lives were lost this winter among the poorer classes, especially in the larger cities, because of insufficient heat and an utter inability to get the means of supplying it. We found ourselves in that condition this winter, compelled to send our representatives to bend their knees to American fuel controllers and beg of them the favour of a little coal. It will not do for this country to be in that position again.

Now you ask, "What can we do?" There are measures we can take so as to be absolutely sure of having coal. We have the coal ourselves. We not only have bituminous coal, we have anthracite as well. We have coal for all our industrial purposes undoubtedly, but I mean we have coal for the heating of our homes; for this purpose we have a grade of coal just as good as any we import; we have it in Alberta, we have it in British Columbia. The minister says that the freight is high. So it is. But the mining of the coal is very easy. Our anthracite mines are not yet reached by railway facilities, but it does not take very long to construct a railway from the end of steel to-day to one or more of our anthracite deposits; it would not take a heavy capital investment; and I venture this conjecture, that that anthracite can be mined at more than one point at a cost very little exceeding a couple of dollars per ton. At present prices of anthracite coal in Ontario that leaves a pretty big margin for the carrying of that coal into this province even to compete against the Pennsylvania product.

But it is not a matter of competition. It is a matter of getting coal, it is a matter of ensuring this country against a fuel famine, and against further humiliation. Let me repeat, it is not something to be overcome by merely relying on the precarious success of this or that experiment and talking vaguely of doing something this way or that. It is necessary to take action to ensure, as we must ensure at whatever cost the insurance may be against the people being confronted with another fuel famine next winter. We were not in this danger in years gone by; this last winter has shown us the very real danger we are in.

I have had estimates given me of the actual cost of bringing coal within at least the radius of Nova Scotia coal distribution, and the figures are not such as to make it prohibitive even in competition with the anthracite product. But again, I repeat, whether the figures go beyond the limit that would bring it within the radius of competition with the anthracite product or not, means must be found to see that we are on a sound basis so far as our fuel is concerned before another winter is upon us.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no anthracite coal within eighty miles of any railway in the province of Alberta.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is eighty miles?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is not anything. But my hon. friend speaks of the condition last winter. Clearly we could not build a railway eighty miles long during the winter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, my hon. friend intimated that it was a very small matter, but he perhaps does not understand that it will cost $4,000,000 to construct eighty miles of railway to reach anthracite coal deposits west of High River, which is the nearest Albertan point I know of at the present moment. There is no anthracite coal in Nova Scotia. True, you can bring the product of Nova Scotia into the heart of Ontario during the summer season, but it is a low grade coal and cannot be utilized in our domestic furnaces.

What I was speaking of was not the immediate demand for fuel. It it were a burning necessity, coal could be brought from Alberta to Ontario to-day, but it would be at a prohibitive price. The utmost limit of coal haulage is about five hundred miles. Now, should we not be alive to a problem that is bound to become more serious as the years go by? It is not at all improbable that the Americans will prohibit the exportation of anthracite coal within the very near future. Therefore is it not good business to prepare for that day by the utilization of our domestic product? If we had coal deposits within four or five hundred miles of the city of Toronto, then it would be quite reasonable to devote every energy to bringing it to the central portions of Ontario. But within three hundred and fifty miles we have just the same grade in the United States, bituminous coal of the same character as Nova Scotia's, that can be treated as I have outlined. It seems to me that that is the problem we should tackle at once.

I am not unmindful of the fact, and as a resident of Alberta I would be delighted to think, that we could at a reasonable rate supply the people of Ontario or any other part of Canada with the immense quantities of fuel that we will have for sale in that province for the next three or four decades. But I think the cost of transportation will make it out of the question. With the product that can be

secured for the province of Quebec from the coal mines of Nova Scotia, although limited, and with the product that can be secured from the United States without fear of having an embargo placed upon it, treated in the central districts as I have outlined, we will, I think, in a much more reasonable way be able to solve this question from the financial standpoint.

Mr. MILLAR: Would the cost of Alberta coal laid down in Ontario be higher than we in the prairie provinces are paying for Pennsylvania coal at the present time—$28 a ton?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh no, I think you could lay down the Alberta product at about $16.50 per ton. That is based on the rates charged from the mines to Winnipeg a year or two ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has furnished the information that exactly completes my argument. I want him to understand that I was not objecting to the endeavours being made now in the Mines department and in the Interior department, or to the plans outlined by the minister. How could I? I think I was instrumental in commencing two of them. But the matter has reached such a crucial stage that we cannot rely on such methods. The minister says that we are not in great danger because in a pinch we can bring in Nova Scotia and Alberta coal. But we cannot bring it in in a pinch. That is exactly what I want to drive home to the minister. We cannot bring Alberta coal in here when we get into the depths of next winter at a time when Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta wheat is flowing eastward; we will not have the railway facilities to move coal as well. We can ensure against another fuel famine next winter by getting the coal here ahead of time, and if we can lay it down in Ontario at $16 a ton, that is less than I am paying to-day. If it is possible to burn the bituminous coal of Nova Scotia in our furnaces, well and good, but I do not know. I have heard the present Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) display considerable erudition in trying to convince this House that the people of Ontario ought to burn the bituminous coal of his province, and he assured us that they would get far better results at the difference in prices.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You cannot burn it in grates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a difference in the government on that point; but that is not the only point on which there is a difference among them.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Get another grade.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the hon. minister take either horn of the dilemma. If we cannot utilize Nova Scotia bituminous coal we have got to build the eighty miles of railway referred to into the anthracite deposits of Alberta. Let the people be warned in time. Let us arrange to get coal from both ends of the Dominion. Do not let us trust to luck, for if we do we are depending on a very slender reed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have had an experience of sixteen years in connection with the burning of the lignite products of Alberta. I am assuming, of course, that my hon. friend did not say—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not mean lignite—bituminous products, say.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Bituminous is not available. This coal is not more than a semi-anthracite; it hardly falls within the class of the anthracite of Pennsylvania. Tests have been made at the university and elsewhere of all these grades of coal. The difficulty with our product is that you cannot utilize it if it is stored in midsummer—at least, not without great waste, and waste is a very potent factor where such a tremendous freight rate has to be paid. So I want my right hon. friend to realize that it is not all as easy as it looks. He suggests storing the product of Nova Scotia, but you could not burn the product of Nova Scotia in your present anthracite grates; you would have to have special grates. True, it has been done by Mr. Gray, one of the officials of the Dominion Steel Company, but when used in his anthracite furnace it was mixed with coke, with fairly successful results. There is nothing mysterious in connection with this thing. I do not think we need experiment on it for two or three years; results can be quickly obtained, but we must start upon definite lines in arriving at a solution. It is not my problem to solve the fuel difficulties of this winter; that was left to another board. My task is to endeavour to solve the problem permanently for this central part of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the minister has mistaken the point of my observations of a moment ago. I do not wish in any sense to cast a reflection on the efforts of the Department of Mines. What I want to point out is that under these two votes we are spending a very considerable sum on scientific research. I believe the government would get results if they instructed a body of scientists such as we have here to solve this problem, and gave them sufficient money to do it. I am aware of the efforts being made by the Mines depart-

ment in seeking to utilize these lignite deposits of western Canada. Now, that is a problem—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is absolutely wrong. The Mines department have nothing to do with that; the Research Council is in charge of it. I hope you will not blame the Mines department for anything in that connection.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will admit that it is under the Interior department that these experiments are proceeding.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The scientific research body is under the control of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The reports from the Lignite Utilization Board come to the Department of Mines. Within the last year, in order to see that we are getting value for these experiments, we have taken a direct interest in the matter; I have had the deputy minister follow every step of the investigation that has been carried on.

Mr. STEVENS: Does that not emphasize the point I am making? My hon. friend gives us quite a lengthy explanation of what is being done to solve the fuel problem; then he says that the experiments are under some other department and that his department is taking an interest in the matter.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me put my hon. friend right—

Mr. STEVENS: Let us brush away these trivial points. What I am getting at is that we have a fuel problem, and I suggest that the government should definitely instruct the Advisory Council on Scientific and Industrial Research that that problem needs solution and needs it quickly. Half a dozen solutions have been suggested. One is to use a coke oven for the coal of the Maritime provinces; another is to bring in American bituminous coal; another is to bring coal to this part of Canada all the way from Alberta. I will add two more: you can get Welsh coal from Great Britain at a very low price; I venture to say it can be landed in Montreal just as cheaply as some of the bituminous coal from the United States. Certainly Pacific coast soft coal could be landed in Montreal or at the head of navigation as cheaply as coal from Alberta. So that there are many suggestions to make, but we seem to be rambling around, one department looking at one side of the question and the Research Council looking at another—no one seems to be responsible. If this vote is not large enough, let us make it large enough to attack seriously and solve this fuel problem.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What I object to is the charge of the hon. member that this is a mix-up affair. I hope I have not misled him to that extent. The experiment at Bienfait was instituted and carried on by the Research Council under the supervision of Mr. Ross, who was chairman of a committee of the council appointed for that purpose. That committee was entirely outside the Mines department or the Department of the Interior or anyone else. The money was voted by Parliament and was expended under the supervision of
9 p.m. that committee until a year ago; in fact, it is still under their supervision.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To what minister do those in charge of that lignite investigation report, and what minister puts in the estimates? I may tell the minister that when I was there they reported to me; they went over all their accounts with me, and it was through me that the recommendations were made to council.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend is speaking now of the committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the lignite committee.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is true I got reports that were submitted to Sir James Lougheed, and it is true also that I had to make a report on this matter last year. But my right hon. friend will not argue that that committee was under the control of the department or took advice from the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes. It is under the departmental control, just as, for example, the old Conservation Commission was under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Its estimates are subject to the recommendation of the minister. It does not take its direction scientifically from the minister, but it is under the control of the government. It is not a commission that is at large and subject to parliament, like the Civil Service Commission. It is responsible to the department over which my hon. friend has control.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Did my right hon. friend have anything to do with the appointment of this committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. It was appointed before I got there; that is why I did not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may be entirely wrong, but that is not the impression

I got of the matter. That committee was appointed by the Research Council. True, for the purpose of making reports and getting the necessary money, it was placed under one of the departments of government, the Department of Mines. Now, we understand the situation; what I am anxious to point out is that, when I came on the scene no one in the department that I knew of was willing to take the responsibility for that committee. I do not think that is the best way to spend money, and that is why I have instituted in the Department of Mines this committee of technical men to work on this problem, being under the control of and responsible to the Department of Mines. I have done the best I could to get value for the expenditure made at this plant out west, but in fairness to the Department of Mines I want to make it very clear that they are not and have not been responsible for these experiments. For the experiments carried on now, however, they will be responsible and the department will be responsible. That is what I have been trying to convey. My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) says that we are mixed up in this matter. To some extent we are, but I am trying to finish an experiment started by another body. I have not, as yet, suggested that the work be taken away from them; I think they ought to be allowed to finish it. But that is not the case in so far as the coking of the coals of Nova Scotia—which I am proposing to-night for the purpose of solving this problem—is concerned. That is directly under the control of the Department of Mines, and of the minister.

Mr. HOCKEN: I want to ask the minister a question that is not so greatly involved as the one we are just discussing. I agree with the necessity of beginning now to provide a supply of fuel for the people of this country, especially those in the central parts of Canada, for next winter, and having regard to the necessities of the province of Ontario, and to the fact that there are large deposits of peat in that province, I would ask what the department are doing to make it possible to use these peat deposits in the neighbourhoods where they are located.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that I can speak of the time when the experiments were started. I may say, however, that the expense is borne partly by the government of Ontario and partly by the federal government, and the experiments were carried on under the direct supervision of the Mines departments of the two governments. The experiments have been conducted at Alfred, a place about fifty miles from this city, between here and Montreal, and I have just announced to the committee that a report has been made to the federal and Ontario governments that they have perfected machinery that can produce sun-dried peat at $3.50 per ton. I may add that I think that after the technical and scientific part of the experiment has been carried out, it is hardly the business of the government to conduct the commercial end of the undertaking.

Mr. FORKE: I am not very sure that I shall be in order in what I am going to say, but my statement is perhaps very well known to the Minister of the Interior. In regard to Alberta coal I have heard some discussion to-night as to the suitability of grates that have been burning anthracite for the burning of Alberta and softer coals. I do not know that there is any hard coal being burned in the province of Manitoba to-day to any extent outside the city of Winnipeg. A few years ago everyone had to purchase anthracite to burn in his furnace. To-day the people of the province of Manitoba generally speaking, are burning soft coal and experiencing no trouble in the world. I am talking from personal experience. We have had better heating results with coal from the Alberta mines than we ever obtained with anthracite; that is in the use of coal in the common furnaces.

I have a statement here made by an Alberta miner which may prove of interest. The letter is dated November 24, 1922 and the writer says:

> Practically all of the mines in Alberta are closed to-day for want of orders, althongh winter has not commenced yet. There are enough mines in Alberta to practically bury Ontario in coal in six months.
>
> I have no doubt that the present mines, operating full time with their present staff, could ship at least four times the quantity of coal in a year that they are now doing.

The writer figures out—and I have no doubt the minister is familiar with these figures—that coal can be carried from Edmonton to Toronto at $6 per ton. Obtaining coal from this source would provide a tremendous amount of all the year round labour for the Alberta miners. It would also yield a great amount of traffic for the Canadian National railway and, perhaps, would do something towards putting it on a paying basis.

I canot go into the figures to-night, although I have a detailed statment here, as to the rate per ton per mile and the load that a train could carry from Alberta to Toronto. I am not an expert on the subject but from the figures in my possession I think it is commercially feasible. At any rate it is worth looking into. It seems a strange thing

that although Alberta has such tremendous resources in coal Ontario to-day should be suffering for the want of that fuel. In the Maritime provinces also there is an abundance of coal. It is just a question of how it can be the most promptly and cheaply transported. The writer of this letter has gone into the matter very accurately, I think, and he makes the statement that the carrying of Alberta coal from Alberta to the western part of Ontario has never been seriously considered by the management of the Canadian National Railways.

I think, perhaps, the greatest trouble with the Alberta coal is the fact of its slacking. Let me say that there are certain of the mines in Alberta that I know of that keep the coal for months and it remains perfectly whole and perfectly good. In view of the fact that we have the coal and the transportation facilities, is it not worth while looking into the possibilities of carrying that coal over our own National system and perhaps saving to the people of Canada at least $125,000,000 that now goes each year to the United States? By developing our own coal resources, and carrying the fuel to the points where it is needed, we should provide work for our own people. It is a proposition, in my opinion, that is well worth looking into.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was a fuel famine about five years ago, and it took a very considerable amount of money and persuasion on the part of the Alberta government to induce the people of Manitoba to burn the lignite coal. It costs to-day about $4.75 a ton for coal on board the car. That is the rate in Alberta at the moment, and it costs about $4.25 a ton to ship to Winnipeg. That is about the same rate that is being charged for the transportation of wheat. The cost of transportation from Winnipeg to Ontario would have to be added to the figure as it applies to coal.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the hon. gentleman quite sure as to the freight figures to Winnipeg.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think they are right but if the minister is sure we will let it go at that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The $4.25? Unless there has been a reduction in the last year that figure is right.

Mr. FORKE: Coal is hauled in mixed trains, and in all shapes. If you loaded a train at Edmonton, one of these big heavy trains, it could be hauled very much cheaper in a continuous journey all the way down than it could be hauled into Manitoba in the way in which it is now handled. People are very hard on the miners sometimes, but when the men are only working about half time, they require double the wages to maintain themselves and their families and so it becomes very expensive to mine coal under the present conditions. I think very few people are well acquainted with the conditions under which miners work when they complain about the wages the miners enjoy. When it is realized that they lack employment sometimes for six months in the year the necessity for the prevailing rate of wages is apparent. Now that we have a new management of the Canadian National Railways I think it would be wise for them to look into the conditions and see whether something along the lines indicated could not be done.

Mr. WARNER: Are the Fuel Commission or the government seeking further means to promote the transportation of coal from Alberta to Manitoba? We are very much interested in that. I understood when discussing this matter with a member of the Fuel Commission not long ago that coal was brought from as far as 2,100 miles and landed at Winnipeg where it was being used instead of our Alberta coal. I do not know the reason for that, but if there is any good reason, I should like to know it. It is possible that conditions were such as to justify bringing coal from that distance from another country when it could have been purchased only six or seven or eight hundred miles away at the most, from Winnipeg. We have had evidence here tonight that they have been using our Alberta coal and find that it answers the purpose very well. I think there are good grounds for investigating this question. We are in a position in Canada where we cannot afford to ignore any means of keeping money in our own country, employing our own labour, and paying the coal miners and the mine operators for getting this wealth out of the ground. I would like to impress upon the government that it would be worth while adopting measures to facilitate such a development. It is really a serious matter. We in Alberta need the money for our coal just as much as the people in Manitoba need our fuel. If that were done, it would relieve the situation more or less, because the coal that comes in from the United States could then be distributed throughout Ontario instead of being taken up to Winnipeg and the west, which our Alberta coal could supply. I should like to know what the government or the fuel commission are doing along this line, if they are doing anything.

Mr. ROBB: If this debate will awaken the people of Canada to the importance of the coal situation and prevent them from forgetting as soon as hot weather comes in June that there is another winter ahead, it will be time well spent. I am not prepared to agree with my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, that this has been the first year of coal shortage, or the worst year for getting coal in Canada. Periodically a coal shortage develops in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that there has been any year worse than this? Scarcely any one in Canada can get coal.

Mr. GRAHAM: Nonsense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish the hon. gentleman were in my position. I am not a member of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM: But you are not the whole of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why it should be more difficult for me to get it than the ordinary man. Besides, we come in contact with many in just the same situation. This is the first really acute year of a coal shortage in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like the minister to visit our cities. There has been no suffering at all till this year but this year there has been widespread and acute suffering.

Mr. ROBB: There has been suffering, but I contend that this has not been the first nor the worst year, and I am quoting the statements made by coal dealers who should know something about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a pretty good year for them.

Mr. ROBB: We will not quarrel over it. I quite agree that we should try to use our own coal, but there is no use boasting that we have a large coal supply in the West and then freezing through the winter. I am not prepared to go as far as some hon. gentlemen and say that there is anthracite in Alberta, but I am told that there is a very good quality of coal there, and if that were developed it would also be an advantage to our National Railways to move that coal east. So much for coal.

The Lignite Utilization Board is the organization that has control over the experiments at Bienfait in Saskatchewan. The committee of the Industrial Research Council in their report say that they turned over entirely to the Lignite Utilization Board the carrying on of research work in that connection. And may I remind my right hon. friend that it was he himself who was responsible for creating the Industrial Research Council, and that it was during his period of administration that this experimental work at Bienfait was turned over by the Research Council to the Lignite Utilization Board? This board is financed jointly by the Dominion government, the government of Manitoba and the government of Saskatchewan.

Like my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), the other evening I listened to the speech of Sir Clifford Sifton, who is a student and goes deeply into these questions, and the thought occurred to me: If this is as good a proposition as Sir Clifford Sifton thinks, it is a great chance for wealthy men to invest their money and go into the business in Montreal. I confess that Sir Clifford Sifton almost convinced me that it would be a paying proposition to float Nova Scotia coal to Montreal, heat that city with the gas derived from that coal, and ship the coke to the country districts, incidentally deriving considerable revenue from dyes and other by-products. If he was correct, that would be a profitable venture for some business men to go into. I hope hon. gentlemen do not expect the governments of this country, either federal or provincial governments, to put coal into the bins of the people. Surely we have not yet reached that point. The people must do something for themselves, and if miners go out on strike in Pennsylvania and we allow the newspapers to lead us to believe that the strike is going to be settled to-morrow for all summer, and we go on in that expectation, we may find ourselves in the same position next winter as we did this year. I think we should give it out to the people of this country that they must look after themselves a little bit. They cannot always leave it to the government to provide them with coal, and bread and butter. It is a business proposition and the people must look after themselves.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) asked a question about the standardization of parts of agricultural implements. It may interest him to know that two or three years ago the then member for Kent, now a member of the Upper Chamber, brought in a resolution for that purpose and the matter was referred to the Agricultural committee. That committee had the manufacturers of agricultural implements before them and went into the matter very thoroughly, and they did arrive at some conclusion regarding the minor parts of agricultural implements, but they did not accomplish all they desired. My hon. friend says that the government should go

so far as to force the agricultural implement makers to standardize parts. So far as possible it is very desirable that there should be uniformity of parts, that parts of different machines should fit one into another. But is it in the interest of users of agricultural implements that the government introduce such legislation as the hon. member suggests? You cannot compel the manufacturer of an agricultural implement in any country outside of Canada to make the parts uniform. If you force Canadian manufacturers to do that, you are creating a great monopoly and you are giving the people having that monopoly an advantage in our country by destroying competition which you wish from other countries. Therefore, I am not sure that it would be to the advantage of users of agricultural implements to pass legislation compelling manufacturers to make the parts uniform.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) has asked that the question of coal be laid to rest and the item pass, the question of the coal supply is, perhaps, one of the most important questions for residents of Ontario at the present time. No one who lives in cities in western Ontario can deny that there has been a very large amount of suffering during the present winter on account of the coal shortage. We have experienced it; we know it. We have not had the coal, and what coal we have had, we have had to pay a very high price for. We hear from people who seem to know and we read in the newspapers that our experience of this present winter may possibly be repeated next year, or if not next winter, then the following winter. This all depends on whether or not another strike occurs in the United States coal fields.

Mr. ROBB: Or in Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Or in Canada. An athracite coal strike in the United States is a most serious thing for the ordinary householder in Ontario. It may be that another strike will not occur in those coal fields next summer, or next winter, or for a year or two to come; but there is still a possibility that these strikes will occur. During the last five or ten years there have been a large number of such strikes, and in some of those years we have certainly experienced a coal shortage in Ontario. I believe the seriousness of the coal shortage was greater this year than ever before. In the city in which I live I have had more complaints this year than ever before, as to both scarcity and price, and there is a prospect of this problem getting worse rather than better. It is one of those questions which we must face in Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada.

I do not take the view of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that it is a question with which the government has little or nothing to do. He should realize that in facing a coal shortage in central Canada, we are facing something in the nature of a national calamity. The people have a right to look to the government for direction, assistance and protection in the matter of a national calamity, and they will look to the government and hold the government responsible. The question which interests us most in Ontario is: What is the government doing as regards this question? What steps is it taking, or what does it propose to do? No one on this side of the House or in any part of Canada would, I think, for a moment question the propriety of the government expending money in experimenting along lines such as those described by the minister to-night. That is well and good but it is highly speculative. It may eventually result in some relief in this country; but it is a very indefinite matter, and the relief may be long postponed. The question is: What are we going to do in the meantime?

If I understood the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) aright as he spoke to-night,—he has left the chamber, I am sorry to say—his proposal is simply that this country could take care of the province of Quebec, which has no coal, if Quebec had the use of the whole output of the mines of Nova Scotia, which output he estimates at about 8,000,000 tons. That, he says, would provide reasonably well for Quebec, and then the problem of a supply for Ontario would arise. I understand, in Ontario, we use some ten or twelve million tons, and we have no coal in our province. The minister says that we cannot bring coal from Alberta to Ontario on account of the long haul. Let me tell him that many cities in Ontario this winter have brought coal from Wales, and the people have been using Welsh coal. It is true we have had to pay a high price for it. If we can use Welsh coal, surely we can use Alberta coal. The Minister of the Interior intimated pretty clearly that, on account of the quality of Alberta coal and the long railway haul, the use of it in Ontario at the present time is hardly a practical question.

What does he propose? He says that there are coal fields in the United States within 300 or 350 miles of Ontario, and an abundant supply of bituminous coal can be derived therefrom. That is the point that rather

puzzles me. I have read in American papers within the past two weeks that if another strike takes place in the anthracite fields, great distress will be caused in the United States, and the result will be that the whole output of soft coal of the United States will be used in the United States and that Canada will get neither anthracite nor bituminous coal from the United States. That is a condition which must be considered. It may not be a probability; but it is a possibility and one which the government should consider. We are faced with a real difficulty and means must be found to avert it. If the condition arises again next winter as it did this winter; if it becomes more grave next winter, as it may possibly become, the government is bound to take care of such a situation. It is bound to protect and to direct and to assist, and the time to lay its plans is now, not later on in the season, not waiting, as the minister will say, until next autumn, until the acute situation actually arises. Let plans be made now. Give the people a lead in the matter. It is all very well for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to say—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What plans, if any, has the hon. member in mind that should be laid now?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know that I have a definite plan, and I do not know that I would be called upon to explain it if I had one, although I would be glad to do so. But a government in office for the purpose of governing and taking care of the country should immediately get busy and devise a plan. What ran through my mind was something in the nature of coal depots to be established at various points in Ontario. Whether those depots were to be supplied with Alberta coal, or Nova Scotia coal, or Welsh coal, I could not form a very reasonable conclusion. Then, if the difficulty arises, we shall at least be carried through what may or may not be another hard winter. It is the government's work to look after that, and the people of Ontario feel very much interested in this question. Letters have come, I fancy, from Ontario to every member of this House during the present session. I know I have been interviewed. I have had communications, and the question is: Is the government prepared to direct, to undertake, to help, and if so, will it lay its plans now?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sorry to detain these estimates, but I imagine we are all speaking at quite a distance from them. I do not rise to discuss this coal question in detail or at any length, because at a future time I wish to take it up in connection with the work done by Mr. Magrath and Mr. McCourt during the past year. But I should not like the idea to go out that the United States has not been dealing fairly with Canada in the coal situation this winter or is not dealing fairly now. As a matter of fact northern New York, to put it mildly, has been as hard pressed on account of the lack of fuel as Ontario has been. I know of one instance in which Pennsylvania anthracite was sent from an Ontario town to a town in New York state to help them out. The United States has acted fairly in the matter in every respect, and I have no doubt that hon. members would endorse that statement if they were acquainted with all the facts. It is true that some gentlemen in the United States, I will not call them agitators, did attempt to stop the export of anthracite into Ontario and Quebec. But when it came to a showdown before the authorities they were brushed aside and the export was permitted, Canada receiving, I think, all she had a right to expect under the circumstances.

As to the lack of coal, we all agree that there is a sufficient supply on the American continent to keep us all warm and provide for all our necessities. But that is not the trouble When the operators and the owners fall out it makes no difference what supply Providence has deposited in the earth; we do not get it, and that is all there is to it. It does not matter whether the disagreement takes place in Pennsylvania or in Canada, the supply depends on the ability to bring it to the surface and have it transported. And the United States has just as much trouble, notwithstanding its large deposits, as we have in Ontario. Suppose all plans were laid for bringing the coal from Alberta to Ontario; if the same trouble arose in Alberta as in Pennsylvania we should not be able to get coal from that province any more than we could from Pennsylvania, because it would not be mined. I intend to speak at greater length on this subject on a future occasion when I have all the data, but at the moment I want to point out that the root of the trouble does not lie in the fact that there is not a supply of coal close at hand, although it may be in the United States; it lies in the fact that the coal is not produced at the mines. I think we burn about 4,000,000 tons of anthracite in Ontario and Quebec annually, and this year we have had only a percentage of that, so that we have been left in a straitened condition. Some cities, I believe, have suffered considerably, although some parts of the country have suffered to a greater

extent than others. As a matter of fact the districts I am in touch with suffered less this year than two years ago. That, however, is only a matter of comparison. No doubt it does seem queer to people generally that while we in Canada have an immense supply of coal there should be a lack of fuel. My hon. friend spoke about depots. This proposition would be a good one, I think, if the coal to be stored were Pennsylvania anthracite. But some of the coal we have in Canada would not retain its quality when placed in these depots, and that, of course, would make a difference. Some of the coal in Canada does not stand the weather and will not retain its heating and steaming qualities when stored in large piles or exposed to the air for any length of time. And that is one of the difficulties that arise in transporting our coal any very great distance.

Mr. FORKE: A good many of the coal sheds in Manitoba are filled in the summer and the coal keeps all right until winter. I do not think it slacks to such an extent as to present any insuperable difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not refer to any particular coal. I have been discussing the matter with Mr. Magrath a good deal, and expect to have more data. But let me emphasize again that we do not want it to go out from this House that we believe we have been humiliated in the United States or treated unfairly or anything of that kind. Those in the United States in authority over the fuel situation this year treated Canada fairly; indeed, more fairly than many of the people of New York state think she should have been treated. And this fact is due not only to their fairness but to the work done by Mr. Magrath, who has been at the head of the commission assisted by Mr. McCourt and Major Bell.

Now, as to peat. Put not your trust in peat, is my advice. We have large peat bogs in Canada and I have had more or less knowledge of the peat industry for a great many years. While it has been difficult to get moisture out of peat, it has been done, but to such a negligible degree that the quantity produced cannot be depended on to take the place of coal. As an auxiliary, shipped over a few miles, it can be successfully utilized, and it has great heating and steaming qualities. But the quantity produced up to date, under the experiments that have been made, has been comparatively small, and for years to come we shall not be able to depend on it except as an auxiliary. I am in hearty sympathy with the idea that we should work out some scheme to enable us to use our own coal, because apart from the possibility of a famine or the difficulty of getting a supply from the United States, Canadians ought to use their own coal so far as they can, simply because it is their own. That is the policy I believe in, and I think that the minister (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) has started a useful line of experiments. I have a good deal of faith in the final outcome of these experiments, because if we can utilize Nova Scotia coal or western coal in the form of coke or in any other form in the central sections of Canada, we have not only done something to protect ourselves, but we have accomplished something to the advantage of both East and West and of the whole Dominion. So far as it is possible to do so, my policy, I repeat, is that we in Canada should utilize our own resources.

Mr. GOULD: Is the $120,000 in this item supposed to be for the purpose of carrying on further work in connection with these experiments this summer?

Mr. ROBB: The $120,000, I understand, does not all go to that work. The work is financed by the Mines branch of the Dominion Department of Interior, as well as by the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Mr. GOULD: Last year there was a total of $250,000 voted for the experimental work at Bienfait.

Mr. ROBB: That matter comes under another department.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might answer the question. There was $250,000 voted last year of which $125,000 is still available. Out of that we propose to devote $25,000 to the building of a carbonizer of the same type as that which has just been used in testing two loads of our coal.

Mr. GOULD: There has been a good deal said to-night in regard to the shortage of coal throughout Ontario. The part of the country from which I come is much colder than Ontario and we have had a coal shortage there this year. Since I have had the honour of representing my constituency in this House I have repeatedly requested that transfer switches be placed at pivotal points on the railway for the purpose of having coal transported to our people with regularity. It is a fact, as my worthy leader (Mr. Forke) states, that in western Canada the local coal dealers in the towns fill up their sheds with 60 to 80 tons of coal against the approaching winter, and those whose credit is good can go to the coal merchants and get a sufficient

supply to fill their bins. But there are thousands of people on the prairies who cannot do that, and these are the people the least able to suffer the hardships of a coal shortage. I maintain that the government in looking after the welfare of the people by protecting them against these fuel shortages should see to it that the railways trasport this coal at lower freight rates. At our lignite mines coal costs from $1.50 to $1.80 a ton, yet when it reaches my home, not more than eighty miles away, I am obliged to pay $7 a ton. I give this by way of illustration. The big spread in price is due to a great extent to the long roundabout haul involving an extra hundred miles or so. It will be readily understood that this is a very heavy toll to take from the people who have to burn this low grade lignite coal.

I do hope that the experimental work will be brought to a success and that eventually we will have the briquetting of lignite coal placed on a commercial basis. About two weeks before I came here one hundred pounds of lignite briquettes were sent me from Bienfait by the Utilization Board. I tried them in my furnace and heater with very satisfactory results. They were a little smoky to start with, but they soon burned brightly and retained their form until reduced to ash. I see no reason why when another carbonizer is installed and the plant completed a great industry should not be developed that will provide for the fuel needs of the people of the west. I would point out to hon. members from Ontario that they still have wooded areas which can be resorted to in case of fuel shortage, but we on the bleak prairies have no substitute to take the place of our coal—when our coal fails we have to suffer all the hardships of our western winters, and we have been in this deplorable condition many times. I myself have seen a carload of thirty or forty tons of common lignite at a siding, with sixty teams waiting for a supply, being doled out in lots of 500 pounds. The people who go out on the plains to build up the country should receive every encouragement from the government, and their hardships should be reduced to a minimum. And certainly the government should take the necessary steps to ensure these settlers against any further fuel shortage.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Which government?

Mr. GOULD: All governments, whether by co-operation or by individual effort. I am not charging any government with being derelict, but it seems to me the seriousness of the fuel problem in the West has not impressed itself upon governments to the extent that we consider desirable. We have terminal elevators to store our excess grain until transportation can be provided, and while the hon. minister was speaking it occurred to me that fuel depôts throughout the western provinces and Ontario would be a means of solving this problem and would not entail a very heavy expenditure. I would like to see the lignite fields in my district developed. I have been informed that north of the present lignite area there are huge deposits of coal of exceptionally good quality, and I have had many requests from people in that territory for the government to test the extent of these deposits. I think it would be good policy for the Minister of the Interior to give this matter his consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a very familiar question to me and one on which I have been expressing opinions for the last twenty years in and out of this House. For many years I found it difficult to get anyone to appreciate the great importance of the question, because we were not then faced with the prospect of embargoes on our importation of anthracite coal from the United States; we could get it in abundance, and therefore it was difficult to impress on the people of Ontario and Quebec the desirability of our being independent in every respect, particularly in regard to our coal supply.

It is rather disappointing to me to hear the suggestions made that after helping to develop the hard coal deposits of the United States, and now having reached the stage when we may be denied any further supplies of their anthracite, we should start in to develop their soft coal and continue our dependence for our fuel upon a foreign nation. No doubt they are a very friendly people and quite willing to deal with us while we have the money to pay for the coal they send us, but the day may come when we will be thrown back on our own fuel resources, and then I am confident we shall regret the extent to which we have neglected to develop our own coal deposits.

Our transportation facilities—our railways and canals—are built with the idea of developing our trade east and west. Now, is it not the sane and proper course for us to utilize these instruments of transportation to meet the necessities of our people, particularly in the matter of fuel supply? I was very much disappointed with the figures given by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) in regard to the limited production of coal in Nova Scotia. It will be readily understood that

every business man has to limit his production or output to his market. That is the situation in the Nova Scotia coal-fields. We have unlimited quantities of coal under ground, but our market is limited; we can sell only 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 tons a year, and consequently the output is limited. But if we can assure the coal owners of Nova Scotia of a bigger market it will be no trouble for them to double their output. Many of the mines now open are only working single shift. With the demand doubled it will be no trouble for those mines to work double shift and produce double their present output, and if this supply is not sufficient to meet the fuel requirements of Ontario and Quebec, more mines can be opened. So hon. members will see that Nova Scotia can produce as much coal as may be required to meet the fuel demands of Ontario and Quebec or of any other part of Canada. We have in Nova Scotia limitless quanities of coal at tidewater, capable of being transported to any part of this country. But those who have invested money in that business are looking for a proper return from what they have put into it, and it is up to the business men of Ontario and Quebec, and up to the government, so far as they can help in that direction, to arrive at some method by which this coal can be brought into the central provinces and used to meet the needs of the people in the matter of fuel.

A good deal has been said about briquetting. We have passed the experimental stage of briquetting in Nova Scotia. We have briquetted coal; it is a splendid fuel of which hundreds of thousands of tons can be produced in our province if there is a market for it. I imagine it is just as good a fuel as anthracite, particularly in open fire-places; it makes a more cheerful fire, being more like wood fire than anything you can get by using anthracite. We have also passed the experimental stage so far as coking is concerned; we have coked hundreds of thousands of tons of coal, and the product thus obtained has been used in the different cities of Ontario and Quebec with highly satisfactory results. This question is one of the most important that the House has had to discuss, and being an old coal miner myself, I am glad to have this opportunity of saying something with regard to it, particularly with regard to our coal in Nova Scotia. There is talk of having coal shipped to Montreal, and there converted into coke. What is the matter with converting it into coke at the pit mouth? If there is danger from ignition in the yarding of large quantities of coal, that danger does not exist in connection with coke. In the process of making coke the sulphur is removed and it can be piled mountains high without any difficulty on that score. We should all stand up, more or less selfishly, for the development to the fullest extent of the resources of our own country, and you will pardon me, I am sure, if I express the ambition we have that our coal should be converted into coke in the part of the country in which it is produced, thus giving our people the advantage of that further development. Coke is much lighter than coal; very much larger quantities of it can be carried by water, and the units of heat in your cargo will be much greater than if coal is carried. I suggest, therefore, that the manufactured article rather than the raw coal, be transported and yarded at different centres. Then you will have a fuel suitable for any use, whether for furnaces or for stoves, for heating or for cooking. I am sorry to appear as if I were delaying the estimates of the minister, but this is a very important subject, and I am glad to have an opportunity to express my views upon it. We cannot too soon be independent of outside countries for such a necessity of life as our fuel supply.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to endorse the sentiments expressed in the latter part of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie). I wish also to put in a plea for Alberta in this regard, particularly my own district. Out there we have a coal that is, I think, unequalled by coal produced in any other part of the Dominion of Canada. I am told that you can light it simply by applying a match to it, and if you happen to break your looking-glass you can use the glistening surface of the coal as a mirror. It is the most beautiful coal you could see. So far as the shortage in Ontario this year is concerned I must say that I have not seen any very pronounced evidence of it; I did not shiver at all—until I heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) speaking. In the West we were not at all alarmed; we did not hear anything about a shortage. However, if a shortage did exist—and it may have; if you have had difficulty in getting coal, it can only be the fault of the people themselves and of this government. We have in Alberta, I say, unlimited quantities of the finest coal in the world, simply awaiting consumers. Are you aware that we are shipping thousands of tons of Drumheller and Taber coal to the United States? If you will only ask us for our coal we shall be glad to send it down to you—if you will pay the freight. The suggestion made by the hon. member for South

10 p.m.

Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is one that might well occupy the attention of the government. Alberta coal would lend itself to storage in depots; there might be some little slacking, but it would not amount to a great deal. I believe you could get that coal landed in Toronto at around $16 a ton—from $16 to $18, at any rate—and it would compare favourably with the anthracite that is now used in this part of the country. I ask the government, therefore, to consider the possibilities of obtaining for use in central Canada our Alberta coal, particularly coal from Drumheller. If you will put it up in great storage bins and distribute it as required throughout Ontario, we will supply you with all you need.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) was in the chamber when in answer to queries with regard to the advisability of storing Nova Scotia or western coals, the statement was made that these coals would not compare with anthracite so far as quality was concerned; that they would not store without slacking, and that our grates and furnaces were not suited to their use. I would like to hear what my hon. friend has to say in that regard. He knows the kind of furnaces and grates we have here and the kind of climate which exists; he knows whether the coal from Nova Scotia must be used right away or whether it can be stored. I should like very much to get information as to what really can be done with Nova Scotia coal. There is just one other question I want to put to him and that is this: He tells us that Nova Scotia coal can be, and is being, successfully briquetted. I take it that even the Minister of the Interior would not say that Nova Scotia coal in briquetted form could not be used in our grates as they are now. I want to know whether Nova Scotia coal is really being briquetted and what the cost of that coal is.

Mr. McKENZIE: As far as the briquetting of Nova Scotia coal is concerned all I can say is that a Nova Scotia company—not the largest of our companies, but a company known as the Bras d'Or Coal Cmpany, and I may say that Senator Currie is the owner of that coal mine—introduced a briquetting machine and made a success of producing the article. But in those days—it was before the war—American coal came in so cheaply that the people did not care to enter upon the experiment of buying these briquettes and the American anthracite coal put the company out of business. In those days you could buy anthracite coal and land it in your cellar in North Sydney for $7 a ton. The cost to-day is two and one-half times that price. Even if the briquetted coal cannot be bought to-day the machine is there; they stopped producing briquetted coal because the people would not buy it when anthracite was so cheap and easy of purchase. But there is no difficulty in burning these briquettes. I have burned them in the grate in my house and they make a splendid fire. I have been keeping house in North Sydney for the last thirty years and the dwelling is heated by a hot water furnace. I have never burned anything but Nova Scotia coal and the house is clean and comfortably heated. I do not think there is anything peculiar about the furnace it is an ordinary furnace built by people in North Sydney who make a business of it.

With regard to Nova Scotia coal being unfit for dumping as they call it, for many years we had no trouble at all. I believe that a few smaller mines, on the north side of the harbour as well as on the south side, have been opened, where there is a certain amount of shale but there is no difficulty if that is kept out of the coal. If coal with that shale in it is dumped and left for some months there is danger that it will ignite and burn. However, the coal produced by the old standard mines is not subject to this danger at all. In the matter of heating one's house, if there is proper care and proper selection of the coal there is no difficulty whatever.

Let me say to my hon. friend that no matter how good any article is it may be spoiled and given a bad name by being improperly handled. Even a coal miner may spoil coal by allowing shale and stones to enter it, whereas he should keep these materials out. If our Nova Scotia coal is properly mined and handled there is no better bituminous coal on the continent of North America.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend did not quite catch the point. I did not want his opinion on the subject of ignition; I wanted to see what his view was as to the statement of the Minister of the Interior that the Nova Scotia coal was of such a character, compared with the lignite of the West that it would not stand; not that it would not burn but that it would slack and become dust and greatly deteriorate in value if exposed to the weather.

Mr. McKENZIE: Any bituminous coal will suffer more or less when exposed to rain and

sun. Much will depend upon how long the coal is left out under the weather. If covered up in some sort of a shed this slacking process will not happen at all. If that process takes place it is due to the influence of rain, frost, hot sun and so forth which disintegrates the coal. But even if Nova Scotia coal slacks it is a good fuel. It is not as nice to handle, but you can get a fierce fire, a good heat, out of slack; it never gets to the stage where it is not heat producing.

Washed coal, for the purpose of making steel is treated in washing plants. That means that the coal is ground into what may be called very poor slack, and then it goes through a washing process. Of course you would not use washed coal for heating your house but it gives the best kind of heat in the making of steel. I have been living in the neighbourhood of coal mines all my life and I never saw any Nova Scotia coal that could not be used for heating purposes if used under anything like favourable conditions.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to add very much to the length of this debate, but while this particular item may be passed without exhaustive consideration the discussion which has grown out of it has really an importance that just at first, I am sorry to say, perhaps some members of the administration did not care to attach to it. We do not want to launch into schemes that are too paternal but on the other hand I do not want to see the government avoiding such measures as may be necessary in order to grapple with really unfortunate conditions which may confront our country. I think that is what a government is for. I think that in a matter of this kind, instead of expending ourselves in mere criticism, if we are given the opportunity it should be the work of each member of the House to make such suggestions as he can for the improvement of the very lamentable situation which we have had to face during the present winter, and which has had to be faced during some previous years.

I am not going to debate whether this is the worst of all the occasions. Personally I think it has been. I may be wrong about that, but I know that the winter has been more severe than any winter in which we had a fuel shortage previously. But we will not get very far by debating that at length. The real question is, what has been done up to date, and what can be done for the future? I do not think that a House that complacently sits for six or seven hours during the discussion of daylight saving, as we did last year, or of a man's spiritual or moral welfare, as we have done more recently, ought to deny at least a few hours of consideration for a man's bodily comfort. I am not half so anxious to prepare a man for the next world as I am to keep him tolerably comfortable while he is in this world, and some people not in parliament will do all that is necessary to look after his spiritual welfare. Let us here devise the means for looking after his material welfare. To keep him decently warm is one of the most important things.

How is this coal or fuel of whatever nature it may be, to be got? I will tell you what I have seen in my own province, and I presume the same thing has been going on all over Canada. It is not bad so far as it goes, not at all bad, but it has simply been the giving of warnings to the people through the press that they must not expect to get American anthracite. In my province we have been leaning very heavily on American anthracite. It has been tolerably cheap; it is a more comfortable fuel than the native product of Nova Scotia and to some extent of New Brunswick, and our people have used it very largely. They have got warnings that they cannot count on a continuance of the supply. There is not involved in that the slightest bit of reflection on our neighbours to the south. They are doing the best they can in the face of a very difficult situation, and I agree with hon. members of this House who have acknowledged that the United States has dealt fairly with us. But they may continue to deal fairly and still be unable to deal with us even as well as they dealt this winter. When that day comes, will it be enough to use the printing presses to warn the people of this country, to send out circulars to tell them that in all probability American anthracite cannot be got, and that Welsh coal, Scotch coal, stovoids and several other substitutes may be used which will do pretty nearly as well as anthracite, or literature such as I have seen saying that you can make soft coal do very well by burning buckwheat with it? That does not mean the buckwheat that the farmer grows, but a particular size of coal they use down there.

It is easy to say that you can use these things, but what are you going to do to get them? Can you rely on the coal trade? They cannot manage everything. Their importations of anthracite are shut off, and a man who has been dealing in anthracite all his life is perhaps scarcely in a position to make arrangements with mines. He can buy his product so far as it goes, but would it not be better to have a governmental agency spending perhaps a little less time and a

little less money on finding out how to make analine dyes just for the present, useful as they may be, and put that energy into co-ordinating the fuel business of the country, just as you would co-ordinate any other enterprise of the country during war time. For this is a war against one of the worst elements with which man has to contend, a war with cold, and he must have his weapons ready.

Is it asking too much of a government that it should function in a matter of this kind, that it should provide leadership, that instead of merely giving out pamphlets, it should have an organization which would be in touch with the men in the coal business, and that means be taken at least to take a rough census of the necessities of the country? For instance, you go into a city like Ottawa. A very brief census will reveal what I will call the institutions whose heating arrangements are capable of being easily made over so as to use fuel oil, other heating arrangements, that can take some of these made-up forms like briquettes, and others which must have anthracite. Then you ration. But it is not enough to ration until you know you have the substance to deal out. Then co-ordinate with the mines and with the railways and see that the necessary material for that particular community is brought in. Leave it in private hands just so far as you possibly can. Do not interfere with the ordinary business of the country more than you can possibly help; but help the ordinary business of the country, help it to stay on its feet and do the work it has to do. Put the force of the government back of it to the extent at least of obtaining information and give them enough power to see that the coal dealer acts justly. It might be necessary to go further, and it being the case of an emergency I would not revolt against even some paternalism on the part of the government. I would even rather have a little grandmotherism than have no action taken at all. What we want to have is the happy mean. I would therefore suggest that some attention might be paid, and perhaps it is being paid now, to the development of oil shales in New Brunswick. I believe a good supply of oil could be obtained there. It would be worth while to help in some way that industry to be developed rapidly, so that oil fuel would be available wherever oil fuel can be used, and it can be used in a great many cases. It is quite a simple matter, I understand, to adapt furnaces of a certain character to the use of oil. But somebody must do those things.

[Mr. Baxter.]

This is as vital to us as any subject I can possibly think of. It is of immensely more importance than nine-tenths of the subjects we discuss in this House, yet to-night it was rather intimated to us that it would be better to let this stand over till some other time, and that anyway, there was nothing the government could do about it. I do not agree with that. I am not taking this position at all from any standpoint of partisanship. I believe the government can do a very great deal about it. I do not believe it is the office of government as one government said of itself, that it was merely a fly upon the wheel and could not control the motion. It did not control the motion, it was a fly upon the wheel, and as soon as the people got an opportunity they replaced it with a government that did something. I am not issuing an invitation to my hon. friends to take measures to remain in power, but I am quite willing, even if it helps them to stay in power, to give assistance by voice or vote in this House in order that they may get courage enough to grapple with this situation and keep helpless people from being frozen to death, for that is what the thing comes down to.

Now I want to say a word about the remarks of the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie). New Brunswick coal is good. That coal stands out. I have seen it standing out all winter at the Canadian Pacific coal dumps in West St. John, and it does not slack too much to be used in the engines. There is no danger there. It can be burnt in practically any furnace. Some slight changes are sometimes necessary, and even if sometimes your grates are burnt out by the use of it, what is the cost of a few grate bars compared with the ruin of the health of a family and the ruin of the building itself through want of heat during our rigorous winters?

That is what we come down to; that is the thing to be faced. I am just going to ask the department to enter upon this thing with a whole heart and a willing mind, and to put into being an organisation that will go a good deal further than the organisation has gone this winter; that will reach higher up, that will bring producers and distributors together, that will make a census of the requirements of Canada, and that will make our supplies go just as far as they possibly can. The department may go even further than that. If there is to be a long railway haul in some instances, let them put the new board of railway experts to work. This will be just one more problem for them. I would suggest that they might even lay off for a time the special trains that will be necessary down in my province to

conduct the second deportation of Acadians from the Maritime provinces, and they might use those trains to better advantage in hauling coal to warm the Canadians of the upper provinces.

Mr. MILLAR: I think if we are going to run true to form to-night, we shall have to switch back to standardisation. We carried on the discussion for a while on standardisation; then we went over to coal; then we went back to standardisation, and then over to coal again. I am inclined to think, if we were able to burn within the next ten years all the coal we have been handling since eight o'clock, we would have very warm winters in Canada.

I should like to make a few remarks in reply to the minister before this item passes. The minister referred to a meeting which had been held, to which I understood him to say the agriculturists had been invited, to discuss this question of standardisation. I do not know that my information is correct; but I got the impression from some conversations I had at different times that the way those meetings worked out was this. Manufacturers of farm machinery, not wishing to do certain things, would say that they could not be done, and the agriculturists present, not being practical machinists or engineers, could get no further. Perhaps a different policy on the part of the government, if they wish to progress along this line, would be to have practical men deal with practical men; that is men who are machinists, who know all about the business of making machines, to deal with those who are now engaged in the business of manufacturing machines. The minister took objection to coercive legislation. He doubted whether it would be wise to force those machine companies to take that course. In case an investigation were to prove that the machine companies of Canada, as has been alleged by many, are, for the purpose of making greater gains, multiplying parts unnecessarily, and refusing to standardise those parts when they could very readily be standardised; if that be the case in order that they may sell more machines and reap greater profits, I should like to ask the minister what the remedy is, if it is not coercive measures on the part of the government. It is quite obvious that purchasers of machines could not possibly bring about any remedy by co-operative means or any other, so far as I can see. This would be no departure from what is being done. We have plenty of precedents for coercive measures. I remember some legislation that was passed a short time ago in Saskatchewan in regard to selling machines, and now we find that a company that sells an engine and guarantees that that engine will develop a certain power, is compelled to live up to its guarantee. Moreover, when they sell machinery, they must use a certain form of contract specified by the legislature. They are also compelled to charge the same rate of interest after maturity as well as before. So in many ways, we have measures that are coercive. Therefore, if it is proved that machine companies are causing a great deal of loss and inconvenience to those who till the soil, and that this is reflected in other lines of business, causing a loss to Canada as a whole, coercive measures will be quite justified.

Since the hour is late, let me close with just one more remark that I was going to make in regard to another matter, perhaps, not quite relevant to the discussion, but a matter of great importance. I refer to the enormous cost of parts. I have heard it said by those who have done some figuring, that a binder that can be bought for about $329 or $330, which, I think, was the price a year or two ago, would, if purchased in parts, cost about $1,500. While I would not say that those figures are exactly correct, I believe they are not far from correct. Those are matters in which tillers of the soil are perfectly helpless. It seems to us that we are in the stranglehold of those who sell us the machinery and provide the parts. It was necessary for the government of Saskatchewan to pass legislation compelling those machine companies to keep the parts, because they practised in the past selling a machine and then within a year or two saying: "We have no parts for that machine; we are not making it any more," and a man with a practically new machine, a machine very little used, was compelled to throw it aside. In order to protect the buyer the government of Saskatchewan was compelled to pass such legislation. This would be going just a little further, and I think it would be quite justifiable. If I thought there was any danger of our switching back to coal, I would talk until eleven o'clock; but as the hour is late, I think we are about ready to pass this item and I will say no more.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar). I have been interested for many years in this matter of standardization of parts, and I think it is really time that something should be done. Perhaps the hon. member is not aware that last year the Committee on Agriculture appointed a special committee to go into that matter. They picked up the threads that had been dropped

at some previous session when a special committee had been appointed for that purpose, and they got to the point where they came to a "gentlemen's agreement" with some of the manufacturers. As far as I understand the matter, this was not very much, but just a start that was made. I think three of the companies in Canada agreed to take a certain standard for some bolts and, I believe, knife heads of mowers and certain things like that, and at any time changes were made in the future, they would hold to that standard. That is, perhaps, all right in a way; but the question arises as to other makes coming into the country. The minister mentioned that matter himself. I would suggest that if it were necessary to take any coercive measures, I would take measures which applied not to the manufacture but to the sale. In this way, the measures would apply to implements coming in from the United States as well. The John Deere Plow Company makes a special class of machine for western Canada, a particular kind of plough that, I believe, is not sold in other parts of the country at all. Yet to suit conditions in western Canada, they make a particular class of machine, and any other company will do the same thing. I think the matter is being seriously considered in several states to the south; in fact, I believe in at least four states, there is a law at the present time as regards standardization of sleighs and cutters. The companies are compelled to manufacture and sell only the standard wagon size, I understand, for the convenience of automobiles travelling in the winter time.

One of the secrets of Henry Ford's success is the system of standardization he employs. You will go into one of the Massey-Harris agencies in a small town for some mower sections. They have none in stock and you step across the street to a Deering or a McCormick or a Frost and Wood. You find that they all have these parts, but there is a difference of 1/16 or 1/32nd of an inch, just enough to prevent them from working. It seems absurd that such a condition should exist. One particular company makes a practice of changing some of its parts every three or four years and I have been told that this is done with the intention of frustrating the specialty companies who make a business of manufacturing these parts. The only way to get ahead of the specialty companies is to adopt the Ford method, that is, of underselling them. This is a matter that might be referred to the agricultural committee for consideration.

Now, I want to deal for a moment with the coal situation which is after all the important question. In the district from which I come we are not particularly concerned with the shortage of fuel. If it is a cold day and there is a lack of fuel all you have to do is to take an axe and go into the bush and bring back some wood with you. There is no trouble in that regard. But I realize the importance of this subject from the national standpoint, and it seems to me that the solution of the whole problem is a matter of transportation. They have an abundance of coal in Nova Scotia, according to the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) as well as in Alberta, and I see no reason whatsoever why it cannot be profitably transported to Ontario and Quebec. I think a good deal of the difficulty could be overcome by making seasonal rates on the railroads. Any practical railway man knows, in fact, one need not be a practical railway man to know, that an engine can haul about twice as much in the summer as in the winter. The time spent on the road and about terminals is a great deal less in summer than in winter and it can safely be said that you can operate the railways on 35 cents in the dollar during the summer as compared with the winter. One of the problems on the prairies is that as soon as the wheat starts to move the coal begins moving also, and unfortunately in the same direction. When the channels are all clogged with wheat that is the time people find they need coal; and there is no reason why coal cannot be transported in the summer. Mr. Hanna giving evidence before the special rates committee last summer, stated that if the railways had steady business all the year round they could operate with 5,000 box cars less. Now, 5,000 box cars, according to my calculations are worth $25,000,000, and I assume that with engines and other equipment it is necessary for the Canadian National Railways to maintain about $50,000,000 extra equipment. Taking the overhead charges, depreciation in value, interest, etc., I believe I am not far wrong when I say that it will run to $10,000,000 more loss yearly. If that or part of it could be saved by keeping the railways busy all the year round you would accomplish one of the biggest things in the country; you would solve one of the greatest problems that face us to-day. It would also help to a large extent to solve the wage question.

Some hon. gentlemen mentioned conditions with regard to miners. I am more familiar with railway matters than with mining, but I may say that the wage question is also one of the serious problems in connection with the railways. We see a good deal in the news-

papers about the enormous wages drawn by train and engine men and others employed by the railways. As a matter of fact, however, some of these men very often do not get enough to break even on. They will make a good wage in the fall and winter and most of the summer they are laid off. I know that last summer some men who had been fourteen years in the service of Canadian National Railways were laid off. That is a serious situation and these men must necessarily ask for high wages if they are to make a living. If you can keep the wheels of transportation moving in the summer—and that I contend can be done by fixing a sliding scale of rates, to go into effect on the 1st of May and be operative until the 1st of August when the grain starts to move—it will give the people in this part of the country an opportunity to secure coal either from Nova Scotia or Alberta, and in many cases some grain could also be carried at lower rates. This would simplify the whole proposition, and I contend that the suggestion ought to be taken into consideration. The transportation of, say, 7,000,000 tons of coal from Alberta would call for about 5,000 trains, and I think the railways are capable of handling it. I would assume from the figures quoted by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) that Nova Scotia can supply 8,000,000 tons, which would leave 7,000,000 tons to come from Alberta. In the year 1922, we purchased from the United States 15,000,000 tons of coal, for which we paid, I think, between $75,000,000 and $100,000,000 or $125,000,000. It seems to me that there is no reason whatever why we cannot save that money and increase the earnings of the Canadian National Railways.

I think that we have overlooked another important source of supply, however. We have looked to the East and to the West, but we have not looked to the North. I think most hon. gentlemen here are aware of the fact that in the islands along the northern part of Hudson bay there are immense coal deposits, and I am one of those who predict that as soon as the railway reaches James bay it will be found that that coal can be easily brought into Ontario. Looking over a report the other day of Captain Bernier I saw the statement that he had mined coal on Melville island and found it as good as Sydney coal. And there was an abundance of it too. Mr. Stefansson mentions the same thing. I see no reason therefore why we should be dependent on the United States or any other country for coal. They evidently do not want to give it to us, and so far as I can see we could be independent of them if we adpoted the proposal I make of establishing seasonal rates.

Mr. NEILL: Some hours ago in the debate, the Minister of the Interior (Mr Stewart) made the remark that having regard to the ever-threatening danger of the United States putting an embargo on coal coming into Canada, it behooved the government, or it was the intention of the government, to seek to develop and enlarge the fuel resources of Canada. He might also have added, to preserve the existing coal resources. I heartily agree with him in that position, and I have been pleased to-night to hear hon. members from Ontario describe the hardships to which they have been subjected through lack of coal in the East, because perhaps they will now pay some attention to the coal situation in British Columbia, which I brought to their attention last year. My plea at that time fell on deaf ears; but when it is a case of "coming home to the hangman" perhaps they will take more interest in the subject.

I want to mention briefly what the situation is, which is more acute than it was last year, in connection with the mines in Vancouver island and in British Columbia generally. In spite of all this coal scarcity in Canada they are going out of business from want of orders —not from any want of market—due to the encroachment of fuel oil imported from the United States with a very small duty. But for fuel oil there would be enough demand to keep the mines working 75 per cent more than they are working at the present time. But the mines in some cases are working only two days a week, while in other cases they are shut down, on account of the competition of imported fuel oil. The miners in these mines, with all the dangers which they have to face—50 having been killed the other day —are paid a very modest wage. So that the trouble is not due to excessive labour cost. The mines are run in a thoroughly modern and efficient manner. In one case there is not a steam boiler in the whole mine; it is all run by electricity generated by water-power. But the trouble is that the coal mines cannot compete with the cheap fuel oil which is sloughed off on the market from the American producers of gasoline.

Now, what happens to any industry when it gets down to habitually working only two or three days a week? As you can imagine, large capital is tied up, and it means that those interested will quit. That is what ultimately must happen; they will go out of business.

And what happened a few years ago? These are deep mines, and if not worked they soon

flood. A deep mine when flooded is about as costly to re-open as to develop a new mine. So when these deep, costly, highly equipped mines go out of business they go out of business for all time, once they become flooded. What happened two years ago may happen two years hence. Two years ago, owing to some economic disturbance in the States—no threat of war or anything of the kind—the sellers of fuel oil notified British Columbia consumers that in three months time there would be no more oil exported into British Columbia. What did the railroad and manufacturing people do? They hurriedly converted back their plants to coal burners, and very glad they were to find the coal mines of Vancouver Island waiting patiently and ready and eager to fill their wants. But in a very short time industrial conditions in the States changed and fuel oil was once more available. Immediately the consumers, selfish, as most business interests are, converted back their plants to the somewhat cheaper and more convenient method of using oil.

Let me predict what will happen two years hence after the coal mines have been shut down. Owing again to some economic disturbance, or to a threat of war or to any other reason whatever—no reason was given last time, none may be given in the future—supposing the United States again put an embargo on fuel oil? A few years ago we would have laughed at an embargo on anthracite coal, would we not? But to-day it is in sight. They may put an embargo on fuel oil, but by then our mines, owing to our selfish neglect, will have gone out of business. Where will our railways, our ships, and manufacturing industries get their supply of fuel then? There will not be any. What will be the position? Suppose war threatens with some nation bordering on the Pacific, what will we do when our oil supply is cut off and we have no coal to resort to?

Last year I pleaded with the House to put a duty of two cents a gallon on fuel oil in order at that time to preserve our coal industry. I thought it worth while not to let one of our Canadian industries go out of business. This year I no longer plead, I threaten and warn this House and the government that in two years or less our railroads, our ships and industries may be desiring coal and will not be able to get it. It will not then be the loss of the industry, it will be the fact that we will be throttled as a nation, for we will not have any fuel supply in British Columbia, and that is of far greater national importance than even the destruction of this single industry. Therefore, I suggest and urge upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he consider once again the national importance of imposing such a duty on fuel oil as will enable these coal mines to be kept in operation at least to meet our future wants. Otherwise when the day of travail comes upon us and finds us with no fuel, we as a nation will bitterly regret the selfish indifference we have displayed towards the situation out there.

Mr. MILNE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Does the committee realize that considerable latitude of discussion has been allowed by the Deputy Chairman? I do not want to shut off the hon. member, but I would remind him that the item now under discussion is No. 367.

Mr. MILNE: My intention was to revert for a few moments to the standardization of fuel oil. I believe I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Yes.

Mr. MILNE: A matter of great importance to the whole Dominion is the standardization of gasoline and fuel oil. It affects not only those who drive motor cars, but those who operate machinery. In making an analysis of a large number of samples of gasoline and kerosene we find that the specific gravity, distillation and other specifications vary to quite a large extent. We find in many cases that when the weather gets cold retailers fill their tanks with a low grade gasoline and sell it at the same price as they charge for the high grade. I think that consumers should be protected from this fraud by making the oil companies declare the specifications of their commodities. I am told that it is very difficult to standardize these products so as to ensure the importation of, say, gasoline of a certain grade on account of conditions obtaining at the oil wells and distilleries; but it seems to me it would be a very simple matter to compel the companies to guarantee their products to be up to a certain standard; that is, if I buy gasoline I should be able to see at the plant or filling station the actual specifications and so know exactly what quality I am being supplied with. I make that suggestion to the government in order to guard our consumers against the gross fraud now being practised on them.

There is room, too, for research work in connection with lubricating oils. I am convinced that more engines are destroyed from the use of poor lubricating oil than from any other cause. While we have specifications for lubricating oil as to its flash test, viscosity,

and so on, yet there is something in a lubricating oil, a greasy quality, that we have not yet been able to define exactly. Therefore I think the research branch might well direct their attention to the subject. If they could frame a standard specification for lubricating oils a great deal of fraud would be prevented, for we would then know what we were buying. In addition to the regular oil companies handling heavy oils jobbers are springing up here and there and putting on the market oils of very inferior lubricating qualities. We also find that the dealers in many cases carry three different grades of lubricating oil, and if they get out of one grade before your can is filled they will take the rest from some of the cheaper grades, but charge you the higher price just the same. I should like the government to take this matter into consideration and see whether there is not some way of protecting the consumer from these frauds —for I claim they are nothing less than frauds. I would like to see the government find out something more about lubricating oils—what the quality of the oil is that makes it a lubricant, and so on—so that the consumers may be protected from every point of view.

Mr. ROBB: This matter has already been under review by the officers of the department, but I will again direct the observations of my hon. friend to the attention of the Research Council with a view to seeing whether we can arrive at a basis for establishing a standard for Canada.

Mr. WHITE: The discussion seems to have gone very far afield; in fact, I have had some difficulty in finding out what item we are considering. There was one matter in connection with the discussion on fuel that impressed me as requiring a little more notice. The hon. minister stated that the steel was within 80 miles of the anthracite coal mines in Alberta. If that coal is really anthracite and compares favourably with Pennsylvania coal, it strikes me that 80 miles is a very short distance to bridge in order that the supply may be made available for Ontario. The hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Copp), according to Hansard of February 21, reports that about 2,700,000 tons of anthracite coal were imported into Canada last year; and that was only about 60 per cent of our normal supply. That would, figuring it roughly, amount to a weight of about 100,000,000 bushels of wheat at 60 pounds to the bushel. If all our western railroads had for every 80 miles of track a business of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, they would be in a much better financial condition than they are today. The government, therefore, might very well take into consideration the matter of linking up the rail connections so as to provide us with adequate supplies of our own Canadian coal. The question of freight rates might be submitted to the Railway Commission with a view to securing special rates at certain favourable times of the year so that solid through trains of coal might be taken from the coal fields to, say Fort William, at a much reduced cost for transportation.

Coming back to the item under discussion. I have had the honour to be appointed a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, dealing with the standardization of parts. There was very little done last year; in fact we met once and had a little discussion, and that was the end of it. The work already done has been a start, but a very small one. Certain agricultural implement makers have agreed to adopt certain standards of bolts, and so on, but they are the standard bolts already made, so that there is very little advance in that respect. The question of standardization involves many considerations. The matter of patent rights is involved; the matter of standardization of machines and parts which come from the United States is involved. In order to make some progress in the matter I wrote to the United States Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, in August last, and was informed by him that the American manufacturers of farm implements had taken up this matter of standardization. I will quote a section of his letter:

> National standardization as a part of the programme of this department is still in the initial stage of its development however, the farm implement manufacturers having recently appointed a committee to carry forward in surveying present conditions and in recommending simplifications.
>
> I fully agree with you that standardizations of Canada and the United States should be in agreement, particularly in such important fields as farming equipment, and I am asking our Division of Simplified Practice to keep you fully informed as this work progresses. Meanwhile, the most accurate statement of present standards can be obtained from Mr. H. J. Sameit, Secretary of the National Association of Farm Equipment Manufacturers, and we are asking him to give you a statement of these practices.

I have several letters on this subject; I quote from one dated December 23rd last:

> Our plow and tillage implement department has formulated its recommendations, and when approved by 75 per cent of the membership who manufacture this line, such recommendations will be ready for adoption, after being formally approved by our General Standardization Committee and the General Executive Committee.
>
> We will be pleased to provide you with the recommendations of each department as soon as they have been formally approved by the General Standardization Committee and our General Executive Committee. If you desire to have the information piecemeal, we will forward it.

I understand that this movement in Canada was started by the farmers, but in the United States it was started by the implement men, the object being to reduce the number of implements that were manufactured for certain purposes, in order that fewer lines of machinery would have to be carried, with resulting decrease in the cost of production. I am not just sure that standardization can be carried very far. It can be effected in many respects, but it can be carried so far that it will lead practically to the stifling of inventive genius. It strikes me, therefore, that a government standard machine is a thing which is a long way in the future.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I understand we were discussing also the following item, 368.

Items agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—maintenance of terminal elevators, and necessary equipment, $10,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for the change there?

Mr. ROBB: There is a decrease of $85,000, an amount which was last year required to provide some improvements at Vancouver. This year there is an item of $10,000 for the Moose Jaw elevators.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The reduction means that certain work in construction which was done last year will not have to be done this year.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—weaights and measures inspection, $310,000.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand there is a charge made for the inspection of public scales. Does this charge meet the cost of the work?

Mr. ROBB: For many years this department showed a loss; this year, for the first time since its organization, there will be a small surplus.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I wish to get some information from the minister bearing upon the answer to a question put in the House regarding the Peterborough district. It would appear that this district is practically self-supporting—in fact, more so—but it is possible that the figures do not cover the whole cost. When the question was put as to what percentage of the moneys collected by the inspector was received by the government the answer was given 100 per cent. The sum of $892 was collected and I would ask what was paid out in cartage.

[Mr. White.]

Mr. ROBB: Is that in Peterborough or in the Belleville district?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): The question placed on the order paper had reference to the inspector of weights and measures for the Peterborough district, but I believe this is the same district as the Belleville district.

Mr. ROBB: It is the Belleville district. I have not at the moment the details my hon. friend wants but I will be glad to get that information for him.

Mr. MILNE: When a gasoline pump is tested by the inspector and the pump is shown to be short, or does not give a gallon, is there a prosecution for short measure? In the gathering of something over thirty samples of gasoline in the province of Manitoba—a gallon being collected at each station—I think there were only two stations in the entire list where there was a clear gallon; the remainder were all short.

Mr. ROBB: The government's responsibility is inspecting the accuracy of the machine; we are not responsible for the operation of the machine. If there is a shortage I submit the question of prosecution is a provincial one.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is there a standard cartage charge? As I understand, the inspector goes into a town or village and inspects the scales in rotation, and that it is the practice to charge $2.50 for cartage in each case. The complaint has been made that sometimes this charge is excessive; that there is no reason to make a charge of $2.50 for cartage when the inspector simply goes from one door to the next.

Mr. ROBB: The cartage charge would vary somewhat in proportion to the size of the weights that the inspector had to carry about. It might also vary in different localities. My hon. friend will understand that there might be places where the charge for cartage would be less than in other communities. Of course this matter is governed by regulations and my hon. friend will understand that we do not carry those regulations around in the record. However I will get my hon. friend the information he desires.

Mr. CALDWELL: With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Milne) I have had very grave doubt in my own mind for some time as to the advisability of the department allowing the use of these pumps to measure gasoline or oil. For instance, the inspector may inspect them and they may be perfectly all right, but there is a possibility that the valve of that pump may

vary the least bit. Gasoline is something that escapes very readily if the valves of the pump are not just as they should be. Then there is a want of suction and you will not get the amount of gasoline you should get. I found on one occasion that the man had put twelve gallons into the ten gallon tank of my car. I told him that I did not mind paying for the gasoline, but I did not want a ten gallon tank stretched by putting twelve gallons into it. How often this thing happens we do not know, and it is worthy of the minister's consideration as to whether the use of these pumps should be continued. They are very convenient, I admit, and one of the things put forward in their favour by salesmen themselves is the fact that they will save their price on the machine in a very short time.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend knows—he is more familiar with the facts than I am—that there are many varieties of this pump on the market. In some cases the department has refused to recognize them. I am not sure, however, whether we should accept the advice of my hon. friend and not inspect them. Perhaps they require inspection oftener. I can quite see that there is a chance for some fraud to be practised.

Mr. CALDWELL: How often are they supposed to be inspected?

Mr. ROBB: Once a year, but if there is a complaint they are inspected oftener.

Mr. SPENCER: If fault is found, is the license refused until the matter is put right?

Mr. ROBB: They are not allowed to weigh on a scale unless it has been put right.

Mr. SPENCER: Would the same rule apply to a pump for oil after it is inspected?

Mr. ROBB: I think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think that once a year is often enough to make an inspection. There is another thing. How many drivers of automobiles, for instance, are in a position to know just how much gasoline has been put into their tank? You seldom have your tank empty. Very few people are in a position to gauge accurately what was in their tank when they began to fill it and what it contained when they were done. I know on the occasion I spoke of I said to the fellow: "There must be something wrong with your pump." He took a gallon measure and pumped it out and it was about two-thirds full. Apparently he was astonished himself and said "I will not use that any more."

Mr. ROBB: I will bring this matter to the attention of the department and see if we cannot adopt a more satisfactory method.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is any certificate issued to the owner and operator of a pump after it is inspected?

Mr. ROBB: The inspector places a stamp on the machine and it is sealed.

Item agreed to.

Printing of parliamentary and departmental publications, including cost of translation of the Canada Year Book, $150,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could we not get back to the old figure in connection with this item?

Mr. ROBB: I am afraid we cannot do that in view of the number of census publications that are being issued.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Exhibition in France, $50,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I wonder if the minister would allow that item to stand in connection with the other.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

VIMY RIDGE MONUMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I desire to move:

That it be resolved that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House doth agree to their Address to His Excellency the Governor General, respectfully requesting that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit our joint resolution to the President of the Republic of France approving the government's acceptance of the gift made by the government of France of a tract of land on Vimy Ridge for the erection of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian soldiers in the Great War, in such a way as to His Excellency may seem fit; by filling in the blank space therein with the words "and Commons".

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adpourned at 11.15 p.m.

Monday, March 5, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

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

That the name of R. M. Johnson be taken from the list of members comprising the standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization and the name of O. R. Gould be inserted in lieu thereof; and that the name of R. M. Johnson be taken from the list of members comprising the standing committee on the Library of Parliament, and the name of H. H. Stevens inserted in lieu thereof; and that the name of T. W. Caldwell be taken from the list of members comprising the special committee on the Redistribution Bill and the name of L. W. Humphrey be inserted in lieu thereof; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint

their Honours that the name of Mr. Johnson has been taken from the list of members comprising the committee on the Library of Parliament, and that of Mr. Stevens inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT

Report of the Civil Service Commission on the administration of the Public Service Act, as provided by section 7 of that act.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ADVANCES TO MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HARRIS:

1. What is the total amount of advances made by the government to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners by way of loan or otherwise?
2. What is the total amount of interest paid to the government by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners in respect of such assistance?
3. What is the rate of interest paid by the Harbour Commission to the government?
4. What rate does the government pay on the money which it borrows to provide such loans to the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. $32,435,000 up to February 22, 1923.
2. Total interest received from 1867 to January 31, 1923, $12,419,053.60.
3. 3 per cent on $9,250,000; 3½ per cent on $17,235,000; 5 per cent on $5,950,000.
4. Advances having been made from the consolidated revenue fund, they are not, strictly speaking, applicable to particular borrowings. Of late government borrowings have been made at 5½ per cent interest per annum.

THE DAVIDSON REPORT

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Is it the intention of the government to publish the report of the Davidson Commission?
2. If not, for what reason?
3. Did the report show that excessive profits had been made in war orders?
4. If so, what firms or individuals were implicated?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The Report of the Honourable Sir Charles Davidson, as a commissioner to investigate sales of small arms ammunition was published in 1917.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. The report speaks for itself.
4. Answered by No. 3.

SAFEGUARDS TO NAVIGATION

Mr. SIMPSON:

1. Was the Government Steamer Lambton lost last spring with all on board while attempting to place the lightkeepers in their respective stations on the north shore of Lake Superior for the season's operations?
2. Was the tug Reliance wrecked last autumn while attempting to remove these lightkeepers from their stations at the close of the season's operations?
3. Has the government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received resolutions from the Sault Ste. Marie city council board of trade, or other public bodies, recommending certain safeguards to navigation on Lake Superior?
4. Is it the intention of the government to adopt any of the suggestions mentioned in these resolutions?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. They are at present receiving consideration.

D.S.C.R. HOSPITALS

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. What was the cost of maintenance per patient per day in each of the D.S.C.R. hospitals in Canada for the years 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the strength of the headquarters of the D.S.C.R. for year ending 1921, and year ending 1922?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Statement showing average cost per patient per day in each of the D.S.C.R. hospitals in Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1922, and for the period of nine months, ended December 31st, 1922.

Institution	Average cost per patient per day, 12 months ending March 31st, 1922	Average cost per patient per day, 9 months ending December 31st, 1922
General Treatment and Mental Hospitals		
Ste. Annes, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.	$3 07	$3 04
Camp Hill, Halifax, N.S.	2 98	3 83
Lancaster, St. John, N.B.	2 97	3 09
*Sydenham, Kingston, Ont.	3 42	3 53
Christie St., Toronto, Ont.	3 41	3 64
Euclid Hall, Toronto, Ont.	7 51	7 85
Brant Hospital, Burlington, Ont.	2 72	3 40
Westminster, London, Ont.	2 89	2 63
Deer Lodge, Winnipeg, Man.	2 28	2 38
Strathcona, Edmonton, Alta.	3 27	2 70
Col. Belcher, Calgary.	3 50	3 31
Sunnyside, Calgary, Alta.	3 75	Closed
Shaughnessy, Vancouver, B.C.	3 34	3 62
Averages.	3 16	3 27
Tuberculosis Sanatoria		
Jordan Memorial, River Glade, N.B.	4 19	4 30
Laurentian, Ste. Agathe des Monts, P.Q.	3 65	3 76
Mowat, Kingston, Ont.	4 81	3 19
Central Alberta, Keith, Alta.	4 34	3 50
Averages.	4 16	3 62

*Closed January 1923.

2. The staff strength of the headquarters of the D.S.C.R. on the 31st of December, 1921, was 1,078, and on the 31st of December, 1922, 805.

CREOSOTED COMMODITIES—DUTIES

Mr. CLARK:

What duties, if any, are payable on the following commodities: (a) Creosoted piling; (b) Creosoted railway ties; (c) Creosoted constructional timbers; (d) Creosoted lumber; (e) Creosoted planks; (f) Creosoted cross arms; (g) Creosote?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: (a) Wooden piling, not further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, is free of customs duty. (b) Creosoted railway ties of wood are free of customs duty. (c) Creosoted constructional timbers, not further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, are free of customs duty, but, when further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, are subject to duty at the rate of 17½ per cent ad valorem, British preferential tariff, and 25 per cent ad valorem, general tariff. (d) Lumber, not further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, is free of customs duty, but, when further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, is subject to duty at the rate of 17½ per cent ad valorem, British preferential tariff, and 25 per cent ad valorem, general tariff. (e) Planks, not further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, are free of customs duty, but when further manufactured than sawn or split and creosoted, are subject to duty at the rate of 17½ per cent ad valorem, British preferential tariff, and 25 per cent ad valorem, general tariff. (f) Creosoted wooden cross arms for use on telephone or telegraph poles, are subject to duty at the rate of 17½ per cent ad valorem, British preferential tariff, and 25 per cent ad valorem, general tariff. (g) Coal tar creosote oil of specific gravity heavier than water, is free of customs duty but, when of specific gravity not heavier than water, it is subject to duty at 15 per cent ad valorem, British preferential tariff, and 17½ per cent ad valorem, general tariff.

PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY—LINCOLN COUNTY

Mr. CHAPLIN:

1. How many miles of the provincial highway between Hamilton and Queenston are in the county of Lincoln?

2. What has been the total cost of this road, within the county of Lincoln, up to the 31st December, 1922?

3. What further amount will be required to complete it?

4. What amount has been paid by the Dominion government for this roadway, within the county of Lincoln, up to the period mentioned?

5. What is the approximate amount yet to be provided by the Dominion government to complete the road?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 26·2 miles.

2. Inspection by federal engineer shows total cost within the county of Lincoln to 15th June, 1922, for federal aid purposes to have been $492,729.

3. For federal aid purposes, $171,000 (estimated).

4. $194,091.24, up to December 31, 1921; accounts for 1922 expenditures have not yet been supplied by the Ontario department.

5. Estimated amount to be provided by the Dominion on account of the road in Lincoln county is $71,400.

ACCREDITED HERDS—RICHMOND

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many herds of cattle have come in under the present accredited system in the county of Richmond?

2. What are the names of the farmers who had their herds tested, and what are their addresses?

3. How many cattle were destroyed under the accredited herd system in the said county?

4. How many were pure-bred and how many were grades?

5. What was the total amount of money paid for the pure-bred and what was the total amount paid for the grades?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. 15.

2. Burrill Bros., Gore; J. L. Cayouette, Bromptonville; H. W. and O. A. Fowler, Kingsbury; R. W. Frank, Kingsbury; G. W. Goodenough & Son, Danville; E. G. Fletcher, Richmond; C. G. Hall, Danville; W. H. Healy & Sons, Richmond; McMorine Bros., Richmond; A. McKay, Upper Melbourne; G. Blais & P. Poirier, Bromptonville; Richmond Jerseys, Richmond; C. Therrien, St. Francois Xavier; E. W. Tobin, Bromptonville; A. Ponton, Bromptonville.

3. 1920 to February 28, 1923, 183.

4. Pure breds, 145; grades, 38.

5. Pure breds, $21,556.66; grades, $2,116.66.

ACCREDITED HERDS—WOLFE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many herds of cattle have come in under the present accredited system of herding in the county of Wolfe?

2. What are the names of the farmers who have had their herds tested, and what are their addresses?

3. How many cattle were destroyed under the accredited herd system in the said county?

4. How many were pure-bred and how many were grades?

5. What was the total amount of money paid for the pure-bred and what was the total amount paid for the grades?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. One.

2. J. H. Crepeau, St. Camille.

3. None.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT SCHEME

Mr. COOTE:

1. What were the amounts due to the Dominion government in each province, in the year 1922, under the Soldier Settlement scheme?
2. What amounts have been paid to the Dominion government, in each province, to date?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. British Columbia, $449,500.77; Alberta, $871,794.62; Saskatchewan, $786,790.26; Manitoba, $485,080.15; Ontario, $232,531.62; Quebec, $59,626.79; Maritime Provinces, $131,-140.68.

2. British Columbia, $204,330.68; Alberta, $301,939.42; Saskatchewan, $481,626.74; Manitoba, $218,008.04; Ontario, $188,178.93; Quebec, $24,149.13; Maritime provinces, $81,-421.46.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES IN TORONTO

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Has the government or the Railway department had any correspondence with the Imperial Bank with a view to purchasing the northwest corner of King and Yonge streets, Toronto?
2. Did the government give the Imperial Bank any notice of intention to expropriate, or wish to acquire the property prior to filing notice of expropriation?
3. If purchase is intended, what price is being offered?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. No.
3. Amount of compensation has not yet been settled.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FIXED CHARGES

Mr. KNOX:

1. What were the fixed charges in 1922 on the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk railway, in each case?
2. How much, in each case, was due to the public, and how much to the government?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The details which form the reply to this question are not yet complete. I hope to bring them down in a few days in the railway statement, and if my hon. friend would drop the question he will get a reply when I bring down the statement.

Question dropped.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

TAX COLLECTIONS AND EXPENSES

Mr. BLACK (Huron):

1. What was the total cost of collecting the customs and excise taxes for the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the total amount of rental paid for offices used in connection with the said work during the above mentioned years?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

3. What would the total amount of interest amount to on money invested in buildings owned by the government and used in connection with the collection of said taxes during the above stated years?
4. What is the total amount of salaries paid in connection with the said collections during the years mentioned?
5. What is the total amount of all other expenses incidental to the collecting of customs and excise taxes during the said years?
6. What was the total amount of customs and excise taxes collected during the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many temporary employees were made permanent by the Civil Service Commission, between March 15, 1921, and the day the late government resigned?
2. How many of the above mentioned employees passed the civil service examination?
3. How many of the said employees cannot write and were unable to sign their names, but simply affixed a cross to the form of oath required by the act?

PRODUCTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What quantity and value of each of the following commodities have been exported from Canada during the past year, and what amount of duty was payable (or collected) on each (a) Agricultural machinery or farm equipments (b) Meats (c) Animal grease, oils, or fats; (d) Milk and milk products; (e) Cattle, calf and sheep skins, green or salted; (f) Wool; (g) Eggs; (h); Apples, green; (i) Potatoes; (j) Fish and fishery products?
2. What quantity and value of each of the above commodities have been produced in Canada during the past year?

QUEBEC ROADS

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What plans for roads were submitted by the Quebec government, for the approval of the Dominion government, by virtue of the Highways Act?
2. What plans were approved?
3. What sums were paid by the Dominion government towards these approved roads?

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—DOCTORS

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. How many doctors are employed by the government railways, whether the I.C.R., C.N.R., or the G.T.R., in the province of Quebec?
2. What are their names and addresses?
3. What salaries do they receive?
4. On whose recommendation were these appointments made?
5. Are they allowed to take part in politics, either provincial or federal?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

ARCTIC ISLANDS AND NORTHERN QUEBEC

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government and any firm or party pertaining to the occupancy of Arctic Islands, and northern Quebec, by various expeditions in those regions, including a copy of reports on results of said expeditions.

Also copy of all contracts, if any, entered into between the government and any firm or party granting privileges on said territory.

CANADIAN PACIFIC—QUEBEC TERMINALS

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all contracts entered into between Canadian Pacific Railway and the Transcontinental Commission or the government, concerning the price and conditions for the use by Canadian National or Transcontinental Railway of Canadian Pacific Railway terminals and station at the city of Quebec.

OTTAWA RIVER WATER STORAGE

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all agreements entered into between the government and any party relating to maintenance and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith and settlement of land damages.

TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL OFFICIALS

Mr. MARTELL:

For a return showing the various technical and professional officials appointed to the Civil Service of Canada during the years from September, 1911, to December, 1922, both years inclusive, with a statement showing the salaries of each official, the qualification of each official and the method employed by the Civil Service Commission to select each said technical and professional official; also a detailed statement naming the examiners in each case and the office to which the party selected was appointed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—EMPLOYEES

Mr. BOUCHARD:

For a return showing the names, occupations, salaries, bonus included, and address of all inside and outside employees of the Department of Agriculture.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of all orders in council passed since the first day of January, 1922, in any way relating to the Canadian National Railways or any railway now forming part of the National System.

GRAND TRUNK—UNITED STATES TERMINALS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of the agreements made between the Grand Trunk Railway or any company affiliated therewith, relating to terminal facilities or grade crossing eliminations in the cities of Chicago and Detroit in the United States of America, executed since the 31st day of December, 1922.

ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 223

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

For a copy of Order in Council P.C. 223 of February 7th, 1922.

NEW BRUNSWICK EXPORT WAREHOUSES

Mr. CALDWELL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, exchanged between the government, or any department or official thereof, and the government of New Brunswick, or any department or official thereof, with regard to the establishing of liquor export warehouses, or other export warehouses in the province of New Brunswick, within the last two years.

LABOUR STRIKES IN 1922

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York) moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents and other writings relating to the strikes of workers in shipping, railway and other crafts in 1922 and also for copy of the opinion of the Department of Justice given in relation to the conduct of either employers or employees affected by such strikes.

He said: This is the matter that was discussed between the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) and myself the last time the motion was called. Owing to the fact that he told me that this would be a very long job, and as I did not want to give any unnecessary work, I suggested—and no doubt the minister has had an opportunity of reading over my statement in Hansard—that the matter should be contracted. Unrevised Hansard reads, at page 514:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents and other writings relating to the strikes—

That means, not only strikes, but contemplated strikes where the department has been called upon to take action.

—of workers in shipping, railway and other crafts in 1922 and also for copy of the opinion of the Department of Justice given in relation to the conduct of either employers or employees affected by such strikes.

All communications of whatsoever sort exchanged between the departments of government or any member of any department of government with any persons or companies respecting the Sydney coal strike of last winter. All communications made to or received by any department of the government and by the railways in connection with the shop trades' controversy of last summer, and concerning the Alberta coal strike in the fall of 1922.

It was also asked at the time that the correspondence between the Department of Labour and Mr. John L. Lewis should be brought down. That has since been supplied on another return, so that that part of the original motion may be struck out.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I think the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has two motions confused. In the one under discussion there is no reference to any correspondence with Mr. Lewis, but there was in another one, the return for which has been prepared for my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I enlarged it; I did not know that that had been covered.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have written a couple of letters to my hon. friend asking just what is desired. I intimated that there were no strikes in the shipping or railways of the country. He then struck out the words, "and other crafts," and this made the order immaterial; there was nothing then to give to my hon. friend. If he would place on the order

paper what is desired, we would be only too glad to endeavour to secure it for him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was placed before my hon. friend on February 21, at page 514 of Hansard. My hon. friend is quite right; I dropped all reference to the question of correspondence between Mr. Lewis and the department.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am still in doubt, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would rule that something concrete should be placed before the Labour department, so that we would know what the hon. gentleman desires, and we would then be only too glad and anxious to get it for him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is on Hansard. It is immaterial to me whether I re-draft the motion and submit it to you, Sir, or my hon. friend, or whether the motion goes through on the understanding of what I read from Hansard of February 21, at page 514.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I point out that as the motion asks for correspondence relating to certain matters "and other crafts," that request would include practically all the correspondence in the Department of Labour on the subject of strikes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, but we got past that point. The Prime Minister was not listening to what I said. I pointed out that, as appears in Hansard of February 21, I had so changed the wording of the motion as materially to cut it down. If the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has any difficulty in gathering the purport of that amended motion I will re-draft it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise the hon. member to re-draft his motion. The motion is dropped.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I think it had better stand.

Motion stands.

MATT C. BECKETT

Hon. Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. Duncan) moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, and writings of any kind, relating to the appointment of, and discontinuance from office of, Matt C. Beckett, of Owen Sound, Ont.

Mr. BUREAU: A question to the same effect appeared on the order paper some time ago and was answered. Three letters which were exchanged were produced.

Mr. STEVENS: I was under the impression that this resolution was passed before, but it is still on the order paper.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. BUREAU: I thought I brought down the answer.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

On the motion of Mr. Woodsworth:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the public interest that the present Royal Canadian Mounted Police force be disbanded and that there be organized (a) a federal police force for the protection of government buildings and other federal property, (b) a Northwest Mounted Police force whose activities would be confined to unorganized territories.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have just had a communication from the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) intimating his inability to be present to-day and asking to have this motion stand. If I may have an assurance from the Prime Minister that we shall have an opportunity to discuss it on another occasion I shall be glad to comply with the minister's request.

Motion stands.

FOREST PROTECTION

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable for the purpose of the preservation of our great forest wealth that the government of Canada should co-operate with the governments of the several provinces.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special interest in the Canadian Forestry Association for many years, and have also read carefully all forestry reports published by that asociation and by the Forestry branch of the Department of Interior. I beg to congratulate and to thank the personnel of these two bodies for their splendid work. They have taken great pains to secure information on this important subject and I am more than thankful to them for the facts which I have been enabled to obtain in connection therewith. We are told that a country without a forest is like a man without a heart. We have forests in this country, the estimated value of which is over two billion dollars, an amount sufficient to pay our present national debt. In 1922, there were over 4,000 forest fires in Canada, and Mr. Robson Black, secretary of the Canadian Forestry Association, has stated that these fires destroyed more lumber than all our forest industries or our own lumbermen could consume in many years of operation. Further, he states that the timber limits destroyed last year would cover a space between Halifax and Winnipeg a mile in width. I have here a report published in one of the Ottawa newspapers of a meeting held

recently in this city. At this meeting Mr. W. H. Shapley, who presided, made some remarks in connection with our forest industries. He is reported thus:

> Time and money was spent to prevent disease and loss in agriculture, laws were enacted to prevent workingmen being injured, and capable men were doing research work in many departments, but little or no attention was paid to means of preventing fire loss.
>
> Mr. Shapley stated that the annual fire loss in the Dominion was a disgrace to its citizens. Complaints were being made of the burden of taxation, yet few were disturbed over an annual fire loss of 45 millions and many valuable lives.
>
> Responsibility for conditions as they were could not be placed upon the fire fighting organizations maintained in this country. The fundamental error was that too great stress was placed on the extinguishing of fires and too little emphasis placed on the necessity of safeguarding the hazards from which fire originate.

There is not a province in the Dominion which has not its timber limits and I know that the government of each province desires the heartiest co-operation in order to preserve its natural wealth. I was very much interested in an article published recently on this subject, in its bearing on the province of New Brunswick. I would quote the following:

> The annual agricultural and forest crops of New Brunswick comprise about 85 per cent of the total value of all products produced. The forests cover about 70 per cent of the total area of the province, and the total value of the forest products produced averages about $35,000,000. Agricultural products in 1922 were valued at $42,965,000. These two great industries, lumbering and farming, combine to keep New Brunswick stable. . . . . There are thirty-four acres of forest land for every man, woman and child in the province, while cultivated farming land under field crops aggregates two and one-half acres per capita.
>
> The rural population is much greater than the total in towns and cities. Farming communities in fertile valleys and on rich uplands are surrounded by forests. During the long winter months when the prairie farmer the potato planter and the fruit grower are more or less idle, the New Brunswick farmer is busily engaged cutting logs either in the timber limits of the lumber companies or on his own wood-lot getting out logs, lathwood, pulpwood or cordwood. Did you ever meet a man from rural New Brunswick who did not know how to use an axe? It is estimated that 10,00 men are employed in the lumber woods this winter. More than $2,000,000 will be paid out in wages and board before the annual cut of fifteen million logs will be safely skidded on the bank of the streams. The forest payroll of the long winter months keeps the farm on a stable footing in that period between harvesting and sowing. If the reader doubts this statement, let him ask any of the merchants in the rural districts about conditions during the 1921-22 season when the depression in the lumber industry was at the lowest level, and there was little or no work in the woods. The same condition would arise and exist for a century if these same forest trees were burned.

The flames that destroyed many homes, wrecked business and caused the death of many men were contributed to to a greater or less extent by the carelessness of lumber men, campers and others who frequent our forests. In this connection allow me to repeat the words of a United States forestry commissioner. In a report recently submitted to Congress—which, by the way, was read at a meeting of our Forestry Association held in Ottawa—concerning the damage to American forests, it is declared:

> When the forests fail the lumber business, one of the greatest industries of the country will disappear. Suffering among all building trades will follow; mining will become vastly more expensive. The price of coal, iron and other minerals will rise. When this occurs the railways will be directly affected and the cost of transportation will increase. In brief, when forests commence to fail every man, woman, and child in the United States will feel the pinch. Through past misuse forests are undoubtedly failing.

There is a lesson for Canada here. Experts have readily admitted that Canadian forests constitute one of the world's greatest reserves of timber. That they should be ruthlessly wasted by fire and other agencies is tragic and unnecessary.

While it is true that the government has done much to protect the forests, there is very much that yet remains to be done. The population of the consuming area tributary to our forests has increased fivefold during the past half century, but its wood consumption has increased tenfold or more. The natural resources of Canada are the envy of the world. To squander these resources is nothing less than criminal.

On reliable information it seems that about 150,000,000 cords of wood, or fifty years' supply, were destroyed by insects in the last ten years in the province of Quebec. In the same province 800,000 acres were burned over in 1921, and only a little over 1,000 acres were planted. And still millions of trees were exported from eastern Canada to the United States in the same year. The Boston Herald, in connection with this great destruction, says:

> What adds to the pity is that most of the timber destroyed by our woodland fires is so young as to belong to generations not old enough to protect it.

So far, I believe, the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick have the most practical laws to protect their forest reserves. I have in my possession the Forest Act of the province of New Brunswick. This was passed in 1918 and has been amended from time to time since. I must admit that in New Brunswick we have copied to a certain extent legislation enacted by the province of Quebec. Let me acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Quebec with its great forest reserves has given an excellent example to all the other provinces of how to take care of this natural wealth.

Reports, based on comprehensive surveys, have been published by the Commission of

Conservation in regard to the forests of Nova Scotia and British Columbia and an inventory of the Ontario forests commenced by that Commission is being completed by the Forestry Branch of the Department of the Interior. The Forestry branch has I am informed examined a very considerable area of the forest land in the prairie provinces and the forest services of Quebec and New Brunswick are collecting data as to the forest resources in their respective provinces, but the information available is still far from complete.

On the basis of what knowledge I have, however, an attempt has been made to arrive at a tentative estimate of the remaining timber supplies in the Dominion. It must be admitted that this estimate is largely a matter of opinion and is subject to revision as new data is secured. It would appear that including all classes of timber, saw material, pulpwood, ties, poles, fuel, etc., accessible and inaccessible, the total stand may be approximately as follows:

	Softwood million ft. B.M.	Hardwood million ft. B.M.	Total million ft. B.M.
Eastern provinces.	300,000	100,000	400,000
Prairie provinces.	140,000	85,000	225,000
British Columbia.	360,000	1,800	361,800
	800,000	186,800	986,800

Note.—Hardwood includes poplar and cottonwood as well as woods generally known as "hardwoods."

It is estimated that of this about 560 billion feet is of saw timber size.

Of the species which are used for the manufacture of pulp, there is estimated to be 850 million cords of spruce, balsam and western hemlock and 490 million cords of jack pine, lodgepole pine, eastern hemlock, poplar and cottonwood; a total of 1,340 million cords. About 650 million cords of this is in eastern Canada. Included in the pulpwood estimate is 500 million cords which is also saw material and will doubtless be used to a very considerable extent as lumber.

Accessibility is a most important factor in considering forest resources. It is difficult, however, to estimate the extent to which these resources may become commercially valuable since accessibility depends on changing conditions such as transportation facilities, methods of exploitation, market standards, price of products and cutting regulations. Under present conditions it is doubtful that more than one-half of the saw material and one-third of the pulpwood, exclusive of the prairie provinces, can be considered commercially accessible.

The average annual cut is now approximately as follows:

	Million feet, B.M.
Lumber..	4,000
Pulpwood, 4,000,000 cords..	2,000
Fuel, 8,000,000 cords..	4,000
Shingles, ties, poles, etc. (estimated)..	1,000
Total..	11,000

A superficial comparison of the above figures might lead to the conclusion that we still have sufficient timber to supply our requirements for an indefinite period, but such a conclusion is unwarranted when all the facts are considered. It must be remembered that these estimates will doubtless be considerably reduced when more authentic information is secured, that a large proportion of the timber can probably never be operated at a profit, that under the present system of exploitation a great deal of the timber is wasted, and that fire, insects and fungi are destroying many times the amount of timber used.

It was estimated that in British Columbia fire had destroyed twenty-two times the amount of timber cut prior to 1917, and there is reason to believe that similar conditions exist in the other provinces. The spruce bud worm has destroyed, it is estimated, at least 100 million cords of pulpwood in Quebec and 15 million cords in New Brunswick during the last ten years. This is equal to twenty-nine times the annual cut of pulpwood in the whole Dominion. Other insects are also destroying vast amounts of timber. No attempt has been made to estimate the damage done by fungi, but it would appear to be as great as that caused by either fire or insects.

It is apparent to all who are familiar with the situation that the timber resources within reach of the established industries, especially in eastern Canada, are being depleted to such an extent that unless provision is made for the growing of new crops of timber, these industries are faced with the necessity of curtailment of production or entire abandonment of their operations. The constantly increasing cost of securing supplies for the saw mills and pulp mills is an evidence of this condition and has led to several of the pulp companies undertaking reforestation measures.

In addition, it must be pointed out that we must be prepared for a greatly increased demand for our forest products. In a recent report to the United States Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture said:

Three-fifths of the original timber of the United States is gone, and we are using timber four times as fast as we are growing it. The forests remaining are so localized as greatly to reduce their national utility. The bulk of the population and manufacturing industries of the United States are dependent

upon distant supplies of timber as the result of the depletion of the principal forest areas east of the Great Plains.

Already the United States is dependent on Canada for two-thirds of its newsprint and our total exports of wood and wood products to the United States in 1922 were valued at over $148,000,000. With the growth of population and decreasing supplies of timber in the United States, we must expect increased demand for our forest products and we should be in a position to take advantage of this expanding and profitable market at our doors. Canada is the principal source of all kind of timber within the British Empire, and our exports to other parts of the Empire and to the Orient are rapidly increasing. With the growth of population in the Dominion our needs for home consumption are bound to be greater; for, in spite of the use of substitutes, the use of wood continues to increase. Our immense forest area is capable of providing a very much greater output if handled with the view of maintaining production. This means protection from fire for both mature and young timber, control of injurious insect and fungi by establishing healthy conditions for growth, and the securing of reproduction by either natural or artificial means.

Dry weather will not prevent a tree from growing. Hail storms cannot destroy our forests; wet seasons do not affect them; floods only stimulate their growth. Trees do not require cultivation in the sense that other products of the land require it; if the forests are protected from fires and if the timber is cut as it should be, forest products will be assured to us in large quantities for years to come. But in the East we have had some difficulty during the last few years in exporting our lumber, because, about the time we are ready to ship it, our friends in the prairie provinces are ready to ship their wheat and every available car in the East is taken to the West for that purpose. I am one of those who like to see our friends in the West grow a good crop and export it to advantage, but we in the East have been handicapped for some years on account of this lack of cars. Especially was this the case last fall. We were glad to see the splendid crop that our friends in the West had, going out, as it did, to many different parts of the world, and we admired the splendid results of their efforts to produce as much wheat as possible. Our lumbermen in the East, however, were making the request that at least a reasonable percentage of these cars should remain in our province in order to facilitate the export of our lumber. After the lumber is sawn early in the spring, it lies in the yards for three or four months until it dries, and that is about the time that it is shipped to different markets in the United States and other parts of the world. Thus our export season for lumber is the same as the export season for the wheat of the prairies.

In conclusion, I would ask the government to co-operate as much as possible in the preservation of our forests so that they may be made the national asset that they can be if they are conserved as I have suggested.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a subject which has not sufficiently impressed the people of the country generally; there are only a few men in Canada who realize its importance. We have one man in the Maritime provinces who is so strongly impressed with the necessity of protecting our forests that he is spending a large amount of money in a personal campaign to educate the public in this connection. Last summer he offered a prize of $5,000 for the best essay on the destruction of the spruce bud moth. Our government in New Brunswick has a very good system of fire protection: lookout stations are established on nearly all the high mountains of the province; these are connected by telephone with headquarters in the centres of population so that forest fires may be detected in their early stages and dealt with before they spread. In that respect we are carrying on good work, but that work was started about thirty years too late. I am firmly convinced that more lumber has been destroyed by fire in New Brunswick than has ever been cut by the woodsman's axe. The destruction of the lumber is not the only consideration; the potential value of the land for the growing of trees has practically disappeared, due to the burning of the soil. Where the lumbermen cut over they take the larger trees; the smaller growth trees then grow more rapidly, and a crop of logs can be harvested every ten years if the cutting is judiciously done. On the other hand, spruce land which is burned over is hardly ever of any further use for the growing of trees, and that is one reason why forest fires are such a serious menace to the lumber industry.

It is also a fact that if our forest areas become depleted there will be less moisture throughout the land. I do not need to emphasize that point so far as our friends from the prairies are concerned; where there are no forests there is little or no moisture. In eastern Canada the depletion of our forests is becoming a serious menace from this point of view; our streams are drying up;

we have less moisture—less rainfall in summer and less snow in winter. Our crops are therefore in danger if we allow this depletion to continue.

The gentleman who offered the $5,000 prize for the best essay on the preservation of our forests has also offered prizes to provincial governments and private individuals for the best reforestation work in the eastern provinces, and in the carrying on of this campaign he has paid out large sums from his own private purse. I do not know what the federal government is doing at present in connection with the destruction of our forests by the spruce bud moth, but I think the Department of Agriculture could very well take under consideration the expending of some money in research work to find out if there is any possible way of combating this very destructive pest. I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but I could not let this opportunity pass without trying to impress on the House and the government the necessity of some work along this line.

Hon. C. A. STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I think we all agree that the forest is one of the most important sources of wealth that Canada possesses. Let me say at the outset that I am entirely in accord with the resolution. It would be a considerable impetus to the Forestry Branch of the Department of Interior to have the co-operation of the provincial authorities in the preservation of the forest wealth of the country. Anyone travelling through Canada this year could not help but be struck with the very great destruction which has resulted through forest fires. The destruction by the moth is a serious menace to the forests of eastern Canada, but probably fire is the greatest enemy we have to contend with to-day in our forests. If we were to organize from one end of Canada to the other a staff of officials who could prevent the serious destruction annually by forest fires, I do not think it would be necessary for either of my friends to make a speech urging the preservation of the forests of Canada.

I find on investigation in the Forestry branch that we are giving some attention to reforestation, but it appears to me that the thing on which we should be united, and upon which we should spend our greatest effort, both at the moment and for a considerable time to come until this menace is overcome to a very large degree, is preventing the spread of forest fires. That is one thing we can unite upon, and that is one reason I am glad that this resolution has been introduced. Most of the provinces of Canada control their own forests, and intervention on our part is more or less a matter of sufferance. I have only to say that, so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, the Forestry branch will welcome any suggestion by which we can work in harmony with the various provinces of Canada for the preservation of the forest wealth of this country.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am not so particularly concerned about the fate of this resolution. It is a colourless, meaningless production, dealing with an important subject but in so gingerly a way that the passing of it means nothing at all. The subject, though, is of consequence and of pressing consequence. It becomes more pressing every year and I venture to say that its imperious character has not been realized by the people of Canada, and I fear I must say has not been realized by the government of Canada.

Co-operation is a word that covers a multitude of sins in these days, or rather, covers a multitude of omissions; but what is in mind when we advocate co-operation? The subject demands action; it demands a broad big policy and the inauguration of that policy now. Consequently, we should not pass lightly over a resolution of this kind without taking the occasion to press home to the government the imperative demand that such a policy be evolved.

I did not expect this discussion to be precipitated to-day. I am not prepared with the figures and the data I would like to be armed with, but I can, I think, recall enough facts to show the serious character of the position we are in, and as I do so, I am not attributing the position we are in to anyone in particular. I am not saying that governments have failed to keep up with public opinion on the question. I am saying, though, that public opinion has failed to keep up with the increasing importance of the subject from year to year, and that consequently parliament has not been alive to that importance itself. I lived for some years under the impression which I think now was a delusion, that the rate of depletion of our forest areas was not greater than the rate of accretion, that is to say, that the production from year to year was overtaking the damage by fire, the damage by disease, and, as well, the reduction by the lumber cut. I do not think there is a question of doubt that that is not only not the case, but that it is so very far from being the truth that we are rapidly approaching the end of our lumber resources.

Mr. Barnum, the gentleman who no doubt is referred to by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), has produced an array of statistics and a weight of argument

that it seems to me is bound to impress anyone who reads fully his production. At all events, let me say this: I have seen no answer whatever to the case Mr. Barnjum presented. I have seen nothing, indeed, which detracts from the force of his contention that we are within a short time, and not a fraction of a century, but a matter of a very few years at the present rate of depletion and of cut, of the end of our forest resources. Nor have I seen his contention answered that the preservation of our forests as they are to-day, and in the extent they are to-day is vital not only to the supply of timber for our country, but vital as well to getting the real value of our agricultural and other resources in this Dominion. Our rainfall and the distribution of that rainfall is affected by the distribution of our forests, and when our forests are gone the result seems to be inevitable, that the great body of our rainfall gets off the land without adding that nutriment to the soil that comes from keeping the rainfall for a certain time within the soil itself.

There are many other consequences that follow such depletion. The contention is advanced by Mr. Barnjum that the United States of America is within a few years, indeed, less than a dozen at the present rate of consumption, of the end of its forest resources, and that Canada, unless some policy designed to conserve those resources is adopted, is not far from that proximity to the end itself. There has been, of course we all admit, a frightful devastation by fire. There has been an almost equal devastation by the bud-worm and other destroyers of our trees. There has been also, of course, a very considerable depletion by the methods of lumber men. These are going on together, and by present means I venture to say that it is impossible to apply any adequate check. We do, of course, what we can to check the spread of fires in the western provinces where the forests are under the control of the Dominion of Canada, but though we multiply our service to that end and add to our Forestry branch of the Interior department, and though I believe we have very expert and faithful officials, it is none the less true that as our machinery has expanded, the forest fires have expanded in almost equal degree. Coming to the other provinces we cannot apply our machinery there; we cannot apply our regulations. We suffer from that even in the west. We cannot apply them for the reason that the jurisdiction is under the provinces themselves. Consequently, the difficulties that surround the subject are many and great. They would seem indeed almost insurmountable, and I venture such suggestions as I wish to make with very considerable diffidence. But because I believe that discussion is worthless unless we come to grips with some specific idea that is worth discussion and worthy of consideration with a view of getting to some goal, I advance one. We might place the prohibition of a heavy export duty upon our pulpwood. I know there are objections to that; there are objections to every policy. In the provinces there is prohibition upon the export of pulpwood cut on provincial lands. That obtains in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, the two larger provinces of Canada. I think it obtains in other provinces as well. I know of no reason why, if that is good sound and defensible policy in relation to timber owned by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, it would not be a reason equally effective against the exportation of pulpwood from other provinces of Canada. That it would perhaps be met by retaliatory legislation on the part of the United States is an argument which is often advanced. It is a subject that one does not care to discuss until he has viewed it from every angle, but from such study as I have been able to give I am not at all convinced that we are subject to retaliatory legislation that would put us in a position in which we would suffer as much as we are sure to suffer by the continued free exports of pulpwood. That is the suggestion that I commend to the government for its consideration.

Now, to meet another difficulty, and a bigger one, I make this suggestion: it is impossible for any province to adopt legislation looking to the safe cutting of our timber, to the clearing of the land with a view to preventing the spread of fire following the cutting of the timber, unless other provinces do the same. For example, if the province of Quebec were to consider adopting the slash clearing policy, and the province of Ontario did not follow in the same line of policy, then the lumberman of Quebec would be put at a disadvantage with his competitor that would probably be fatal to his business; consequently it follows that whatever is done of any importance to the lumber industry in this regard in one province must be accompanied by a like course in another province, or it becomes impracticable in the province that considers its adoption. Then, how can the Dominion parliament meet the situation with a view to the adoption, say of the slash clearing policy in all the provinces of Canada, because, unless we are going to insist, at whatever cost, on the clearing of the slash after the timber is felled, we simply pave the way,

we feed the flames, and make all our difficulties in the way of preventing and overcoming forest fires in the future. Well, there are two or three ways in which that can be done—two or three, at all events, worth trying. The provinces might be brought together and we might perhaps agree with the governments of those provinces to recommend to their several legislatures the adoption of uniform regulations in this regard. I question if that would succeed. It might succeed and it might not, but if everything should fail it would be at least possible for this Dominion, and in my judgment it would be not only constitutionally practical but would be justified by the stern necessity, to make the failure to clear slash in the public interest an offence by Dominion legislation, and to make it compulsory upon all private operators in timber and on our timber land. If that were done, then unquestionably it should be followed by operators upon public lands in the various provinces.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. member refers to the burning of slash?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I refer to that.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the hon. member realize that our spruce in eastern Canada grows from a tree the size of your arm to trees of very large size, and it is impossible to burn the slash without killing the small growth?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not think it is impossible, without killing the small growth. I know it grows in that way. If the slash is killed by fire wherever it lies, necessarily that would ensue, but it would be quite possible to have regulations that would provide for the gathering or the accumulation of slash, and then provide that it would be got out of the way in some manner, and I presume, of course, by fire, and thereby take away the main cause of the spread of forest fires in future. I for one can see no way in the world in which we can ensure ourselves against the spread of these large forest fires that are devastating the great wealth of the country unless we take away the fuel of these flames. It is this fuel that causes the flames to spread. It is that which starts them going, and though it be a matter of expense, the extent of that expense is already pretty well known. That it does cost something to accumulate and to burn this slash without at the same time destroying the young growth is now pretty well established but it is far better that that cost be borne, and added, indeed, to the cost of our lumber—for there is where it is going to come—than that we now should not only mortgage prosperity to pursue blindly and prodigally a policy that is going to leave the country depleted of not only one of its great sources of its wealth, but of one of those sources that is vital to the other sources, without which the main source at all events is of very little value to our land.

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): It is a matter of general agreement that our forest lands are becoming unduly and greatly depleted. There are three causes for the depletion of our forests—fire, insect diseases, and overcutting. All are important factors. They may vary somewhat in degree, but they are all formidable and large factors in the depletion. The depletion of our forests is a serious matter for the country's welfare, not only on account of the enormous wealth that is being lost, but because the replacement of the forests requires so many years. It is appreciated now—and I do not think we need take an absolutely dark view as regards our forest lands in this respect—that general knowledge is now being diffused throughout the land regarding the serious conditions that exist, and what steps should be taken to prevent it. That of itself is something. It has not reached the point where action is being taken to nearly the extent that it should be taken. It is becoming recognized now that the condition of our forests is somewhat similar to the condition of health in the human being—that there is such a thing as forest health and such a thing as forest disease, and that when forest disease occurs our forests suffer to a very great extent. What causes forest disease? There are two principal causes. One is fire and the other is overcutting. Fire destroys a large portion of the forest and the soil; it lowers the health of the region and encourages, just as is the case in human diseases—the onset and growth of insect disease. In the same way over-cutting encourages plant disease. If forests are overcut, the land dries, the trees die, the high state of health of the forest depreciates, and this allows the onset of insect and lower animal life disease. These are matters of importance for our people to know, so that the problem may be dealt with, with a reasonable hope of success.

What can be done to solve this great and serious economic problem in Canada? I should be disposed to attach a good deal more value to the word "co-operation" than I have so far heard mentioned. And why? Forest lands are the property of the provinces, and the federal government has a Department of Agriculture. This, then, must largely be a

matter of co-operation between the provincial governments and the federal government, and much could be gained by a series of conferences between the federal government, especially its Department of Agriculture, and the local governments. To what effect? So that they would agree and lay down certain standards—what measures should be adopted for the prevention of fire? How should we deal with the removal of slash? To what extent should we attempt to keep our forests clean? How should we deal with insect diseases? It has been mentioned that we must look to the federal Department of Agriculture for more assistance, because they have the entomologists who are carrying on this work. The federal government might help us still further in the matter of plant pathology, in view of the fact that forest diseases are so destructive to our forest life at the present time. We have now reached the point where our forests have suffered so severly that we must have recourse to those measures, and we must preserve our forests and keep them cleaner. We might well turn our eyes towards the condition of forests in France; and if we follow the example of French forestry, where everything is carried out so completely as regards care, cutting, fire protection and removal of slash, this will be very much to our advantage. I quite recognize that this is a matter of process of time. When Canada was a new country, forests were regarded, and we regard them still somewhat, as something to be used without any sense of discrimination or limitation. That time has gone. We must now accustom ourselves to caring for our forests as is being done at the present day in France where the forests are older, the problem larger and greater care required.

Mr. E. A. LAPIERRE (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I believe the federal government should at once take measures to co-operate at least with the Ontario and Quebec governments on account of conditions which at present exist in the northern country. The discovery of gold in Rouyn township, which largely adjoins the boundary of the province of Ontario, has caused a tremendous rush of propectors into that section of northern Ontario. Within the last six or eight months, some twelve or fifteen hundred mining claims have been recorded in the township of Rouyn and adjoining townships. During the coming summer, in conformity with regulations imposed by Ontario and regulations imposed by Quebec, a certain amount of development work will have to be done upon those mining claims. Any of us who are familiar with conditions in Cobalt or in the Porcupine country, knows what happens after prospectors have gone into the bush. The slash may not be as great as that produced by lumbering; but as soon as prospecting and development work starts on a large scale, in a timber country, the same conditions are created that slash creates in a lumbering country. The section of the north country in which these mining claims have been recorded adjoins the largest and most valuable standing pulpwood there is on the North American continent, and in its present location and owing to its density, should a fire, such as the one we had in Porcupine in 1916, start in the slash that will be created in the township of Rouyn and in the district of Kirkland Lake, there will be a repetition of the great conflagration that took place in the Porcupine district and one which will cause Canada one of its greatest losses in its pulpwood wealth. These conditions are being created; we are having to-day a repetition of what took place in the Porcupine country, and nothing less than immediate co-operation between the federal government and the governments of Ontario and Quebec will prevent a serious conflagration in the pulpwood limits of northern Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE: Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from one of the greatest lumber manufacturing centres in Canada, I feel that I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words in commendation of the spirit which prompted the mover of this resolution in bringing this matter before the House. We do not spend enough time in discussing our natural resources, in endeavouring to plan ways by which those resources may be conserved and made use of to best advantage for the people. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has quite properly stated that one of the greatest dangers to our timber is fire. I know that is true in British Columbia. Fire has taken an immense toll of our timber and our trees, and I am afraid it is a very difficult problem to determine the best method of protecting our trees against fire. In this connection, I might mention that in Vancouver there is an air station which is maintained, I think, by the Dominion government. A very splendid work has been done by that station in patrolling the forests of British Columbia. There is an extensive territory to be covered and it is impossible in any other way properly to patrol the forests of that province. Where fires have got under way in the forests of British Columbia it is almost impossible to put them out, and what we

have to do if possible is to prevent them from getting a start. That is what these men are doing. I think they have accomplished a great deal of good and I should be very sorry indeed to hear that there was any proposal to do away with this air station. I have heard it suggested that in the execution of a policy of economy, this service was going to be dispensed with or curtailed. That, I think, would be a mistake. There is no doubt about the importance of our practising economy, but it would be false economy to dispense with, or even to curtail, the air patrol which has done such splendid work in connection with the forests of British Columbia. We must realize that it has taken many hundreds of years to produce the trees that are now standing out there on the Pacific coast. I am told that some of these trees have been a thousand years growing. Now, if a tree of that kind should be destroyed by fire, and if we have to wait another thousand years—

Mr. BUREAU: We will not wait.

Mr. McQUARRIE:—until another one grows, it can be seen what a hopeless outlook there is if some effective means are not taken to prevent fires. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said in reference to the burning of slashings. I am afraid, however, that in British Columbia that would be a great undertaking. It would be a considerable problem to dispose of the limbs that come from one of these giant timbers; I do not know that it would be practicable in our part of the country.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would inform the hon. member that it is not only practicable but it is being done to-day in British Columbia.

Mr. McQUARRIE: To some extent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Very largely.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Should not the province have the right to compel the man who cuts timber on Crown lands to clean up the slashings? He should be made to clean up these slashings at the end of each season and to prove that he has done so. His business is a profitable one and therefore he ought to be made to clean up.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I accept the assurance of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) as to the practicability of this proposal. Of course, if it can be carried out it is something that certainly should be done. I thought, however, that it presented a rather big problem.

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

I think we should make every effort possible to conserve our timber wealth because it is one of the greatest assets we have. In my district we are to-day shipping lumber to a great many parts of the world. The business is almost wholly an export one, and if it had not been for the timber industry in British Columbia during the last few years I am afraid that province would not be in the satisfactory position it occupies to-day. We are doing a world trade in lumber, and as I see it, we have only just started; there is a great future ahead of us. Our timber seems to be unlimited in extent. But unless we take every precaution to protect it from the ravages of fire, I fear it will be sadly depleted. I am very strongly in favour of bringing such matters to the attention of the House and I commend the action of the hon. member (Mr. Michaud) in moving his resolution.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I have been very much pleased to notice from several quarters in the House the commendation of the good work that Mr. Frank Barnjum is doing in educating the Canadian people on this very important subject. Mr. Barnjum is a Canadian who spent some years in the United States, prosperous years I am glad to know, and has now returned to Canada filled with splendid enthusiasm and prepared to do whatever is possible for the promotion of every Canadian industry. He feels a deep interest in this subject because he has been associated with the business for a long time. Everything that he proposes in the way of forest conservation, every movement that can be made for the better protection of the forests from fires, everything that can be done in the way of tree planting, and all that Mr. Barnjum desires in the interests of our forests, will, I am sure, have the heartiest sympathy of the House and the public generally. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) said he had had a revelation in regard to the alleged endless valuable forests of Canada. I had a somewhat similar experience. I am reminded that very many years ago, travelling in Nova Scotia in the southern portion of the province, I had the pleasure of meeting an old Scotsman who was engaged in the lumber business. He had carried on operations in Sweden, Norway, I think, Newfoundland and then in Nova Scotia, and he seemed to have a grievance. Meeting a minister he naturally wanted to air his grievance. He said he had a great complaint to make, because we were charging him a duty on seeds. I said I did not think that the duty on seeds was very high and I did not think that his grievance could be very

grave. I asked him what kind of seeds they were. Spruce seeds, he said. As we looked out of the window of the train we saw a thick spruce forest. "What are you talking about spruce trees for?" I asked him. "Why, there is any quantity of spruce trees in the province." In his broadest Scotch he said: "Mr. Fielding, I give you warning that if there is not a policy of tree planting in Nova Scotia and in this country generally, and in America, within twenty-five years there will be a timber famine in Canada and on the American continent." Well, ten or twelve years passed, and very much of what the old gentleman predicted had come true. At that time he was planting trees. My right hon. friend was substantially, though not technically, correct in his reference to the provincial regulations; and he apparently suggested that what was good enough for Quebec and Ontario was good enough for the other provinces. He rather assumed that there was a prohibition on the export of wood in these provinces. That is not technically correct, although in the main it is. Neither the province of Ontario nor the province of Quebec has the power to prohibit the export of wood or to impose an export duty. But in Ontario and Quebec the provincial governments are owners of timber lands. They lease timber lands to people desiring to operate them; and any landlord who has any land to lease can impose any condition he desires on the lessee. So that the fact is that in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario the export of wood is largely, though not absolutely, prohibited in its raw state. But it is not correct to assume that this prohibition is general, because one of the difficulties is in relation to private lands. My good friend Mr. Barnjum is enthusiastic in all these movements and he goes further than any one who has spoken on this subject. He attaches great importance to the entire prohibition of the export of wood. Perhaps a high export duty might serve the same purpose, but he insists that the export of wood should not be allowed at all. It so happens that there are lands in Quebec that are not owned by the government but by private persons, and no prohibition can be applied to them. On private lands the man who can raise pulpwood thinks he has the same right to handle it as the man who raises any other crop. We heard a good deal on that question years ago in the course of a tariff investigation. At that time the owners of private lands complained very bitterly against any prohibition or restriction being put upon the export of their wood, and they stated that this would be equivalent to placing them at the mercy of a few home manufacturers. I am not adopting one view or the other, I am merely repeating the objections urged on that occasion.

My right hon. friend mentioned retaliation by the United States, and that means a great deal. I am very much impressed myself by the letters Mr. Barnjum has written, and I know he has educated a great many people on the importance of this subject. I must admit that I have at times entertained a considerable measure of sympathy with his proposal that we should absolutely prohibit export, but there are grave difficulties in the way, and anyone who comes from forest districts, notably those in the province of Quebec, where timber areas are in private hands, will see at once that the prohibition or restriction of export would probably create a good deal of ill-feeling. My sympathies go largely to Mr. Barnjum, and perhaps in a little while we shall be able to find a solution of the problem. Meanwhile I think my hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Michaud) has done good service in raising this discussion to-day.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, most of this discussion has been confined to districts where lumbering operations have been in progress, and there the slash is no doubt a menace. But I have travelled hundreds of miles through forests in which no cutting has ever been done, and there I found the marks of fire. I saw now and again lying on the ground the trunks of trees three feet in diameter, which is pretty big for spruce, and I do not believe anything but fire has destroyed what must at one time have been very heavy forest growth. On the edge of these forests one can see where settlers have cut down trees, but as the greater portion of the area belongs to the Dominion government, comparatively little interference has taken place.

I think the resolution is appropriate in calling for co-operation between the Dominion government and the governments of the several provinces to ensure protection of our forest reserves against fire. At one time I was under the impression that Canada had unlimited forest wealth, but since going through various forest areas I have come to the conclusion that there is a limit in this respect unless we stop the ravages of fire.

As to placing an embargo on the export of forest products, I do not see that that would help at all in the part of the country to which I am referring, because it has never been possible, so far, to do any cutting there on a commercial scale. But those forest areas are

worth protecting, and we should educate the people on the importance of co-operating in this national work. No doubt considerable damage has been caused by insects, but I am not well enough acquainted with the actual conditions to speak definitely on this point. It is my opinion, however, that in the wilder lands to which I am referring very little damage has been caused by the depredations of insects; most of it is attributable to fire.

I think this resolution will have a good effect by impressing on the people the need of fire protection if we are to preserve our forest wealth. I agree with my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. McQuarrie) that the aeroplane is the best means of patrolling our forests, for it affords better observation and enables fires to be reported very shortly after they break out, and that is the time we must get after them and control them. Therefore I think the air service is indispensable in taking care of most of our forests outside the settled areas.

Motion agreed to.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF CANADIAN MAGAZINES

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that measures should be adopted to encourage the publication of Canadian magazines and periodicals.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in presenting this resolution is to bring to the attention of the House the very grievous state of an important industry—one which is not only an industry in the ordinary sense of the word, but is a factor in the education of our peoples as well as an important agent in the development of our national life.

We talk of the publishing industry as we would of any other manufacturing industry, but, Mr. Speaker, it is something more than that. The periodical press of a country is an educational institution, and in every country where there has been created and developed a good periodical press, there you will find the national ideals more firmly established and the unity of the people brought about in the most satisfactory manner.

We have a very difficult country in which to establish national unity: we have many racial problems and we have also the problems of geography. In addition to the two chief racial groups, there are in western Canada a great many colonies of people who still cherish the ideals of their native countries and seek to perpetuate their old national customs. Unless we can bring these people into harmony with the rest of the country we will never establish that national unity which is so desirable. And I maintain, Sir, that one of the most, if not the most, effective agency is the publication of magazines and periodicals with a nation-wide circulation.

In addition to these racial impediments that afflict our country, there are geographical difficulties to overcome in establishing our national ideals and in promoting the harmony of the people. There are the differences of material interests between the Maritime provinces, and Quebec and Ontario; and still further differences of material interests between the Maritime provinces and the western provinces. To make the sentiment of one province known to another becomes a great national service and a great national duty which we should use every available agency to promote.

The diversity of material interests between the Far East and the Far West, in the absence of some means of communication that will bring them closer together, is one of the reasons why there has been so much misunderstanding between their respective inhabitants. I believe that notwithstanding anything that has been said in the West or in the East, there exists in every province a keen desire to assist every other province in achieving that degree of prosperity for which it strives. There is more Canadian spirit in the Dominion, I think, than most of us realize, but it is necessary that it should be made coherent and that it should be understood in the different sections of the country. We all know how proud the East is of the West, of its great productiveness and of the virility of its people; and we know that the West, notwithstanding that you do not hear very much of it on the platform or in the press, has more admiration for the enterprise of the East than perhaps is apparent to those who look upon the matter superficially. But to many it is hard to discover a way for the East and the West to co-operate in national policies to the advantage of both the grand divisions of the country.

It is unavoidable, Sir, in a country with so large an area as ours, embracing, as it does, three thousand miles of territory, that what is closest to us bulks most largely, the result being that local interests in the different sections have more prominence in the minds of the people than the national interests. To this must be attributed any provincial jealousies that may exist. I think it is the duty of government, by just and equitable laws, to convince the people in all sections that their welfare is the deep concern of the

administration. I think it can be said that that duty has been had in mind by every government we have had in Canada. Errors in judgment have been committed; there have been errors of policy on trade questions, on transportation questions and on many other matters, but it has always been the intention of the governments of Canada to serve the interests of the whole people. This parliament must view public questions in a broader way than they are looked at in many of the provinces where local interests bulk so largely. If, therefore, we are to bring the people together it is imperative that all the agencies available to secure this end should be employed to the fullest measure.

Now, among the agencies to promote national ideals and advance national unity, I think the press is the most effective. In my judgment the daily press cannot perform this work. It suffers from two disabilities. First, the daily press is partisan; secondly, its circulation is local, or at the widest, provincial. The editors of daily papers must cater to their respective constituencies; what affects parts of the country remote from the place of publication is treated very lightly or in some cases gets no attention at all; thus local feeling is stimulated and national considerations are overlooked. I am not attempting, Sir, to discredit or belittle the daily press. He would be a very injudicious person who would attempt to do that, because we know the mighty place it occupies in this or any other democracy. But I am trying to point out that the exigencies of the business of running a daily newspaper make it pretty nearly impossible for that newspaper to take the national as opposed to the local or provincial viewpoint on many questions. There is, therefore, in my opinion, a definite and very important field for magazines and periodicals. I am not insensible of the fact that these might show bias or partisanship, but the success of a publisher would depend upon the absence of such bias or partisanship; he must first consider the requirements from the business standpoint, and the danger of bias and partisanship is likely to be very slight. If, then, there is to be an independent press to express the sentiment of all Canada, it must be found in the periodical press and the magazines of the country. Canadian periodicals, which are all too few in number and have circulations all too small, have the ability to interpret the sentiment of one province to the other—the sentiment of the Maritime provinces to British Columbia, to Alberta, Saskatchewan or Ontario, and the sentiment of those provinces, then, to the East. No daily newspaper can do that; no daily newspaper has a circulation covering the different provinces. This service, therefore, can be rendered only by a virile, profitable and successful magazine press. To bring the East and the West together for their mutual understanding on great national issues would be a patriotic service of no small moment, but it can be performed only by publications having, as I say, a nation-wide circulation. Only by such publications can we ever hope to develop Canadian national ideals, to create a market for the productions of Canadian writers, and provide for those opportunities to use their talents for the dissemination of Canadian literature throughout the whole Dominion. That is a legitimate field for the efforts of publishers.

Nothing more surely conduces to national pride than a national literature. I think it can be said that Canada to-day cannot claim to have a national literature in the shape of a periodical press such as prevails in the Mother Country and in the republic to the south. There is no young country in the world which has so much material for good writers, so much romance mixed with its history, as this Dominion of Canada. The discovery of the country; the work of the early pioneers who hewed out their homes from the dense forest; the intrepidity of the officers and servants of the Hudson's Bay Company; the wonderful exploits of the Northwest Mounted Police—these are just a few of the things which writers could discuss for the entertainment and benefit of Canada and for the development of our national literature.

The trouble to-day, Sir, is that Canada is being Americanized by the periodicals of the United States—a process which is proceeding much more rapidly than is realized by the average citizen who does not give a great deal of study to the question. If it were the best class of American magazines that had the largest circulation in this country there would not be so much ground for complaint, but such magazines as Harper's, Scribner's and others of the same class have comparatively limited, indeed, extremely limited, circulation in this country, while those like the Red Book, Snappy Stories and that kind of stuff—

Mr. BUREAU: Snappy Stories has been banned.

Mr. HOCKEN: It does not circulate any more in Canada?

Mr. BUREAU: It ought not to.

Mr. HOCKEN: I agree with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau). There are other

magazines that may have not so "snappy" a name but have stories that are just as "snappy" as those that appear in Snappy Stories. I hope my hon. friend will ban that new magazine which I will refer to in a moment.

The adolescent mind of Canada is being trained by a long catalogue of frothy and frequently anti-British and often suggestive writing that should be discouraged. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Customs that he is banning this kind of stuff as he discovers it. This kind of literature is specially favoured in being introduced into this country, and that is the bone of contention that I am endeavouring to present. I do not think that we should continue to allow the mental pabulum of the youth of this country to be the Yellow Kid and Mr. Jiggs and other stuff sent out by the Hearst Syndicate. How can we hope to nourish the intellectuality of our young men and young women by such puerility as we see in the syndicated stuff and in the magazine and other periodical publications that fill the news stands of this country.

I was interested the other day in reading a pamphlet on Canadian Literature of French Expression by Jules Tremblay, and in it I find this which I would like to present to the House as the opinion of an author of some prominence in this part of the country. Referring to the Americanization of this country through the periodical press, he says:

> All our provinces hold certain things in common. One, considered dangerous, is the peaceful, and steady intrusion of Americanism through the stage, the wireless, the moving picture shows, the phonograph, the magazine, certain newspaper services, and the book. American ideas permeate our minds to-day. No reason there were to complain, did we borrow from our neighbours their qualities with their goods. But people, as a rule, rather borrow defects, faults, and vices, or indispensable things from other races. Our idiosyncracies are adjudged too slow, and must be replaced by fashions of speech, dress, dancing, and thoughtless libertism in matters of religion. . . . Do you not think that this easy going penetration will never promote the best kind of nationalism in Canada? I bear no preconceived hostility against Americans. I have lived long enough with them to know their real worth. But we do not import too much of their worth. The brand of accessions that comes from them to us is a source of alarm for Canadian unity. Segregation is in the air, not far from the Rockies; it is potential only, just now, but may very soon become actual, if we do not find a strong counterpart; and that counterpart is Canadianism opposed to Americanism. We must shape our own destinies for ourselves, and not for outsiders. Unless we act with a purpose, we are of small account in the process of change. In twenty-five years, we may be Canadians in name and Americans in fact, a fact which may politically evolve a few decades later.
>
> Evolution is constant. Canada will be transformed, with the rest of the world. The surviving nations will be those where the people will have kept faith with their own traditions; and these traditions are best maintained by literature, by national literature.
>
> [Mr. Hocken.]

I entirely agree with Mr. Tremblay, and I quote his words as those of a man who has given a great deal of thought to this particular subject.

Before going on I would like to quote a paragraph taken from the Ottawa Citizen of February 24. Referring to the address given by Colonel R. H. Webb at the Carnegie Library, it says:

> He said that one or two United States firms alone were selling upwards of $38,000,000 worth of American books in Canada.

I know that the copyright law has a great deal to do with that, but I think it is fair to say that the taste that is being developed in Canada by these American periodicals is also largely to blame for that tremendously large importation of American books. What I venture to say is that we should make an effort to give every reasonable encouragement to the men who are willing to risk their means and devote their business ability to providing a substitute for this overwhelming mass of American literature that is coming into this country. At least, we should be willing to remove the handicaps, the unfair competition under which the publishers of our magazines and periodicals labour at the present time.

I happen to know of many men who at different times have endeavoured to establish Canadian national publications. I have watched them organize their forces, launch their enterprises and carry them on until they had sunk perhaps one or two or three hundred thousand dollars, and then be forced to suspend publication. That has been the experience of the great majority of those who have ever attempted to organize a Canadian periodical press. They have almost all met with disaster. There is only one publication in Canada to-day that has a circulation of 75,000. There never was but one that had a circulation of over 100,000, and that one, I understand, has recently suspended publication. So that it is not that Canadians have lacked the enterprise. It is not altogether the fact that they have neglected what may be called the duty of trying to develop a Canadian literature through the periodical press, because many of them have tried, have used up all their resources, and finally have had to desist.

The extent to which American magazines come into Canada is not generally understood, nor is the very rapid increase that is taking place in that importation. People in the ordinary course of their business see the bookstalls filled with flashy covers, but they do not take the time, perhaps they have not got the time, to get the facts as to the

quantity of this material that is coming in or as to its character. It may surprise some members of this House to know that for every Canadian periodical sold in this country there are four American publications sold; that is to say, that by reason of the handicaps under which this particular industry is suffering Canadian publishers are able to secure only twenty per cent of their home market. There is no other industry operating in this country that could possibly exist under conditions of that kind, or that could even get capital to start under such conditions, and the situation for the Canadian publisher is getting worse every year. I have a memorandum prepared by the Canadian National Newspaper and Periodical Association, and it presents a few figures which I think it would be well to put on Hansard. In 1912 the total value of the magazines coming into this country was $831,000 and in 1922 the value was $3,122,000. In ten years the volume of American periodicals coming into Canada increased from $831,000 to over $3,000,000. That will indicate the rapidity of the growth that has taken place in the last ten years, and the conditions are so favourable to American publishers and so difficult for Canadian publishers that this increase is likely to continue in proportion as our population grows. Owing to the conditions under which the business in foreign publications is carried on in Canada there has been a growth in ten years from $800,000 to over $3,000,000.

Now, Sir, the meretricious charcter of most of those publications is something that should give the people of this country concern, especially those who are interested in the moral welfare of the people, particularly the young people. They are devoted almost entirely to fiction of a most sensationally suggestive and generally demoralizing character—about as demoralizing in some cases as publishers dare print. I noticed recently in an Ottawa paper the advertisement of a new magazine called, The True Story Magazine. Here it is. Hon. members may have noticed the advertisements. It has been printed all the way across Canada, and it is a pretty fair sample of the kind of stuff the American publishers are sending in for the young people of this country. I see here the statement "Has every man and woman a soul mate?" Perhaps we ought to have a sole mate, but not this kind of soul mate. This advertisement sets out this kind of stuff as an inducement for the young people of this country to buy the paper. One of the stories they print is headed "Whose Daughter", and it goes on to give a brief description of the story. It says:

> Suppose your own sister turned out to be "the other woman." Suppose your husband frankly told of his love for her, and showed a revulsion to yourself to whom he was married; suppose a love child was born to your sister, your husband its father, and during the birth your sister died. Would you adopt the child and bring it up?

And so on. Is that the kind of stuff to be allowed to come into the Dominion of Canada under specially favourable conditions? This is a new magazine. Perhaps the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) when he reads some of these stories may ban this magazine, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a class of literature such as this should be prevented from coming in, and that steps should be taken to encourage a wholesome literature such as Canadian publishers will produce if they have an opportunity and a fair chance of making ends meet.

I am going to give the House some reasons why Canadian publishers are unable to compete. In the first place the raw materials of the Canadian publisher are taxed, and that leaves him at a very serious disadvantage with his competitor in the United States. He has to pay in Canada for white paper a price equivalent to the United States price plus the duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member explain why it is we have to import the white magazine paper from the United States, when we are large exporters of white paper?

Mr. HOCKEN: We do not have to import the white paper, but white paper is sold in the United States at 25 per cent less than in Canada. It is sold at an advance greater than 25 per cent, because you pay for Canadian paper exactly what you would pay for paper bought in the United States, plus the duty and plus the freight.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed—and the hon. member will know whether my information is correct or not—that the character of paper that goes into magazines is not manufactured here, that it is an American manufacture and that the quantity that is used here would not warrant the manufacture in this country. Newsprint is another paper altogether and of course we manufacture that.

Mr. HOCKEN: The information given to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is not correct. There are a good many book paper mills in this country doing quite an extensive business. There is a mill at Georgetown and mills at other places. Book paper of all grades is manufactured in Canada, but it is sold in the United States for 25 per cent less than in Canada. The same is

true of engravings, inks and other raw materials that go into the production of magazines. There is protection for the papermaker, the inkmaker and the engraver, and everybody else that produces anything that goes into the magazine, excepting printing presses, and there is no duty on them because they are not made in Canada. If that were the only handicap it would be bad enough, but there are other factors more serious than that. So far as the Canadian circulation is concerned, the American publisher has an enormous advantage. In his own country he sells anywhere from 50,000 to 2,000,000 copies of an issue, it may be a weekly or it may be a monthly. What he sells in the United States pays all the cost of overhead, type-setting, proof-reading, making of plates, engraving and everything. These charges amount, I should say, to about 80 per cent of the total cost of producing a magazine, and they are all met by the domestic circulation. So that all the cost the publisher has to meet for his Canadian circulation is that of his white paper and press work, and the freight charges incurred in sending the product to Canada. Once a magazine is prepared for the press the cost of running off a few extra thousand copies for Canada is only a very small proportion of the total expense. He dumps into Canada his excess circulation, and thereby makes it impossible for the Canadian publishers to establish Canadian periodicals. Besides that, many of these publications that are coming in are unfit for young people to read. The Canadian publisher has to meet all this competition.

Let me for a moment put the matter in this way. Take the cost of writing, editing, type-setting, for a circulation, we will say, of 50,000 in Canada and compare that with similar cost for a publication in the United States with a circulation of 50,000 in Canada, and you will see how much greater the overhead is of any publisher who is trying to do business in Canada. As I said before, I know of only one Canadian publication that ever reached a circulation of 100,000, and that publication reached that circulation by methods of puzzles and guesses and that kind of thing. That was not a healthy, normal circulation; but even that publication has gone out of business; it has recently ceased publishing. Any Canadian publisher who is able to secure 50,000 circulation is regarded as a very successful man, but there are scores of American publications selling in Canada 50,000 copies, all the cost of which to the publisher is the white paper, the press work and the freight. I contend that conditions which make it possible for foreign publishers to secure a wider circulation in Canada of their publications than can be gained by their Canadian competitors call for amendment. Under present conditions, a Canadian publisher would be at an advantage if he put up a plant in Buffalo or Detroit. He would get his paper at nearly 30 per cent less, and he would have the advantage of a certain circulation in the United States. In fact, I know of one publisher in my own city who, a few years ago, seriously considered moving his printing plant to Buffalo. If he had, perhaps he would be in business yet. He did not take that step, and he is now one of the "has-beens"; he is one of those who have had, during the last few years, to suspend publication.

Mr. GOOD: What would be the effect of the abolition of the duty on these book papers?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not very much. I think conditions call for greater amendment than that. Twenty-five per cent reduction on the paper would be something, because paper is a big item in periodical publications; but the biggest item is the writing and, of course, that would not be affected. Something more than that is necessary if Canadian publishers are ever going to be able to establish Canadian publications.

Present conditions are unfair to employees as well as to employers. I know of one publisher in this country who circulates about 75,000 magazines, who pays in wages $125,000 a year. If the 1,183,000 copies of American publications that come in here every month were produced by the workmen of the Dominion, there would be fifteen times as much paid in wages in this industry in Canada. If American publishers were put on a fair basis of competition with Canadian publishers, many of the former might find it profitable to print in Canada, and that would add to the volume of work for Canadian workmen. Our friends in the United States take very good care to guard their American workmen when the question is one of publication of books or anything under the Copyright Act. Nobody can get a copyright for a book in the United States until the type is set up and the book produced in the United States. If we followed that plan and required books and magazines to be set up in this country, of course that would be prohibition. I am not arguing for that; I do not think we need go that far; but I want to point out that there is a real market in Canada for periodical literature, as is proved by the fact that 15,000,000 copies of American magazines are sold annually in this country. If we could secure half the volume of that trade, it would mean a large expen-

diture of money in wages as well as making the industry somewhat profitable for those who engage in it. I have questioned some men who are in this line of business, and they estimate that, with proper encouragement, there would be a potential extension of this business to, at least, $10,000,000 a year; that is, this would be an industry expending $10,000,000 a year in Canada. I am giving that only as an estimate; but undoubtedly the industry would be very greatly expanded if it were possible to continue on any reasonable basis of profit.

All kinds of magazines are coming into Canada; but as the present leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) said last year, prime objection is to be taken to American Sunday School publications that come in. I have no objection to the morality of their teachings, but these papers are edited for American children. All their illustrations are drawn from the lives of the great men of the republic. All their heroes and heroines are Americans. The whole atmosphere of those papers is that of the United States. We should remember that these papers are perused by very young children. At the beginning of their lives, they are taught American ideas instead of Canadian ideas, and this prepares them, as they grow a little older, to take up with those meretricious American magazines that come in so freely, and to make them the chief source of their mental exercise. Are we not perpetuating conditions that are calculated to Americanise our Dominion and to prevent the development of a strong Canadian sentiment, when we begin with little children going to Sunday school, and follow that up with Snappy Pictures, and True Stories and the rest of it as the children grow to young manhood and young womanhood, until they are fed on that kind of stuff and nothing else and rarely read good books that are available. Their taste is vitiated; they are unable to value and appreciate good literature.

I am not proposing that a subsidy should be granted to magazines. At the present time this government grants an annual subsidy of $50,000 a year to the daily press to assist them in carrying on a news-gathering service. That has been paid, I think, for at least three or four years. Therefore, even if the periodical press asked for a subsidy, it would have a good precedent for doing so. I think that money spent on the daily press is well spent; but if it is good policy to give substantial financial assistance to the daily press, would it not be equally sound policy to remove the handicaps from which our periodical press suffers? To my mind, having in view the value of developing a national literature and building up strong Canadian sentiment, the case for the periodical press is stronger than that for the daily press.

I should like to submit to the House another aspect of this question, and while it may be thought that I am straining the case a little. I do not think I am. What effect have these American publications on the movement of population? How far do they account for the emigration of so many of our people to the United States? What part do they play in making it hard for us to keep our young people here? There is nothing we want in this country more than population; the government spends large sums of money in order to get people here, and yet our population increases much more slowly than it should. I think we may trace this directly to the large emigration to the United States. We bring people in, they live here for a short time, and then drift across the line. They would not go there unless they felt that the opportunities there were better. And how do they get that idea? I do not think they get it from the daily press of the country in the particular localities in which they live. My contention is that they get it from the reading of American periodicals. The United States is pictured to them as a land of greater opportunity. Not deliberately perhaps, but none the less actively, those periodicals carry on a propaganda which finally convinces thousands of our best young people, the most enterprising and virile, that while they may get a living in Canada they would do very much better in the United States. When that kind of thing is read week after week and month after month by young men and women it is bound to have its effect.

There is no counter-irritant, so to speak. No publications are put into their hands to show them that there are counter attractions in Canada, because it is impossible for our publishers to compete in the volume of reading matter provided or the number of copies distributed. We can have no complaint to make if our young people slip across the line believing they can meet with better opportunities in the United States. We know as a fact that they can have no better opportunity there than in Canada, but the Canadian opportunities are not set out in the same striking and attractive way. That is what should be done in this country, and any agency that can and will do that should have the favourable consideration of the government. In fact, we need a little Canadian propaganda; at any rate we need fair statements as to the pos-

sibility of achieving success in our country. The Consul General of the United States in his report says:

To a large extent the Canadian reader of magazines depends upon those published in the United States. The advertisements in these magazines are perused with considerable advantage to the advertiser, as they keep before the public numerous lines of American merchandise.

I want to refer for a moment or two to the unfairness to the Canadian manufacturer in American magazines being able to present the claims of his competitors so freely and extensively in a medium from which he is excluded. All this publicity which the American magazines afford in Canada to the extent of 1,183,000 copies a month is denied to the Canadian manufacturer because it is absolutely beyond his reach to get it. Space in these magazines is sold on a basis of the total circulation, which runs to hundreds of thousands and in some cases to millions of each issue. Ninety per cent of that being in the United States and ten per cent in Canada, manifestly the Canadian manufacturer cannot get his announcements published in these magazines; he has to pay for two millions of circulation in order to reach 100,000 readers. There is one magazine in the United States which circulates in this country to the extent of 95,000 odd and its advertising charges are $7,000 a page. If the Canadian manufacturer tried to get into that magazine he would have to pay $7,000 a page for a circulation of 100,000,—some thing so preposterous that no one would consider it for a moment. But all his competitors in the United States advertise their goods in this country to 100,000 readers and it costs them nothing more than what they pay for their American circulation. In other words, this is excess circulation dumped into Canada after the American edition of the magazine is printed.

I do not know whether I am able to impress my hon. friends sufficiently with this aspect of the question. There are many articles of merchandise which could not be sold at all without large and extensive advertising; many depend entirely on advertising. And when we maintain a condition of affairs in this country that prevents our manufacturers from presenting their goods to the public of Canada on equal terms with foreign manufacturers I think we are depriving them of something that they ought to have; we are setting up conditions about which they have a right to complain. In this way our own manufacturers are more seriously handicapped than I can describe in their own home market. They have it invaded under conditions with which they cannot compete, and this reacts on their employees, lessening the volume of output and thus effecting an increased cost of what is produced. If a man produces a magazine in this country and his circulation is only 50,000 he has to charge twice as much for the magazine as he would if he sold 150,000 copies. All his overhead costs have to be covered by the 50,000, and if he had three times that sum his overhead cost would be only one-third as much per copy. That is a very serious side of this question.

I have had put into my hand a considerable list of resolutions passed by various bodies in this country advocating that some action be taken to encourage Canadian magazines. I have a number of them here, and while I will not take up the time of the House reading them all, perhaps one or two might be worth while considering. For example, here is one passed by the Toronto Women's Liberal Association.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is an influential body.

Mr. HOCKEN: This resolution reads:

Whereas the number and circulation of periodicals publishing immoral and indecent reading matter is rapidly on the increase:

Be it resolved that the Toronto Women's Liberal Association do strongly urge the appointment of a national censor board to inspect all printed matter in circulation in Canada, and that copies be sent to the Minister of Customs, the Postmaster General and the Finance Minister, enclosing samples of objectionable literature.

Here is a resolution by the Canadian Authors' Association:

Whereas, the Canadian market is now flooded with magazines, chiefly from the United States, which do not inculcate Canadian sentiment and nationality; and

Whereas the large amount of advertising matter in many of those magazines is detrimental to Canadian industry; and

Whereas this condition prevents the foundation of Canadian magazines, the growth of those which now exist, and thus restricts the market in Canada to the detriment of the interests of Canadian writers;

Be it resolved, that the Canadian Authors Association go on record in favour of a duty to be levied on the advertising matter in magazines imported into Canada and this meeting directs that copies of this resolution be sent to the secretary of the Canadian National Newspapers and Periodicals Association, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to the Minister of Finance.

Similar resolutions have been passed by the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Association of Canadian Clubs, and a great many other organizations. For example, the Brantford Chamber of Commerce has passed a very strong resolution. So, Sir, this question has been discussed in those circles which are interested in the permanence and prosperity of our periodical press.

May I point out another thing? I think an examination of the facts will demonstrate that the great majority of the best writers of fiction in the English language began their work of authorship on the periodical press. Authors like Dickens, Thackeray, and others first had their productions published in the magazines of the day. The magazine press provides a vehicle for the development of literary talent, and no other medium so good can be found. It provides a means for the young man or young woman having literary talent to develop that talent under the very best conditions.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a constructive suggestion. Perhaps it has already been placed before the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), but I would like to present it to the House. I would suggest that a tariff be put upon the advertising sections of American magazines. That is a perfectly logical proposal in view of the present tariff. If any one desires to circulate in this country printing matter for advertising purposes produced in the United States he must pay an import duty of fifteen cents a pound; if he is importing white paper he pays a duty of 25 per cent. Here are magazines of from 150 to 180 pages, of which probably more than three-quarters are advertising matter, but because there is a modicum of stories mixed up with these advertisements the latter are not subject to any tariff whatever. All that is necessary to give our Canadian magazine publishers a reasonable opportunity for "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is that the tariff now applied to advertising matter when it comes in loose or in a solid book be applied to the advertising portions of these magazines.

The figures which I am about to quote illuminate the situation very much, although they cover only four publications. These figures, I may add, are prepared by the Canadian National Newspaper and Periodical Association. If a duty of fifteen cents per pound were placed on the advertising space in the Saturday Evening Post, the Ladies' Home Journal, the American Magazine and Good Housekeeping, it would amount altogether to $644,760 a year. The Saturday Evening Post would pay on each issue $7,540. And why should it not? It contains nearly two hundred pages, of which about one hundred and fifty are devoted entirely to the advertising of American goods—advertising space that our Canadian manufacturers cannot use at all—and comes into this country to the destruction of our magazine industry. The Ladies' Home Journal would pay over $16,000 odd on every issue because of the tremendous volume of its advertising. I submit that my proposal is a very fair one and I hope that the Minister of Finance will give it consideration when preparing his budget.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What postal rates do these magazines pay coming into Canada?

Mr. HOCKEN: They come in largely by freight. But the Saturday Evening Post enjoys our postal privileges, and I think about a dozen other magazines as well. The Saturday Evening Post has no more right to our postal privileges than any other magazine published in the United States. Although it violates all the regulations of the Post Office Department, it gets those privileges. Undoubtedly it should not come in here under postal rates at all. However, I am not striking at one publication, I am trying rather to get at the principle involved. I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that he consider this question from the three or four standpoints I have tried to present: First, from the standpoint of the necessity of developing Canadian sentiment, the wisdom of providing some agency by which the aspirations of one part of Canada may be communicated to the other, and to try to make it possible by fair conditions for national publications to circulate all over Canada—throughout the Maritime provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the prairies and British Columbia. I believe there is enough enterprise and ability among Canadian business men to establish this industry if given a fair chance; but they have not got a fair chance under present conditions.

I would like my hon. friend to consider the question, too, from the standpoint of the manufacturers. I am not speaking for them alone, but when the enterprise of a Canadian manufacturer becomes successful it means a great deal for the men employed, for no manufacturer can succeed without hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of our men, being able to earn good wages and to maintain happy homes. In the interests of the men who are employed in those industries I would ask the Minister of Finance to consider the imposition of such a duty as I have suggested. In view of the fact that the great volume of these American magazines entering Canada consists of advertising matter, I hope my hon. friend will deal with it as he would deal with any other matter entering Canada for advertising purposes.

Mr. GOOD: I understand that a good many of these trashy magazines contain very little

advertising. How would my hon. friend's suggestion meet the case these present?

Mr. HOCKEN: My hon. friend has heard the Minister of Customs tell us that he has banned some of these magazines. I think that is the proper way to deal with meretricious or suggestive stuff. It has been proposed in some quarters that instead of a tax on advertising matter there should be a tax of ten cents a pound on the whole magazine. I would be quite as willing to accept that as the other, but of course it is for the government to decide whether or not a tariff duty should be imposed, and if so, what form it should take. But if it is desirable to keep out the class of magazine the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) refers to, then a tax of ten cents a pound on the whole magazine would be the proper way to deal with the matter.

Mr. E. W. ROBINSON (Kings, N.S.): I do not intend to say anything in regard to the financial points that have been brought up by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), but I would point out that there is need for exercising care in the matter of banning literature from the country. We all agree that literature which is obscene or low in its tendency should be banned; I believe the law already covers that. But the hon. gentleman read a resolution that had been sent to him or obtained by him from some Liberal association of Toronto, and I was verw sorry to notice in that resolution the word "censor" was used. If I remember rightly, the question of censoring literature was dealt with some two hundred years ago or more by John Milton in his Speech for the Liberty of unlicensed Printing; if hon. members will read that they will find the question fairly well dealt with.

There are a number of things that I believe should be kept out of the country, but we must be very careful before we put any hindrance upon the free entrance of books; he will need to be an able person who makes a decision in respect to which the life or death of a book is at stake. The danger of attempting to shut out magazines is that in keeping out the poor ones you may keep out also the good ones, in attempting to eliminate the tares you may at the same time destroy the wheat. I doubt whether the adoption of the procedure advocated by the hon. gentleman would ever produce a Canadian literature. We cannot produce a Canadian literature simply by taking steps to provide cheap paper, or by imposing a duty on magazines or anything of that kind.

[Mr. Good.]

The hon. member spoke about the magazines failing, about their ceasing publication. The question arises, why? The people buy certain magazines, and I believe that if we had the kind of magazine we should have, it would be bought, and the question would not be asked whether it was Canadian or American. In other words, if we deliver the goods we shall be able to get the price. If these magazines have failed, it is because, as the hon. member said, some of them started a puzzle department or adopted a plan of giving away an automobile for every new subscriber, and so on. That would put any magazine out of business.

I wish to quote from an article I read in the paper the other day in which reference is made to an address delivered in this city by Sir Henry Newbolt. It says:

> "You do not build a great literature like a building of brick and stone that can be bought with money; you can only get it when a nation cannot rest satisfied until it does secure it," Sir Henry Newbolt is reported to have said in his lecture in Ottawa. In this pronouncement, there is a challenge both to Canadian readers and to Canadian writers. Is the nation displaying any restlessness in the interests of a great literature?

I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to that question. Does he find any universal demand for a Canadian literature?

> Not sufficient to interrupt the stream of normal life. But the public is not indifferent. It is reading more to-day, and better. Yet it refuses to buy Canadian literature if better literature comes from outside, and in every department of letters, with one or two special exceptions, better literature is coming from outside.

That, I think, is from an Ottawa newspaper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that many of the best Canadian writers, because of the lack of a market for their product here—the lack of any channel for its distribution—went to the United States, contributed to United States magazines and became American citizens, and that that literature now comes to us through those American sources?

Mr. ROBINSON: Certainly, I am well aware of that. I am aware also that some of them have gone to England—Sir Gilbert Parker, for instance. We can name a number of our writers who have gone to England and who have contributed to English magazines. But as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the question is, can we produce a great Canadian literature by banning other literature? Is that the way it has ever been done before? Go back to the ways of Shakespeare and Milton and other great English writers; did their contributions to literature come about by the shutting out of literary works from other

countries? Shall we ever become a literary people simply by keeping out of our country the magazines, and so on, that might be an example to us in our writing? The mere fact that our writers had to go to the United States and to England would indicate that they were able to get their articles published in a better class of magazine. If we produce a better magazine in Canada it will be purchased in Canada and read in Canada; then we shall have an important medium for the publication of articles written by our own writers. I do not believe a Canadian literature can be created by taxing the advertising in certain magazines. I do not believe we can bring about the publication of good Canadian magazines simply by shutting out those from other countries. What we have to do is to encourage the reading of good literature; that is the best way to induce good writing. I do not believe we have in Canada to-day what may be called a Canadian literature pure and simple. We have to create a demand for good books. Why is so much of this cheap stuff from the United States sold in Canada? Because there is a demand for it. Are we to create a demand for something better simply by shutting that out? It cannot be done in that way. We heard our friends the Progressives lectured the other day for introducing moral measures, for trying to put us in a good moral position.

I merely wish to enter a protest against the taking of any action that would prevent reading matter that would be of benefit to our people, from entering our country, I care not where it comes from. Moreover, I am afraid that when you introduce the thin end of the wedge, when you give authority to certain men to decide what magazines shall come in and what shall not, you are putting a power in their hands that they should not possess.

Mr. HOCKEN: I may point out to my hon. friend that I did not propose banning any newspaper. I did not propose to tax any reading matter; I did not propose to keep it out. I proposed simply that the tariff now on advertising matter should be applied to the advertising matter in magazines.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with the mover of the resolution, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), in regard to the questionable character of a great many of the American magazines that come into Canada, and I was very much pleased to hear the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) make the statement that he was banning certain of these magazines. I have very great respect for the views of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Robinson), but I believe we should ban a great many of the publications that are at present coming into this country from the United States. However, I do not find myself in such general agreement with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) as to the remedy. In fact, I would take the opposite course, and in that respect I am very pleased to find that I have been able to convert the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to my view as to part of the remedy at least. Instead of putting a duty on the magazines coming in I would take the duty off the print paper coming in. It is not that to which I hope to convert the hon. leader of the Opposition at the present time, but I was very much interested to hear him state in a previous debate this afternoon that he would like to see the exportation of pulpwood prohibited, or a large export duty put on it. That is what I have advocated every session since I have been in this House, and I remember very well that when I proposed it two years ago the present leader of the Opposition, who was then leading the government, had quite a good laugh at my expense. I am pleased, however, to observe that I am converting him to my view.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that a good free trade measure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is why I laughed.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think it would help to remedy the present situation with regard to Canadian magazines. The publisher of one of the best Canadian magazines told me less than two weeks ago that he could buy his paper in the United States, pay the duty on it and the extra cent-and-a-half sales tax on the imported article, and still get his paper cheaper than he could buy it in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: What kind of paper was it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Magazine paper, I suppose.

Mr. CALDWELL: The same quality of paper he would buy in Canada. That was the statement he made. While for a time to prohibit the exportation of pulpwood would work a seeming hardship on our producers of pulpwood, really it would have a healthy effect on the manufacture of paper in this country. We have practically a monopoly of the spruce wood of North America, and the United States must have our pulp. If they cannot get the raw pulp they are getting now free of duty they would establish pulp and

paper mills in Canada, and it would mean the development of possibly one of the largest industries Canada could hope to secure.

Mr. BUREAU: They are doing that right along.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to show what is happening to our natural resources, in view of the discussion we have had this afternoon as to the depletion of our forests. I have here a prospectus issued by the Oxford Paper Company of Rumford Falls, Maine, dated June 1, 1922.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'cock, I was endeavouring to show some reasons why the Canadian publishers cannot compete with the American publishers in the publication of magazines, and in order to do this I wish to quote from a prospectus issued by the Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, in June 1922. They were issuing this prospectus for the purpose of selling $3,000,000 worth of stock to develop the pulp and paper industry in the United States. and I want to give the House what they quoted as the large or important part of their assets. The prospectus starts out with this statement:

> The company has been a successful manufacturer of paper for more than twenty years. It owns and operates large plants at Rumford, Maine, manufacturing book paper, coated paper, soda pulp, sulphite pulp and electrolytic bleach. It also owns all the capital stock of Rumford Falls Power Company, which owns and operates the entire electric and hydraulic development at Rumford, including a modern hydro-electric plant with a present installed capacity of 31,000 horse power. An ample supply of electric power and water for the company's present and future needs is thus assured. It also controls a large acreage of spruce and fir timber at various places in Canada, sufficient for 100 years' supply at the company's present rate of consumption.

It enumerates the different holdings which they have in Canada and says:

> The company's available supply of pulpwood is ample. It holds under lease from the Crown the right to cut and remove pulpwood and all forest growth from a tract of about 1,015 square miles (approximately 650,000 acres) in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. This lease runs for a long term of years in twenty year renewable period, the last maturing June 19, 1998, at an annual rental of $6,000. This rental is a fixed sum, regardless of the amount of wood cut from these lands. These holdings are virgin forests and contain, according to conservative estimates by experts, at least 6,000,000 cords of high grade pulpwood sufficient to supply Oxford Paper Company for more than 100 years at its present rate of consumption of spruce and fir.
>
> In addition, the company owns the right for 12 years to cut spruce and fir from a track of 55,000 acres in Canada, near the city of Quebec, and also has the right to cut spruce and fir from 125,000 acres additional Crown lands in Canada.
>
> The company has a further large available supply of spruce and fir and pulp through its one-half ownership of Nashwaak Pulp and Paper Company, Limited, which owns in New Brunswick a pulp mill and owns or controls about 359,000 acres of land containing about 1,000,000 cords of spruce and fir timber.

This is the reason I say that I believe the federal government, if they do not prohibit the exportation of pulpwood entirely, should at least put a very high export duty on it. Before the House rose at six o'clock when I suggested this export duty or prohibition of exports, I think I heard the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) make the remark that it was immoral. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is immoral to conserve the supply of raw material in Canada for one of the most important industries in Canada, to say nothing of the vast importance of the forest growth of this country, in order to protect even plant life in Canada, it is certainly more immoral to allow that raw material to go out free and then to charge a 25 per cent duty on the finished product when it is imported.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be misquoted. I said I considered the principle of an export duty as immoral, and I do.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am pleased that I did not misquote the hon. member, and I still contend that if it is immoral to conserve our natural products in Canada by any method we see fit, it is much more immoral to allow them to go out of the country free, and then charge a high import duty on the finished article which our people must buy. I said that I found myself in general agreement with the mover of this resolution as to the quality of the publications coming into this country from the United States, but I find myself at very great variance with him as to the remedy. My remedy would be to remove the duty, not only from the paper which enters into Canadian magazines, but from the printer's ink, printer's type, if they are not already exempt, and every other item of tariff that enters into the expense of making Canadian magazines. It is very important that we should have Canadian magazines. I do not wish to cover all the ground covered by the mover of the resolution; he did it much better than I could. I think we will all agree with him that American magazines which come into this country, not only contain literature of a very low type which tends to lower the morals of our people, but, as he so well put it, advertise American products, boost the United States as a country and, I think, are

a large factor in inducing our young people to migrate to the United States.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I find myself very largely in agreement with the sentiment contained in this resolution, but I am not in agreement with the proposed remedy. Anything which tends to create a national feeling is very much to be desired, but it takes more than sentiment to create national unity. The mover of this resolution (Mr. Hocken) wants, I believe, a duty of some 10 cents per pound placed on Canadian magazines. My opinion is that we have too much protection of this kind already in this country on everything. If we want national unity, this whole country must be put on an equal basis as regards opportunity. Many Canadian magazines and periodicals that are now facing ruin, if that be true—and I believe to some extent it is—or who find it hard to live and prosper—have advocated protection so much that their own pyramid is at last tumbling down on their heads. The protection they have so long advocated has at last made the cost of living and the cost of production so much out of line, so high, that their productions are altogether out of line as to cost with that of those with whom they have to compete.

It is said that nearly 2,500,000 pounds of United States' magazines were carried a year ago by the Canadian mails, and that fact is used by magazine publishers as an argument for more protection. To me, it conveys the fact that there is in Canada a wide reading public, and did we follow a just economic system, that 2,500,000 pounds could be very largely supplied by our own countrymen. Only to-day I received a letter from the Canadian National Newspaper and Periodical Association in which they state that Canadian magazine publishers have to pay from 25 to 40 per cent more for their material than United States publishers, and this, in spite of the fact that a very large percentage of pulp used in the manufacture of book paper in the United States is the product of Canadian forests. So, we are in this country at this time in the position of supplying the United States with the material from our natural resources and paying duty on the finished article from that product. The magazine publishers' association really admit the fact that they are paying from 25 to 40 per cent more for the material because of this trade penalty which we have placed on that product. Were it not for this, it seems to me that they would be well able to compete against all comers.

Senator Willis, of Ohio, is reported by the New York Herald to have stated at a recent dinner of the American Paper and Pulp Association that Canada can produce mechanical pulp 23 per cent lower and chemical pulp 19 per cent lower than these can be produced in the United States. Why, then, should Canadian publishers have to pay from 25 to 40 per cent higher prices for their supplies of book and half-tone paper? We are in the position of having the raw material; but owing to this short-sighted policy of trade restriction by a protective tariff, we have driven the cost of production so high that we cannot make the use we should of our own natural resources. The Woman's Century and the Canadian Courier were forced out of existence by high production costs, with very heavy loss, I believe, in one case. I would be in favour of giving these people relief by the removal of the duty altogether from book print, and I would move that this motion be amended by adding thereto the following words:

By placing on the free list all material used in the production of Canadian magazines and newspapers.

Mr. JOHN A. MacKELVIE (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I find myself very heartily in accord with every word advanced by the mover of this resolution (Mr. Hocken); nor, since he took his seat, have I heard from other members who have spoken on the subject anything that has changed my viewpoint in the slightest. An hon. member across the way objected strongly to the idea of censorship of any kind, calling in support of his contention the somewhat celebrated pamphlet by Milton on the freedom of the press. I do not know that that is particularly germane to the subject under discussion, but something can be said for censorship. It may be remembered that not many years following the utterance of Milton, a vast revulsion took place in England at the time of the Restoration, and the literature of that age which found expression through the drama, while sparkling in many instances with wit and humour, was so lewd in its nature as to lead up before many years to a strict censorship which barred it from the stage. I suppose most of us in this House have reached such years and, I hope, such maturity of judgment, as not to be particularly affected by reading such things. Many of us probably have enjoyed the wit of Congreve, Fletcher, Marlowe and other dramatists; but we would not care to place them for indiscriminate distribution amongst the young people of the land. Those of us who can take enjoyment in Boccaccio would not care to hand over the Decameron to the school boys and girls of the country. So something can, after all, be said for censorship which

we also carry on in a very sensible manner in conection with our moving picture shows.

But the argument advanced by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) presents a new phase of the question. I do not suppose that it is necessary for me to inform the members of this House that I am a firm believer in the policy of protection as applied to our industries; and here I find myself more consistent in the support of such views than the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) can claim for his position. While he has frequently enlightened the House as to his ideas regarding trade, and has fulminated against anything in the way of restriction in this country, now that he finds himself particularly interested in an industry that is of great importance to the district from which he comes, he is quite willing to throw aside his principles and advocate that an export duty be placed on pulpwood. It all depends on whose ox is gored; that is the attitude of a great many hon. gentlemen in this House.

Referring, however, to the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), I think he so admirably covered all the ground that it is hardly necessary for me to enlarge on any of his arguments. But I may remark that if ever there was a time in the history of our national life when it was important that some factor should be encouraged and cherished which would have the effect of bringing about a unification of Canadian sentiment and of making conditions better known to our people both east and west, that time is the present. And I think no more important factor could call for support than that of developing to as large an extent as possible a real Canadian literature embodied in weekly or monthly publications.

The remedy suggested by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) is that in order to give protection to this industry another industry which was built up at the expenditure of a great deal of capital in Canada should be sacrificed. He would remove the duty from paper irrespective of the damage which that would do to our paper mills in this country, giving no consideration to the numbers who would thereby be thrown out of employment, and regardless of the death blow such an action would bring to a rapidly growing and very important business. But the remedy which he proposes does not in fact secure the relief which those seek who are supporting the resolution. It is rather astonishing that members outside a particular line of business, who cannot be expected to have any technical knowledge of that business, should suggest some remedy which those who are personally interested in the business are sure would be of no effect. It is not a reduction in the duty on paper that is asked for by the resolution. If the supporters of the resolution needed that form of relief they would no doubt request it. On the contrary, they have a specific remedy which they desire to advance in behalf of their position, and that remedy has been well set forth in the resolution.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to speak at any length on the subject, but I cannot help observing that there was some force in one of the arguments submitted by the mover of the resolution in regard to the question of emigration from Canada. We have heard a good deal about immigration this session, and I expect we shall hear a great deal more before the session closes. In this connection I would read a brief extract from an article which appeared recently in the Financial Post bearing on this subject.

> Westerners are beginning to worry about the effect that articles in United States magazines are having upon Canadian emigration. In western Canada where crops and prices are temporarily unsatisfactory and have created some discontent, the articles in these United States publications play up incessantly and inaccurately the doings of Americans and the attractions of United States life. The natural result is that readers want to go where they think life is more enjoyable and they are going in thousands. Many of them are native born Canadians and Old Country people. Letters show they are not finding the happiness they expected.

The rosy picture placed before the readers of scores of these magazines has had its effect in this direction, I have no doubt; and it is rather a hopeless situation in which Canadian publications find themselves. Glancing through nearly every month a number of these American publications, I find in some of the best of them much to interest and amuse me and, occasionally, some information that is not easily accessible in any other form. But I will say that except as regards those of the very highest type, the average publication from the other side which is displayed on the news stands of this country does not at all compare in literary merit to the average Canadian publication. I am convinced that given a fair show and a free field, and allowed to develop as it should, it would not be long before a real Canadian literature could be built up. As pointed out by the mover of the resolution, there is no method better calculated to develop and foster a literature than serial publications in magazine form. That has been found to be the case in other countries and it will be the case in Canada. I am convinced that the elimination from our

news stands and general circulation of a lot of the more trashy publications which are sold in such large quantities, and the substitution therefor of Canadian magazines of the type we now have, would be of inestimable benefit to the citizens of Canada. The cheaper magazines of American publication are incomparably inferior to the best of ours and will not average up even to the lowest standard of publication we produce in this country. I am not dwelling on the salacious aspects of the literature provided by many of those publications, because I admit that a great many of them are tolerably free from that imputation. Some of them, however, which are among the most widely circulated and pretentious of American magazines are full of literature of a very insidious and debasing type. I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): I have a great deal of sympathy with the majority of statements which have been made during this debate this afternoon and evening. I can very well understand that it is desirable that we should have a Canadian literature. But it is a far greater problem to say how we are going to get the Canadian people to read it. I think it would be a mistake to place a ban on any literature that is coming to this country, because the moment you do so you shut out to that extent the light from the people who desire it. It may be that the great mass of the Canadian people have not been prepared to receive the literature that we as a people would like them to read. But even if the supposed remedy were placed on the statute books, whereby we placed ten cents of a duty on every magazine coming into Canada from the United States, if the Canadian people wanted that magazine they would pay that extra ten cents. In other words, they would get it in spite of anything we might do in the way of taxation.

I fully appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that our literature is of great educational value, and that the kind of literature we read will to a large extent mould our public life. For that reason I would be very glad if our people would read Canadian literature. But at the present time many American magazines have a large circulation in this country, and the greater proportion of them are of value to our people. I do not need to mention any particular magazine, but I do not think it will be disputed that some of these American magazines are almost indispensable to us at the present time. Whether we in Canada, even if we had the opportunity, would be able to produce such magazines is open to question.

I have looked at this problem from a good many standpoints, and if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) is in order I shall support it, because I do believe it is a step in the right direction. I do not altogether agree with the argument advanced by the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. MacKelvie) that it would be a death blow to other industries if the tariff were removed from the materials that enter into the manufacture of Canadian magazines, because they are produced from our own natural resources. It does seem to me that our manufacturers of pulp and paper, having their raw materials right at hand, should be able to compete with our American friends who have to buy their raw material from us. For that reason I think the argument of the hon. member for Saskatoon is well founded.

I do not altogether agree with the criticism directed against the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) by the last speaker, namely, that he was inconsistent in advocating an export duty to preserve our Canadian forests. It does seem to me, whether we be free trade people or not, when we find Canadian business men devastating our natural resources and despoiling our forests for the sake of gain, and thus denying to posterity its rights that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton was taking a fair view of the situation in advocating an export duty on pulpwood. Such a duty would at least be killing two birds with the one stone: it would assist our revenue on the one hand, and on the other hand it would also help to preserve this national resource.

Now, I can hardly see the connection between emigration and foreign literature. It must be admitted that although American magazines colour our national life to a large extent, yet we derive certain advantages from their perusal. But that reading matter in the shape of Snappy Stories has such a decisive influence upon the lives of some of our people as to impel them to cross over to the American side is more than I am willing to admit. The only reason why people emigrate to another country is that economic conditions practically force them to go where they can make a good living. Therefore I do not believe that merely by imposing a tariff upon American magazines we shall be able to stop the flow of emigration from this country to the United States.

I would like to see Canadian publishers build up a large magazine industry that would offset the sale of American magazines in this country. But we cannot ignore the grave disadvantage which they are labouring under at

the present time. At best they must find their circulation among a population of only nine million, and this limited output renders it impossible for them to pay the high prices for articles and stories that American publishers offer to successful authors. As a result we find that many Canadian authors go to the United States, attracted by the higher remuneration which they can command there. To a large extent we benefit by getting better magazines from the American side. Of course, on the other hand, there is a great deal of trash coming into this country from the United States, much of morbid suggestiveness. But at the same time many people in Canada delight in that kind of reading. Why, it is sold on our trains. You cannot go on a railway journey without a news agent coming along and putting the latest number of Spicy Stories in your hand. And I admit that sometimes after a hard day's work in parliament or somewhere else, when you are tired and weary, a spicy story is all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEWIS: I am speaking out quite frankly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: But I do not believe the reading of this trash is good for our youth. When we consider the cosmopolitan character of some parts of our population, people not even with British or French traditions, the circulation of these trashy magazines is not conducive to inculcating in them ideals of Canadian citizenship. Consequently I was delighted this afternoon to hear that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) is willing to ban any reading matter that drops too low in the moral scale.

I hope that if this House sees fit to adopt the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), it will put our Canadian publishers on the right road to success, and I trust that our great educationalists and others who have the benefit of the public at heart will see to it that in our schools, our collegiates and our universities our youth are trained to read good literature. We cannot legislate our young men and women to read the classics, but we can train them in the home and so mould their literary taste that they will be able to sift the chaff from the wheat and read the solid achievements of literature. It is only by cultivating a taste for good reading and building up a Canadian literature that the people of Canada will themselves be able to discriminate between what is good and what is worthless in literature and select what they feel is best suited to nurture Canadian ideals.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself in a general way with the resolution of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). I fear the discussion this afternoon has wandered a good deal from the resolution, and therefore I shall ask the House to consider its exact terms.

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that measures should be adopted to encourage the publication of Canadian magazines and periodicals.

That resolution, it seems to me, should appeal to every member of this House, irrespective of party or creed. I regret—and I say this quite sincerely—that more hon. gentlemen representing the province of Quebec have not supported it. There is a very fine French Canadian literature of which the French Canadian people are naturally very proud, and I must say I had expected to see a number of hon. gentlemen from Quebec very quickly support the resolution. I regret also that hon. members to my left have made it a question of tariff. I do not think that the tariff enters very much into it. The main objection raised by the publishers of this country is that the American periodicals, being supported by a much larger population, are more attractive, probably, so far as general appearance goes; that they have a larger circulation and consequently a larger income, and on the whole can turn out a more attractive publication, and that they are pushing out of the market in Canada the admirable Canadian magazines of which we have quite a number. That would appear to be the general opinion of the publishers as set forth in the literature which they have sent to hon. members of the House.

I agree with other speakers that to ban literature is, generally speaking, not the best way to keep it out of the country, though it may succeed to a certain extent. I remember well travelling in Germany on one occasion and almost everywhere on the doors of cars over the entrance to buildings, and so on, the word "verboten" appeared. They were "verboten" to do this and "verboten" to do that, until one got very tired of looking at that German word. I do not think we should in this country follow that line of thought. I am not one of those who believe that we can legislate ourselves into heaven, or legislate the people of this country into heaven. Probably we would have a better chance to succeed hereafter if we faced at least some of the trials which beset us rather than attempt to wipe them all out. I do not think

you can strengthen a child's back, for example, by putting a corset on it from its babyhood; and that is what is too often attempted in legislation. So that I do not believe in banning literature, generally speaking, though I have no quarrel with what has already been done in that respect; some of the literature excluded was spicy, to use the expression of my hon. friend who preceded me (Mr. Lewis), and might well be refused admission to this country. I noticed that Victor Margueritte of France, was the other day expelled from the Legion of Honour for writing a book which was a little too spicy, and I understand that over a quarter of a million copies of the book in question have already been sold in France; so that it is usually one of the best methods of advertising literature to say that it should not be read. There is enough of old Adam in practically every member of this House—possibly with some exceptions—to induce him to read any of these books. I am sure that if the Library should get a copy of Margueritte's "La Garçonne," the rush on the part of hon. members to read it would be so great that it would be necessary to have duplicate copies.

It has been pointed out here to-day that the value of the American periodicals coming into this country in 1922 was something like $3,000,000. That is quite an importation, particularly when we are endeavouring, or should be endeavouring, to lessen our importations from the United States, if from no other reason than that we would prefer to have our exchange on a basis of par. The following are the six magazines having the highest circulation of the American magazines which come here. They are not given in their order, but these are the pre-eminent ones: Pictorial Review, Cosmopolitan, Ladies' Home Journal, Red Book, Delineator, Saturday Evening Post. I should like to ask hon. members of this House this question: If through some catastrophe any or all of these six happened to fail to reach this country during the next year or so, would there be any real damage done to the people?

Mr. JACOBS: You could always read the Orange Sentinel.

Mr. MANION: I always read it?

Mr. JACOBS: You could always read that instead.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend himself always reads high class literature, so I am sure he would read the Orange Sentinel.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is good literature, anyway.

Mr. MANION: I do not know that I could always agree with that to the same extent as I do with the resolution of my hon. friend. However, I did not get up to discuss the Orange Sentinel; it does not come into this resolution, I understand. I was going on to say that I myself enjoy reading these magazines on occasions, and I am sure many hon. members do the same thing. But if any of them, through some accident, failed to come here, I doubt whether there would be any permanent harm done to the people of this country. It is true there are very good magazines published in the United States, and if some measures are taken to keep out of this country or to limit the circulation here of American magazines, some exceptions could easily be worked out to permit magazines of the higher type to come in without difficulty.

I wish to offer four main grounds upon which I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) might give serious heed to the representations of the hon. member for West Toronto in this connection. In the first place, practically all the magazines that the hon. member for West Toronto is aiming at are luxuries. If, therefore, some extra tax were put upon them it would simply be a method of taxing luxuries. Even my hon. friends to my left, who interject free trade into all these questions that come up in the House—even they, I imagine, who know by now, or ought to know, unless they are much more dense than I think they are, that they are not going to get free trade—

Mr. EVANS: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is not aware that the Magazine Publishers' Association itself has made a tariff question out of this matter? One of the grievances they lay down is that all of the materials that go into and are used in the manufacture of Canadian periodicals are protected by a tariff resulting in the Canadian publisher paying from 25 to 40 per cent more for his raw materials than the United States publisher.

Mr. MANION: I am not trying to voice the opinions of the Canadian publishers; I am simply giving my own. But even so, that is only one of the reasons which the Canadian publishers give. I think they submit in their literature that the important reason why their magazines are not read as widely as they should be is that the American magazines have such a large circulation in this country. I was going on to say that even the veriest free trader among my hon. friends to my left would take the attitude of taxing luxuries, and the Minister of Finance, if he

puts any tax upon these American periodicals, will be taxing luxuries.

Mr. JACOBS: Why?

Mr. MANION: Because they are luxuries.

Mr. JACOBS: Literature is a luxury?

Mr. MANION: Most of the literature of which we are speaking is entirely a luxury.

Mr. JACOBS: That is, the spicy part.

Mr. MANION: Some of it, I should say, is an injurious luxury. In the second place, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, would be raising revenue. The figures given by the publishers' association show that the revenue resulting from a tax of 10 cents per pound on American magazines or of 15 cents per pound on advertising would result in a revenue of a million dollars or more—and I do not suppose there is anybody who knows better than the Minister of Finance that revenue is a very important thing. In the third place, it would aid Canadian literature, and I think it is the desire of every member of this House to do that if at all possible. Finally, it would help to build up a Canadian national spirit, something which I think we lack. Unfortunately, due to the immensity of our land, due to its various sections having different interests, our national spirit has not been developed as it should have been; to too great an extent we speak from the point of view of the sections that we represent. But this would appear to me to be one of the questions upon which we can speak as Canadian citizens without quarrelling from the standpoint of party or even of section, and we should endeavour to build up a greater Canadian national spirit in this country. All that is asked by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and by the publishers is that some of the handicaps be removed. I do not care very much just how the Minister of Finance should happen to go about it, to put Canadian publications on the same level of marketability as the American publications. There is no doubt we have publications in this country, magazines which stand very high as reading matter. I will name only two of the best known; they are the Canadian Magazine and MacLean's, both of which have a pretty fair circulation in this country, and both of which furnish high-class reading matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member spoke of promoting French-Canadian literature and was surprised that nobody on this side spoke in favour of the resolution. In what way would the adoption of this resolution help French-Canadian literature? Does my hon. friend think that the exclusion from this country of French literature or the imposition of a heavy tax on it would help French-Canadian literature?

Mr. MANION: The question gets us back to the sectionalism of which I spoke a moment ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all. In what way?

Mr. MANION: I do not say that this would distinctly aid French-Canadian literature, but if it would, that would be one more reason why the resolution should be adopted. The reason it may not help French-Canadian literature is that there is practically no French literature published in the United States. My hon. frend should be the first, and would be the first I am sure, to endeavour to build up Canadian literature even if it is not French-Canadian literature.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear. But my hon. friend spoke of French-Canadian literature being built up through this resolution and expressed surprise that we were not supporting it. I simply asked how it was going to help French-Canadian literature.

Mr. MANION: I might point out to my hon. friend that there are a number of French Canadians who fairly often contribute to the English-speaking literature of this country, and in that way it would help French-Canadian literature.

Mr. LAPOINTE: French-Canadian literature in English.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend should have no objection to that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, but that would be Canadian literature, not French-Canadian literature.

Mr. MANION: I hope my hon. friend always makes it straight Canadian literature, and straight Canadian questions when he discusses them throughout the country. When I mentioned French-Canadian literature I certainly did not mean to offend my hon. friend, but simply to take the attitude of boosting the French-Canadians as well as the other Canadians in this country. My hon. friend will agree with me that to a French-Canadian, Canadian means French-Canadian, and the others are English-Canadians. I have read something of the people of Quebec and I know something of them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite willing to accept my friend as a Canadian.

Mr. MANION: Well, I am quite willing to accept my hon. friend as a Canadian also, so far as that goes. I do not think either one of us deserves any credit for accepting the other as such. Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to enter into any controversy with my hon. friend. I wish to say in closing that I think the Minister of Finance will be doing a favour to the people of this country, will be doing a favour not only to Canadian literature, but also to Canadian literature of the province of Quebec, if I may change my phraseology, by doing something to foster the building up of the literature which we have in this country to-day by endeavouring to implement the resolution proposed.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): As an old newspaper man I may be allowed to say a few words on this subject. I am old enough to remember when the newspapers published in Canada had not been converted into omnibuses for the carrying of advertising. The old-time newspaper, which was a very small publication in its way, contained some editorials, a little news, and very little advertising. The difficulty with the modern newspaper of to-day is that it is so bulky and, to many readers so uninteresting. I have been ashamed of myself often in the railway stations at Montreal and elsewhere to see these huge masses of American newspapers coming into the country and flooding the English provinces more especially, for the reason that they are English publications—we are not threatened very much in that respect in the province of Quebec, except in the cities—and I have wondered whether it was because we had nothing worth reading in Canada or because American publications contained a kind of literature which was not produced here.

In the United States, as elsewhere, there are many things worthy of the country in the way of books, magazines and newspapers of the highest order. It is so in England, in France and in Canada, but I am prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are publications in the United States which should never be allowed into Canada. Whether this is a matter for the customs, for the post office or for the Minister of Finance, certainly some of these publications should be barred from the country if for no other reason than the moral reason and because they are anti-Canadian and anti-British. We boast in the province of Quebec, and I know it is not an idle dream, to be very British, British to the core. We and those who came before us have proved it, and are ready to prove it again.

Glancing over the Hansard of some years ago I notice that when you, Mr. Speaker, had the honour of being Postmaster General you gave the British magazines a preference in this country to offset this flood of American publications, and I notice that from 1908 to 1912, to judge by poundage only, according to post office regulations, the number of British publications coming to Canada had increased from 2,000,000 pounds to 5,500,000 pounds. This was a great advantage to the Britisher coming to Canada because he was able to get his own publications, his home newspaper and his home magazines out here, and it was brought about through what the Liberal party had done some years before in bringing about the penny postage. That stands to-day to the credit of the eminent Postmaster General who was successful in that undertaking. It is unfortunate, for some reason or other that I am not prepared to discuss now, that arrangement fell through. Sir George Foster in the course of the debate claimed that this arrangement with the British post office was not continued because the British post office did not carry its share of the burden, that the rate of postage had been reduced from eight to two cents a pound in England, and that Canada carried the whole cost across the ocean. At all events the arrangement fell through, and that is why not such a large number of British publications are read in Canada to-day as was the case then. I hope if such an arrangement can be revived at any time by the Postmaster General, that it will be done, because if I judge the sentiments of the Canadian people we intend to remain British in this country. We intend to make of Canada the leading nation in the Empire if we can do so, and for that reason we want to seek our information at the fountain source and to get from England—I mention England, but the arrangement would also be extended to France of course—publications which are hardly equalled and most certainly are not surpassed by anything in the United States of America.

We have every reason to remain on friendly terms with the United States. Our lot has been cast alongside theirs, and we will continue to be on friendly terms, I hope, as long as we continue to exist as a separate nation, and that I hope will be for many years to come. But I think the Minister of Finance would be well advised—and it is fortunate that in this present case the Minister of Finance is a veteran newspaper man who is in a position to judge of the situation,—to avail himself of any means of increasing the revenue of Canada through the mass of American literature which comes in here

in the shape of newspapers, magazines or otherwise.

These are not essential to the Canadian reading public. I am not in favour of buying the literature of any country if it is obscene, or immoral, or contrary to public policy. But when I pick up a magazine with 20 or 30 pages of reading matter and 50 or 60 pages of advertising—which advertising is used in a way detrimental to the manufacturers and business men of this country—I do not see why Canada should not obtain some revenue out of the advertising. When we are taxed to the limit to-day, in all classes of society, federally, provincially and municipally, we should find some means of increasing our revenue by taxing in some shape or form this method of advertising American goods in Canada through the medium of American newspapers or American magazines.

I am speaking more especially of the city of Montreal at present. We have now in Montreal English and French newspapers, well illustrated, issued on Saturday, which compare very favourably with the publications brought in from the United States. The advantage of circulation of the Canadian newspapers is that they assist in creating a national spirit, and we are all prepared to admit that if Canada is to continue to live it must be united. Canadians must come to understand each other better and cease to be divided by provincial lines. Those who came before us may have divided this country for the purpose of administration on provincial lines, but surely the day is not far distant when a Canadian will realize that the whole of Canada is his country and that he is not peculiarly a citizen of any one province. This national spirit can best be created, fostered and encouraged by publications in Canada which are filled with Canadian ideas and Canadian ideals, and its interests can be built up by circulation of its own as well as by publications from the Mother Country. In this country the Canadians have the advantage of two mother lands. We have what is called the Mother Land and also what has been called our stepmother land. However, from the literature of France and from the literature of England, Scotland and Ireland, Canadians can draw from abroad all the inspiration that is necessary. We must build up Canadian sentiment. The most powerful instrument to-day in modern times is no doubt the newspaper press. The newspaper to-day is the most powerful instrument in civilization for good or for evil.

If a way can be found of preventing the flooding of this country by that which is not helpful, by that which is damaging to it, by that which is permeating the whole body politic of Canada and creating imperceptibly in the younger and rising generation ideas which we should not encourage, I hope the veteran Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), will find it, with the assistance of the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy). Whatever change is brought about, not simply the means proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), but by all other means, either through the post office regulations, or by some variation of the tariff, I know that the Minister of Finance will feel it his duty to encourage the effort that is now being made to give to the Canadian people the intellectual food so necessary in the formation of a virile national sentiment, and nothing, I consider, is more important to the people than the newspaper they read day by day. It was said by an old philosopher in olden times, and I think the Minister of Finance repeated the quotation some few days ago—

> I care not who makes the laws of the country, if I but write its songs.

If you can succeed in placing in every Canadian home a Canadian newspaper, bound up with with Canadian ideals, striving through its every effort to make Canada what we want Canada to become, you will be giving that house and that family the most valuable of all assistance. Some years ago there was published in the city of Montreal—and it is still published under another name—a newspaper called the Montreal Witness. We did not always share its views, but it was an honest paper, and whenever one entered the house where the Witness was to be seen we knew what the sentiments of that family were. I wish it were the case now with every newspaper and periodical published in Canada. But surely, as between the two, there should be no hesitation, and I know that if the Minister of Finance can do so he will try, in a friendly way and not in a hostile spirit, wherever an American publication appears, to give an equal chance to a Canadian publication, and if he succeeds the benefit to this country will be very great.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre): I should like to support the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans). It seems to be the only way of accomplishing the end which the resolution calls for. As for the resolution itself, while I will be very heartily in favour of it in the form in which it stands as an encouragement to the publication of Canadian magazines and the development of Canadian literature, I

would hesitate to vote for it because of the interpretation which has been placed on it by the mover (Mr. Hocken) and those who have supported it. If a vote in favour of this resolution simply means that we are going to place a sort of a duty on magazines coming in from outside, it seems to me we are moving in the wrong direction. It is all very well, perhaps, for us to object to certain classes of American magazines. We have some literature that is below par in the United States and we must confess that we have some literature in Canada that is below par. There is certain literature that does not tend to foster a unified Canadian life. I think we all agree that we want to develop in this country that literature that does foster unity. We want to do everything in our power to develop a high type Canadian literature, but you cannot do that simply by putting a ban, or an embargo or a duty, upon literature coming from other countries.

We heard some strong words here the other day directed against paternalism. I wonder if we are going to submit to the paternalism that will indicate to us just what we should read.

I am rather surprised that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) should seek to enact a new sort of Index Expurgatorius—a Canadian Index—that will decide for the Canadian people exactly what type of literature they should read. It would seem rather as if, instead of banning ideals from the other side of the line, we should welcome them, yes, welcome ideals from whatever source they may come. We must recognize that just south of the line there is a great population of over 100,000,000 people, people speaking the same language that we do, people who have a much longer history than the English speaking peoples of Canada, people who have had time to develop a very considerable literature, people who have a certain class that is more or less free to do writing, people who have the same old English backgrounds, and to a large extent the same British institutions that we have in Canada, people who to a considerable degree have the same social ideals that we have and, I would say, people with whom, whether we like this or not, the future of Canada at least socially is inevitably bound up. With these hundred million people to the south of us, we must surely look for a development of literature that is well worth while. Presumably from a hundred million people, there are likely to come more writers than from eight or nine million people. Presumably from a hundred million people there are likely to come men who will give us ideals that are not simply the commercial ideals of which we are afraid, but ideals along all lines which we might well welcome in this country and use to our advantage. Think of the long list of high class, worth-while magazines which are now being published in the United States and which we could ill afford to do without. Why should these be put beyond the reach of the poorer people of this country? If we are to ban literature because it comes from the United States or some other place outside of Canada, shall we then proceed to ban painting or art or music that comes from outside of Canada? I should like to protest against a narrow parochialism that has more or less developed in this country. Rather, if we are going to build up a unified Canadian sentiment and make life worth while in this country, we ought to welcome the highest and best in literature, art and music that comes to us from the United States and from all parts of Europe.

Mention has been made of our immigrant people. This thing I know, that if we are going to unite all our immigrant people into a new Canadian type, we shall have to be more hospitable to new ideals and ideas than we have been in the past.

I submit that the only practical solution has been put forward by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans). We cannot put an embargo on ideas; we cannot by taxation stimulate ideas or literature. The most we can do is to make it possible for men to express themselves, to cut down the cost incident to men expressing themselves. I would vote heartily for the resolution, if it meant that this House was extending in some other way by some other method an interest in Canadian literature. I rather regret that we have interpreted the British North America Act a little too narrowly and that this Canadian parliament has had so little to do with Canadian educational affairs. I would rather like to think that this parliament might subsidize, if you will, the various provincial governments in making more adequate provision for education. We are told that two or three or four or five and, perhaps, in this province six per cent of our people get through the high schools. If the education of the people of Canada remains that of the public schools, perhaps, even that of the lower grades of the public schools, we cannot very well hope for an appreciation of the highest and best in literature. I trust that this House will pass nothing that will make it more difficult for people to obtain information from the United States or from any other part of the world.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take up much of the

time of this House. All that I intended saying has been so well said by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that I feel it almost needless for me to say any more. I could very well have supported this resolution. I had not the privilege of hearing the mover (Mr. Hocken) deliver his address to the House. I gathered, however, that it was the mover of the resolution who introduced the question of a tariff in connection with this matter. I would like to say only this—and I say it good naturedly—I do not see why members to the right of me love so much to lecture hon. members who sit in this part of the House.

Mr. MANION: We are only returning some of your own medicine.

Mr. FORKE: I suppose they are doing it kindly for our good and perhaps we shall be benefited by it to some extent.

Mr. HOEY: Ultimately.

Mr. FORKE: Ultimately. I have no doubt we have some parochialism in this part of the House, but, perhaps, parochialism may also be found in other parts of the House. I am not saying this in an ill-natured manner, but many hon. members have a tendency to tell us what they think about us and what we ought to do on all kinds of subjects.

I had intended giving the quotation which the hon. member for Bonaventure gave a little while ago of the philosopher who said:

> I care not who makes the laws of the country, if I but write its songs.

I well believe the truth of that saying, that the literature of a country has certainly a great deal to do with the life and welfare of the nation which reads that literature.

As regards press censorship and censoring newspapers and periodicals that come from the United States, I have very much doubt whether that can be done. It has always been very dangerous when any set of men have undertaken to say what a people should or should not read. I certainly agree with the sentiment that nothing anti-British or anti-Canadian should be allowed to come into this country, if we can possibly prevent its coming, and anything that can be done in that direction would, I am sure, receive my hearty support.

One thing that struck me during this debate was the remark that has been made so often that Canada is such a small country,—a country with only 9,000,000 people,—that it cannot expect to have any great literature. I wonder if those who make such statements have taken into account the fact that the grandest literature that the world has yet known was written by the natives of small countries. England was a very small country as regards population when Shakespeare wrote his immortal plays. Dante was not a native of the Empire of Germany, but of a very small state; and I hope hon. members will not think I am too bold in mentioning the fact that my own native country gave birth to Robert Burns. Much as we may regret the fact, it is not because we are a small nation, a small people, that no great writer of literature has yet appeared. I think he is coming. He will come some day, perhaps, under very humble circumstances and from a place where we never looked for him, not from learning, not from wealth; but from native ability and genius will come the great literature of Canada.

I have nothing to say against American magazines. I want to mention just this as I go along—it has nothing to do with the argument—as regards reading trashy stuff, perhaps the House will excuse my egotistical way of talking when I say I do not think I have read much trashy stuff for a number of years; but after being in this House and listening to speeches I felt an inclination to buy something trashy and perhaps spicy and read it, by way of change, as a setoff to the many speeches we have been listening to, my own included. I have nothing to say against American literature. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). If we could get some British publications we should have the very best reading and we could delve into the deeps of the best literature and find something worth while. It may not be uninteresting for me to remark that this very day at lunch I was discussing with my desk mate (Mr. Hoey) certain articles in Hibbert's Journal, a magazine of the highest class. I mention this merely to let hon. members know that sometimes Progressives do read what is worth while.

Let me say a few words in regard to our national spirit. I remember well when I came to this country forty years ago that it struck me as rather strange to hear people coming into the province of Manitoba always speaking of particular provinces, Quebec, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and so on. The words "Canada" and "Canadian" did not seem to be in use at all. I have noticed during recent years, however, and more so since the Great War, a striking growth in the Canadian national spirit; and, whatever may be said in the House sometimes in the course of debate,

I believe that there is undoubtedly a Canadian national spirit among our people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Whatever may be our differences, and although we may perhaps speak from a sectional point of view at times because our material interests lie in that direction, I do not think we are forgetting our birthright as Canadian citizens. All of us, I think, are willing to subscribe to a Canadian citizenship. I trust that in the years to come that feeling will grow and that our children will rise up with that pride in their nationality that they should feel.

I do not like introducing personal affairs into a debate, but as most hon. gentlemen know, I was not born a Canadian citizen. This fact notwithstanding, I am always proud to hear my children affirm their Canadian citizenship, although perhaps they are as ready to declare that their father is Scotch. I do not hear any one of them, however, say he is Scotch; they are Canadians all. So that one generation does the trick, so to speak, and there is no danger of any of our young people forgetting that they are Canadians.

I might say a word or two also in regard to our foreign population. I think sometimes we speak too disparagingly of those people who come from other countries and make their home in Canada. I had occasion while doing some public work in Winnipeg once to come into very close communication with a lady who superintended the children's hospital in the northern part of Winnipeg, and she said that the Canadian people in that city had a great deal to learn from the foreign population in the art of music and the entertainment that could be derived from that pleasurable source. The people who have a taste and a talent for music are well worth while and will in time make really good citizens.

Let me say once again that I have nothing to say against the United States. I believe that the future welfare of the world is to a very large extent bound up in the future of this North American continent. We find to-day in Europe trouble and distress, sorrow, hatred and envy everywhere. I do not suppose that the people over there are any better or any worse than we are. But we are placed in that position to-day that we can give a lead to the rest of the world, and I believe that this can be brought about by a perfect unity between the great nation to the south of us and our own Canadian people. I do not want it to be thought for a moment that I have anything but the most kindly feeling for the people of the United States. It seems to me that every effort should be made to develop that Canadian national spirit of which I have spoken. If the mover of the resolution had been content to introduce it as it stands on the order paper I do not think I should have had any hesitation in supporting it. In regard to its bearing on the tariff I find that the Canadian Authors' Association makes this statement:

> Canadian magazine and periodical publishers must pay duty on considerable equipment which they bring in from the United States and which is not made in Canada.

At least the mover of the amendment is willing that they should get that advantage by removing all restrictions on any materials they require for carrying on their business in Canada. I have no doubt that Canada can produce just as good magazines as are published in the United States, and I can realize too, that they are working under very great difficulties. My sympathies are all with the publishers of Canadian magazines, and I only wish that something could be done to render their business profitable and enable them to produce magazines that would be read by the Canadian people. It has already been said that you cannot legislate people into reading good literature. I admit the truth of that dictum. Nearly everyone will pass through the stage of reading light and easily read literature until he acquires a taste for something better; and once having acquired that taste he will never go back to the trashy stuff. Once a man has got to know what is worth while in life and has learnt the secret of true living it is not likely that he will spend his time in the pursuit of what is unworthy. I have been wondering in these days when reading current literature why it is that we never get to-day the literature that is likely to last through the coming years. The best selling novels are read to-day, and to-morrow are forgotten and pass away. Why is it that to-day you find the novels of Sir Walter Scott and Charles Dickens still standing their ground and read by countless hundreds and thousands? There must be some reason. I do not know what the explanation is, but such is the fact. Everybody will agree that no matter how popular a novel may be to-day, in five years it will almost be forgotten. We are getting no literature that will live through the ages. It seems almost a bold thing to say, but it appears to me that the world has become so materialistic, and is looking so much to the almighty dollar, that we are not getting the literature that we should expect. It seems perhaps a little bold on my part to criticize literature, but I am stating honestly the view I have.

Reference has been made to the Montreal Witness, which I believe to be one of the most

honest papers we have in the Dominion of Canada. I am not going to say anything about the Orange Sentinel. I get it all the time through the kindness of my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken), for I have a fair idea from whom it comes. I read it and enjoy it and I hope I am benefited by it. At the same time I might say a word in regard to the Witness. It has been in my household for the last thirty years and I am ready to make the statement that I have been greatly benefited thereby, because I know that, although I may not agree with what it says in all its editorials, it at least says what it thinks and believes to be true. Now, I could support either the resolution or the amendment; it seems to me it does not make very much difference. But I think perhaps it is best to accept the amendment. The hon. member for Bonaventure took the wisest view when he suggested that the government use every endeavour to give Canadian publications all the advantage that could possibly be afforded and to encourage the reading of good Canadian literature.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to participate in this debate, but it seems to me one phase of the subject has not been touched on yet. Before I left the West I attended a meeting of business men who were consulting one another as to how they could reduce the cost of living, and, among other things discussed, they spoke of the cost of advertising. One Vancouver business firm stated that their advertising cost them as high as 7 per cent of their turnover. Another firm stated that they could not afford to reduce their advertising so long as American journals were circulating on the Canadian side and carrying so much advertising. The manager of this firm, which sold boots and shoes, said that the advertising in these American journals had a great effect on the Canadian people, inducing them to buy the goods thus advertised. Now, if there is anything Canada wants particularly at the present time it is a reduced cost of living, and if a tariff on these American magazines will reduce the cost of living in this country, then I say it is the duty of this government to impose such a duty as will keep them out.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The resolution of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) is brief and quite simple. It expresses—shall I say—a pious hope, perhaps he will prefer if I say a patriotic hope, that we may all be able to encourage Canadian magazines and periodicals. That is a sentiment which we can all subscribe to, and I want to vote for the resolution. But the moment we undertake to define the method by which this condition is to be brought about, we shall probably be divided in opinion, as the discussion has already shown. For the resolution itself I think we might all vote; I am sorry the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) has not given us a chance to vote for it as it stood on the Order Paper. True, it is very general, it may even be said to be very vague in its terms, but a resolution of this type, even though it be not specific, yet serves a good purpose in opening up such a general discussion as we have had this afternoon.

As I say, I am sorry the hon. member for Saskatoon has interposed his amendment. I regret to say that I am obliged to vote against it, and I hope the House will not adopt it. If free trade were part of our general tariff policy his amendment would be all right. But it is rather broad in its scope. He is going to place upon the free list quite a lot of things —paper, type, ink, presses, folders and a large list of goods now dutiable to a greater or less extent. Well now, the desire to relieve the press of some of its burdens is one that may appeal to our sympathies, but if you place those articles on the free list you may do very great injustice in other quarters. For example, take the item of paper. Without discussing whether or not paper should be protected, there is a duty on paper. If you strike that duty off you are putting the paper manufacturers of the country under an unexpected competition, and they will be able to say justly, "While you are having free trade in the thing we make, you are leaving us subject to duties on many of the things we use in our production." If you are going to strike out a very few items in the tariff which stand alone, it will be found in most cases that each item has some relation near or remote to some other item. Therefore if you make all the items covered by the amendment free, you are imposing a very unfair condition on the paper makers, the type makers and all the other manufacturers concerned.

I am sorry the amendment is made part of the resolution. The latter is based on a sentiment which I rather like, but I do not want to do any injustice even to the protected paper maker. I think the duties in the tariff to-day in relation to the press are not ungenerous, and I do not think the press has much reason to complain. At all events, while I would have pleasure in voting for the resolution of my hon. friend from West Tor-

onto (Mr. Hocken) for, I repeat, it expresses an encouraging sentiment, I do not think the House ought to accept the amendment of my hon. friend from Saskatoon.

Right hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I was about to speak before the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) rose in the hope that I might in some way influence his view. I have not very often been successful in that undertaking; probably I would not have been to-night.

I will ask the House to bear with me a very few minutes while I state with conciseness why I shall support the resolution in its original form and vote against the amendment. In the first place, let me say very frankly that I shall vote for the resolution in its original form, not because it is a mere expression of pious or patriotic hope. I shall vote for it because the mover (Mr. Hocken) embodies in his resolution, and in the excellent speech he made in its support, specific, definite, understandable means by which the encouragement looked for in the resolution is to be given. I do not see much value in academic discussions urging the government to find some way of doing something good, unless we have something proposed by means of which that goal is to be reached.

The mover of the resolution has proposed one of two ways. He proposes a ten cents per pound duty on imported magazines, or a fifteen cents per pound duty on the advertising matter contained in such magazines. In my judgment one of those methods or a similar method is feasible. I do not wish to get off into the safety channel of the term "similar method" at all; I believe either of those methods is the right method and will bring the desired result, and I do not think that any other suggestion made in this debate will bring it about. I venture to offer my reasons for that conclusion.

In the first place, I do not regard this as a question of encouraging good literature or bad literature, looked at from a moral standpoint. I do not say that that is not an important question. I believe it is. I do believe that the government has a duty in the way of discouraging, indeed banning, bad literature from a moral standpoint; but the way to do that is to ban it, and the government now has the power. That power has been exercised under previous governments; I have no reason to say that it is not being exercised under this government; but if it is not being exercised it ought to be exercised. If we admit the principle that all literature should be submitted to everybody for perusal, and simply let that policy take its effect, it will carry us to lengths which, if described, no hon. member would be prepared to go.

The only extent to which the quality of the literature to be encouraged enters into this question is this: By a policy of encouraging Canadian literature by the means suggested would we be likely to get better literature from the moral standpoint; or from the Canadian standpoint? I think we would be likely to get better literature from both. I think it would be better from the moral standpoint for the simple reason that in a country like Canada of a sparse highly rural population, the general average of literature that will appeal to the people will probably be better than in a great cosmopolitan nation of the immensity of the United States. I think that may be concluded without assuming to ourselves any superior moral attributes. That we will get a more Canadian literature goes without question ,and therein is the principal subject that we have to discuss.

Then, the question comes: Is it better to have in this Dominion a thriving periodical monthly magazine industry, or is it not? Secondly, if it is, can it be done under present conditions? Can it be done without some of the means suggested by the mover of this resolution? Now I address myself to those questions.

I first of all want to affirm and press home to the government with all the emphasis in my power that this class of Canadian industry is as important as any other class of industry in this Dominion; that it is not only important that we do have a Canadian monthly periodical publication, but that it is so important that the necessity of any other single industry pales into insignificance compared to it. Now, why is it so important? Well, in the first place I believe the foundation as a propagator of opinions in a country to-day is the periodical literature. I believe that in the United States, in Great Britain, as well as in other countries, the editorial writer to-day does not occupy the same sphere of influence relatively that he did in years gone by; in the United States particularly and in England to a lesser degree his place has been taken by the magazine writer, by the contributor to the periodical literature of the country. There is disseminated in the most thorough and most forcible way, and in a manner that causes them to take root in the minds of people, principles of public policy, and public thinking, and these things take their flow from the writers in the periodical press rather than from the editorial writer as in days gone by I do not minimize the influence of editorial writing in the Canadian newspaper, but I do

believe that the influence of the magazine writer has grown immensely in comparison. Very well; the magazine, then, the periodical paper, is of importance in any country. It is of especial importance in our own country, and I proceed to give the reasons why I think so.

We are peculiarly situated in this Dominion. We are as yet a small country. If we were a small country, though, as England was a small country in the days of Shakespeare, then the reasons that make it necessary for us to adopt special means would not be present; but we are not a small country in that sense at all. England in the time of Shakespeare was the only English speaking country in the world. England had no competition, had no inflow of outside literature occupying the time and attention of her people. England had one language and one alone; the other countries around had their languages, consequently what market there was for the writings of Shakespeare, on the stage and in the printed paper, was virtually reserved for him and for his contemporaries.

Mr. FORKE: May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? He does not imagine that we have a Shakespeare in Canada to-day who is silent because of the great nation to the south?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am developing my argument, and I do not know that it is very far from the conclusion that the hon. gentleman suggests. If we had, and if he were of the same temper commercially as the Shakespeare of the sixteenth century, he would be in the nation to the south and not in Canada. I will take second place to none in my admiration of, indeed my reverence for, the Bard of Avon; I regard him as the father of our literature. Nevertheless, Shakespeare wrote for gain; he wrote successfully for gain. If he were in the literary field of this Dominion to-day, and if his object were gain, he would soon be a resident, and later a citizen, of the United States of America. Such Shakespeares as we have produced are there to-day, for the reasons that I will later adduce.

I was contrasting the position of Canada as a young country to the position of England in the time of Shakespeare. I do not know that there is any young country that is in a position similar to that in which Canada finds herself to-day. Canada has a population of 9,000,000; we are alongside an English speaking country with a population of 110,000,000. There is no similar situation elsewhere in the world. We have to devise our policy in the light of all the circumstances that surround us; and in all the circumstances that surround us that is the great one—it is so much greater than the others that all the rest of them are of little consequence in comparison with it.

Now I am asked, why is it necessary, in view of the peculiar position of Canada, that we should take these special means? For the simple reason that unless we do, the literature of this country will be largely American instead of Canadian. It has been largely American right through the history of this Dominion up to now. It is getting more and more American every year; it is more American to-day by one hundred per cent—yes, I venture to say by two hundred per cent—than it was ten years ago. Why is that? It is for the very simple reason that is at the back of the whole protective policy of this country. Now I hope hon. gentlemen to my left or anywhere else will not think I am trying to lecture them because I venture to express different opinions; that is not the spirit of any hon. member who has spoken. On this subject I know I hold different views from theirs; I have always held them, and let me say that I have never misled them as to what my views were. We in this country have a population of 9,000,000. We have a limited market because we have that population; the main competitors of every industry of this country are across the line with a home market of 110,000,000. Our magazine publisher in this Dominion can cater to a circulation that can be gathered from what? Not even from the 9,000,000; only from that portion of it that speaks the English tongue; or if he publishes his magazine in another tongue, from that portion of the 9,000,000 that speak that other tongue. He has a very contracted market indeed to appeal to; consequently he must produce his magazine on a scale that will not be wholly out of range of the market to which he caters. The magazine in this country that has succeeded most has not reached to one-tenth the circulation of the leading magazines of the country to the south.

Now, hon. gentlemen to my left, and the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans)—whom personally I respect very much and whose views I always listen to carefully—say, "Take off the duty, and we will be all right. Take the duty from what this magazine publisher uses in producing his paper. Take it from his paper; take it from his ink; take it from his presses and his folders; take it from all these other things, and then he will be able to compete, because he is just as good a man as the man across the line who is producing a magazine against which he must

sell." Well now, let us consider it calmly just for a moment. I wholly agree with the argument, first of all, of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that if you do that you have got to march right on. You have to go to the man who is making the paper, and who can make just the same case on that ground as the magazine publisher can now. He can say, "Well, you took the duty off the magazine publisher's raw material because he was under a disadvantage. I am under a similar disadvantage; take it off the goods my workmen use; take it off everything that goes into my plant." The answer to him would have to be yes; it would have to be done. I cannot really explain to my hon. friends to my left how glad I am to-night and under the present conditions that argument is presented by the Minister of Finance and I am not put under the unpleasant necessity of pressing it home upon his mind as well as upon that of other hon. members. I wholly agree with that contention. You cannot do it while you have a protective system; you must maintain that system equitably throughout the whole country. We have it in this country and we are going to have it under this government the same as under the last, and it is right that we should have it.

But let us press that inquiry further. We cannot do that, first of all because it would carry us to lengths to which we cannot go. But we cannot do it because it would get us nowhere after we had done it. How would our magazine publisher compete? He would have his raw material free, it is true; he would have what little excess would come through the removal of the duty on his ink, and the rest of it; but would that put him on an equality with the producer in the south? Let us come to grips with that phase of it. Is there one hon. member of this House who, not having regard to his past speeches on the hustings, but consulting his intellect and his common sense, would venture to stand and say that in those circumstances the magazine publisher in this country would be on an equality with the producer in the south? Concede that he is just as good a man, has just as good principles, has just as much enterprise, is just as sagacious—concede all that; does any one contend for one minute now that he is on an equality? Why of course, he is not on an equality, and why is he not on an equality? Because his circulation cannot reach, no matter how successful he may be, one-tenth the circulation to which a man equally successful would attain in the United States of America.

Mr. GOOD: What is the duty on magazines entering the United States? I ask for information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know, but for the purposes of my argument we can assume it is nothing at all. Why would our magazines be bought in the United States? Our magazines catering to Canadian circulation naturally are concerned with subjects of peculiar interest to Canada. American magazines are concerned with subjects of peculiar interest to the United States. Consequently, American magazines for that reason would have a tremendous advantage over ours in their own country, and, of course, they carry American advertisements too. There is every reason in the world why they would have that advantage. The same case prevails here as prevails everywhere else. The Americans can attain to a tremendously larger area of business and, as a consequence, unless we are given some advantage in the Canadian market the American is in a position to swamp the Canadian market and keep out of business his Canadian competitor in the magazine business almost altogether. Why is it after all these years that we have so few Canadian magazines? It has simply been because the advantage of the American competitor has been such, year after year, that he has invaded the Canadian domain, got his advertising over here, his literature over here, and made his sales over here. He has invaded more and more as time went on, and now we have less and less Canadian periodical literature and more and more American periodical literature. Before I leave the duty question, let me say this. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) said that there was a duty on pulp coming from the United States, and, as I understood him that pulp had to go first from Canadian mills to the United States, then be re-exported to this country, and that after being shipped to the United States it could be bought more cheaply than it could be bought from the Canadian manufacturer. What I say is this: If the Canadian manufacturer is discriminating against the Canadian consumer, there is a remedy in the hands of the government, and the government should not hesitate a day to put that remedy into effect. Of course, there are differences that could legitimately be taken into account, in the quantity purchased, for instance. If large purchases are made, probably a smaller purchase price might be justified; but for smaller purchases, if the American is given the advantage at all, the government has power under the law to take the duty off and the government ought to bring the Canadian manufacturer to terms by just that method. There

is no excuse for discriminating against the Canadian consumer. I am not saying on my responsibility that that is being done. I can hardly believe that it is. I can hardly understand how it can be the fact. But it is the duty of the government to ascertain if it is the fact, and if there is discrimination, then the government should apply the remedy. Because there is abuse which it is in the power of the government to remedy under the law of the land, that is no reason why the principle itself should be removed.

Very well. Because of wholly dissimilar conditions there is no possibility of the Canadian magazine thriving as compared with the American magazine unless there is an advantage given in this country to the Canadian publisher. Why is it of extraordinary importance that this be done? It is for two reasons: First of all, magazine publishing is an industry the same as any other. It is entitled in my judgment to be treated the same as any other industry: it is entitled to the same advantage as any other industry in this country, the advantage in the home market over that enjoyed by its competitor in another country, for the sake of the men employed in the industry and in allied industries. In a word, in order that we may have it as an industry, it has the same claim as any other industry.

But that is not the major reason. There is a reason that appertains to this industry that has no relation to other industries at all. The magazine industry is one that contributes to the building up of Canadian spirit and Canadian national sentiment, and why should we apply our protective system to the manufacturer of cart wheels and screws and nails and Ford cars, and not apply it to the production of periodical literature in this country, is more than I can understand—and as I make that statement I make no particular attack or indictment against any government in particular. It seems to me that the reasons that apply to periodical monthly or weekly literature are powerful one hundredfold over those that apply to any other industry whatever.

Mr. HOEY: I think the hon. member is perfectly logical in the position he takes. Why has not this protection been extended to this industry before?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I can give an adequate answer, but I will say this. I am not making this as an attack, as I stated before, on any party or any government. Under the late government the sale price of paper was entirely controlled until the courts declared that we had not power to exercise that control. That control existed for years, and I am pretty sure I am right in saying that under that control an advantage

10 p.m. was given to the Canadian consumer.

As a consequence, there would be an advantage there. Of that I speak with some diffidence, but if it will be helpful in any way to the hon. member I will be prepared for the sake of argument to admit that the late government should have given an advantage to Canadian periodical publications and did not. I am inclined to think though that through the greater period of its existence it did. I was emphasizing the importance of giving something in the way of fair treatment at least, and you must give the advantage in the Canadian market if you are going to give fair treatment to Canadian periodical literature. What is going to be the result—yes, what to-day is the result of the consumption of American publications in this country in the degree that they are being consumed now? Why, by the character of the literature of the country, by the spirit that animates that literature the whole mind of the nation is nourished and supported. What is going to be the consequence if the child in Canada reads the publications of Atlanta, Georgia, reads the publications of New York, reads all these literary productions that are inspired by American spirit and American sentiment, and makes that the mental nourishment of his life? If that is all right, if that is necessary on this alleged free trade or free literature principle, it would necessarily be right that they should also have free access to our schools. Why not let them also on the same principle provide the literature for the children of our schools, make our readers, sell them on a commercial basis? That is an extreme illustration.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But only by that can one make oneself clear to some hon. gentlemen. In a word, if government is to exercise no control whatever over literature, it follows that we must let the American publisher right into the schoolroom and let him there feed the mind of the young on just as free a basis as would the Canadian writer and publisher.

Now what I want to urge upon the government is this: we should make certain that the young writer of this country, whose thoughts are Canadian and British, gets an avenue for his energies and a reward for his efforts in this Canada of ours. We have too many of them across the line. I can name them on the fingers of my hand now. I know men who went through college with me who

to-day are eminent in literary work, and I do not think I know one who is not a citizen of the United States. These men get access to these widely circulating American publications that can pay far more than any little struggling magazine in this country can pay. Put the Canadian magazine in a position where it will get the same circulation as that now enjoyed in Canada by the American magazine, give it the body of that circulation, and then it will be able to offer inducements to the young aspiring Canadian writer; there will be something to keep him in his own Dominion and the mind of the Canadian people will be fed on literature produced in Canada and animated by the spirit and aspirations of this country. Surely that is of vital importance to us.

There is one thing I know that will meet with the approval of hon. members to my left. On this question of the British preference I am ready to go the whole extent of their 50 per cent,—yes, I will double that preference. I am willing to make the preference to British magazines 100 per cent, and I will tell hon. members why. This is a British country, and I cannot speak in too high terms of the excellent speech in support of the resolution made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and of the good British sentiments that he expressed. He made as sound an argument for protection, without mentioning the word "protection" of course as I have ever heard in this House. There is no reason at all why we need protect Canadian literature against British literature. The more British literature circulates here the better. It will never circulate to the serious detriment of Canadian publications. It has too far to come and is too old when it reaches us. The difficulty will be, and is to-day, that we do not get enough of good British magazine literature in this Dominion, and Britain has excellent literature of this character in her publications. The difficulty is we do not get enough of it. We should have no prohibition or discouragement whatever of that literature, and should not interfere with the access of that character of literature to Canada. The prohibition of the Atlantic itself is quite sufficient, because literature, even periodical monthly literature, that is a few weeks old is usually too old for very wide consumption. However, having regard to the necessity for the spread of British thought and British spirit through this country, we are not going to get too much of it, though we put no ban on it, though we place no duty on it and though we have no obstacle at all in the way of it reaching Canada.

What we need to do is to give the Canadian competitor here a chance against the man who really to-day is destroying his business and preventing its success for years, and who is stifling the production of Canadian literature, and we need to do that now. How can that be done? I think I have shown it cannot be done by the method suggested by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans). That would lead us to extremes to which we cannot go, and if we went to those extremes we would be just where we commenced, and we would not have achieved any of the objects whatsoever. It is all right to pass a fine resolution about encouraging literature, but let us be practical. How are you going to encourage it? Those engaged in the business have devised this plan. They say "Put a duty of 15 per cent upon the advertising contained in the magazines, or 15 cents a pound or 10 cents a pound upon the magazines themselves". Of the two I am disposed to favour the first, for this reason, advertising matter is now taxed, provided only that it does not come within the folds of the magazine. If it comes by itself, it is taxed, but if you put some spicy story with it and call it a magazine, it is not taxed at all. That does not appear to me to be reasonable. It seems to me it should be taxed in whatever form it comes, and by taxing the advertising matter you also do away with some of the advantage that the American advertiser has as against the Canadian advertiser—an advantage very well determined by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). In other words, you achieve two very important objects by a duty in that form. You do not achieve either of those objects so directly by a duty upon the magazine itself. Therefore, I am disposed to favour the proposition that we place a reasonably fair duty on the advertising matter contained in American periodical literature, that we do it without delay, and that we seek to attain the goal by this method, and if this method fail, then if we consider the goal high enough and desirable enough to attain we will resort to other methods to reach it.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I did not intend to take part in this very interesting debate, but the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to which we have all listened with very great interest, has led me to make a few observations, perhaps, in a sense somewhat opposed to those which he has addressed to the House. Apparently the literature of this country has to be encouraged by a protective tariff. Has not the result to the industrial life of this country of a protective tariff taught the

right hon. leader of the Opposition how futile that method is? We have had in this country, for the last 50 years or thereabouts, a protective tariff, and in most lines of industry or manufacture, the protected manufacturers ask, not for less protection but more protection, and I take it if literature is to be protected by a tariff of 10 or 20 per cent, in a few years the authors and journalists will come before the House and say "Our genius does not afford us a livelihood, and unless we have the protection of a 40 or 50 per cent tax on literature we will have to go out of business".

I was somewhat pleased and interested in hearing the historical allusion of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Shakespeare was one who wrote for a comparatively small audience. The people who lived close by spoke different languages, and that is where his success lies. Might I point out to my right hon. friend that if ever there was a man who borrowed from contemporary literature in his day, or from literature which shortly before had been prevalent in other countries, it was the same divine William Shakespeare. Take his plays Romeo and Juliet, the Two Gentlemen of Verona. Did he not get his plots from Italy? When he wrote his immortal Hamlet, was it not from Denmark that he drew the theme of his drama? I would recommend my hon. friend to turn from Shakespeare to the other great contemporary, or almost contemporary, John Milton, and there he will learn that literature, that the intelligence of a nation and that the creation of a human soul are not propagated or helped by the commercial 10 per cent or 20 per cent, but that if there is anything under which genius flourishes it is liberty and the air of freedom, and not a protective tariff or adventitious aids of that sort.

How is a nation developed? My hon. friend is anxious to have a Canadian spirit in this country. I am anxious too, but perhaps we would proceed by different methods in endeavouring to arrive at the desired result. I do say that we could arouse a Canadian spirit in this country first of all by teaching the boys and the girls and the men and the women of Canada that we should be Canadians first and all the time; that this country is the country to which we owe our first allegiance and that there is in the world no other country which has a greater claim over us than this country in which we live; in which our children have been born and in which we hope to lay our bones when we pass to the other side.

[Mr. McMaster.]

May I point out to the leader of the Opposition and to all those who agree with him, that to expect to keep out American magazine literature in this country by a 10 per cent or a 15 per cent tariff on advertising matter is just about as likely to succeed as Mrs. Partington when she tried to keep away the waves that were coming on the advancing tide. The leader of the Opposition, if he really believes in his theory, is the modern King Canute who sat by the seaside and told the waves not to advance any further. This magazine business is not on a commercial basis at all. It is the advertising that pays for those magazines.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is that not commercial?

Mr. STEVENS: That is literature.

Mr. McMASTER: No, it is not literature. We have been talking about literature so much that it might be as well if we had a definition of literature. There are books for the moment and books for all time, and books for all time compose literature and the other things are not literature. What makes the American magazine circulate so much in Canada is the fact that the Canadian people like to read the stories which are in those magazines and one reason why the stories are good is because there is a great deal of advertising in those magazines and the publishers are able to pay very large sums of money for those stories and to command the best writers. I do not think, whether we like to do this or not, any ten or fifteen per cent tariff will affect that situation. If Canada is to have a great magazine literature and if Canadian literary genius is to be developed, it is not going to be developed in that way. Of that I am quite positive. But there is one suggestion I have as to the development of a Canadian national spirit and as to the growth of Canadian periodical literature. It is this, that our papers should not appeal only to one class or one section or one province in the country. How splendid it would be, for instance, if that journal, conducted by a distinguished member of this House, printed one page in French! How it might add to its circulation in provinces other than Ontario and what a help it might be to the development of a true Canadian patriotic sentiment that would cut right across the division of races and provinces and even all ecclesiastical differences, I will not call that religion!

What about this amendment? I am extremely sympathetic with the idea of the amendment; but I am afraid that when we go to reform the tariff, we shall not be able to reform it fairly or reasonably by picking

out just a few things of this sort in a discussion of this kind. The tariff will have to be amended; I believe the imperative interests of this country demand that it should be reduced; but it should be reduced, it seems to me only after a careful examination of the whole field, and I am inclined to the opinion that although I am deeply sympathetic with this amendment, it is not the proper way to go about this business.

Let me say just this to those who, after seeing shoes taxed and stockings taxed and clothes taxed and hats taxed, now propose to tax even the magazine which we take to while away a pleasant hour—you may make a logical argument from the protectionist point of view for taxing the people of Canada in order to encourage the native production of magazines, but there is one thing which should remain untaxed and that is the free flow of ideas into a country. That is something that we should not tax even if we are protectionists. May I say this, that any industry that cannot stand on its own feet in a country is commercially not an asset, but a liability to that country, because the producers of a country who are carrying the burden, have to carry just so much larger a burden. The danger in Canada—and it is a very real danger, is though the friends sitting in the left hand corner of the chamber, do not seem to realize it—that if you impose this burden of maintaining a non-economic industry and that burden of encouraging and producing and forcing into economic life another non-economic industry, you may make the burden too heavy for the industries which are really economic. That is a real danger to this country. There was a cartoon which someone told me about the other day. The German goose was being held by a French soldier and the French soldier was pressing its neck and saying: "Lay, confound you, lay." But that is the position in which the natural producers of this country are more and more getting into with the burden which the non-economic industries of this country are placing upon them. They are getting into a position of saying: "We won't lay."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be very interesting if the hon. gentleman would tell us, why he says: "more and more" every day.

Mr. McMASTER: I would say that "Every day, in every way, our protectionists are getting greedier and greedier." We have had an interesting speech from the leader of the Opposition. Every journalist, every magazine writer, who hopes for better things under a protectionist tariff, every magazine proprietor who sees great profits flowing in when 10 per cent is put on his competitor from the United States will no doubt echo and spread over the Dominion what the right hon. gentleman has said. But after all, it is founded upon a fallacy and when I hear—because I was not in this House years ago—the echoes of the speeches, those strong low tariff speeches, that the leader of the Opposition made for lower taxes on implements of production coming into this country, I have a sort of sneaking feeling that in his heart he agrees more with me than he does with himself.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, just a few words before we vote. I think the remarks that were made by the leader of the Agrarian party (Mr. Forke) as to the dullness of speeches in this House have had the effect of brightening up this particular debate. Certainly, since he spoke, there has been a little more pep in it than there was in the earlier part of the day.

Let me express my gratification at, and deep appreciation of, the temper of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). He is an old newspaper man; he knows a good deal about the publishing business, something about which I think the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is about as ignorant as he is of trade questions. The hon. member for Bonaventure was speaking out of experience and of course he was speaking wisely, and I am sure his contribution to the debate has been very valuable. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) tries to be facetious at my expense. Well, Sir, I do not think that need bother anyone; it certainly does not perturb me. Any man who stands up in this House and tries to discount the genius of William Shakespeare cannot, I think, be taken seriously by anyone. It is pretty late in the day to charge Shakespeare with plagiarism or anything of that kind. I am not asking for the removal of duties; that removal would not provide the remedy required in this case. I cited the fact that the publishers have to pay duty on raw materials; but I pointed out to the House the injustice under which they labour in having no protection themselves. None of them, as far as I know, asked for the removal of the duties on paper, ink, or anything else. But, Sir, they think that they ought to have protection from the competition, which is unfair, from the other side of the line. The American publication that comes here is dumped on this market and it seems to me it should come under the dumping

clause of the tariff as clearly as any other manufactured goods that might be brought here. American magazines are sold in this country at less than the price of the paper and press work would amount to if they were printed here; and how it is expected that Canadian publishers can compete with that is beyond my comprehension.

I do not wish to go over anything that has been already said, but we have got to this point: the free importation of American periodicals means the forced exportation of the brains of authors and the talents of artists of this country. That is what it amounts to. Any man who makes a mark as a writer here does not stay here to serve a Canadian magazine. We cannot expect him to. Can we expect a man who has talent to write an article for which he can get $1,000 in the United States and sell it here for $100 or $200? And the same thing applies to artists as well as to writers. Any person in the magazine industry, whether a writer, an artist, an engraver or a business man, as soon as he demonstrates his capacity in his particular line, is taken over the border by reason of the enormous circulations and revenues which the American publications enjoy. It is only about a year and a half ago that the man who was editing the most largely circulated paper in this country was taken off that paper, by a salary twice as large to go to Philadelphia. I am speaking not of a writer particularly, but an editor; and there is a marked distinction. And that applies to every man on a Canadian magazine. Just in proportion to the ability that Canadians display is the speed with which they go over the line and assist in producing magazines that come into this country and make it impossible for Canadian publishers to compete. If there is any industry in this country that should be protected it is the one that will teach the people to be Canadians and will try to interpret one province to another, using the talents of Canadians to develop Canadian ideals and a Canadian sentiment from one end of the country to the other.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. F. G. THOMPSON, WINNIPEG

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, documents, telegrams, etc., connected with, leading to, or in any way relating to the withdrawal of professional work for the Inland Revenue Department, formerly performed by Mr. F. G. Thompson, barrister, at Winnipeg.

[Mr. Hocken.]

MR. H. P. BLACKWOOD, WINNIPEG

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, documents, telegrams, etc., connected with, leading to, or in any way relating to the withdrawal of professional work for the Inland Revenue Department, formerly performed by Mr. H. P. Blackwood, barrister, at Winnipeg.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—TRANSFERENCE OF LEGAL WORK

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, documents, telegrams, etc., connected with, leading to, or in any way relating to the withdrawal of professional work for the Inland Revenue Department, formerly performed by Charles Blake, barrister, at Brandon, and a returned soldier, and the turning of same over to Mr. Clement, of that city.

PETER THIBEAU'S MAIL CONTRACT

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, and other documents, relating to the cancellation of the contract of Peter Thibeau for the carrying of mail from Thibeauville to Sporting Mountain Station, Nova Scotia.

CIVIL SERVICE DISMISSALS

Mr. HANSON:

For a return showing the number of dismissals of officers or employees of the government, and all others appointed at any time by the government of Canada (in cases where the position vacated, or required to be vacated, has been filled by another, or is intended to be filled by another), from the 1st day of January, 1922, until the passing of this order, and showing also the position vacated or requested to be vacated, and the names of the persons so dismissed, or whose resignations were so requested and the reason in each case for such dismissal or request for resignation, and the name of the person now occupying the position thus vacated, also showing in each case whether an investigation into charges made against the person dismissed or requested to resign was made, and by whom.

CANADIAN TRADE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. PUTMAN (for Mr. Archambault):

For a return showing the names of all the commercial agents or trade commissioners representing the Canadian government abroad, showing their address, the date of their respective appointment, and their respective salaries.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House a special committee of eleven members be appointed to inquire jointly with Mr. Speaker into the advisability of adopting a rule of the House which will provide that an amendment to an amendment be allowed on the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into committee of supply or ways and means; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution that it is a very important departure from old parliamentary practice, and I do not think it should be adopted hurriedly. The matter might at a later day be referred to the committee on rules and be considered in connection with other rules, but I would ask my hon. friend not to press his resolution to-night. This is an old established practice of parliament, and although there may be reasons for a change, I do not think the practice should be changed without much more deliberation than we are able to give it to-night.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, that is just the reason we are moving for a special committee. We understand it to be a matter of some importance, and therefore we thought it best to move in this way. Of course, if it will meet with the wishes of the leader of the House at the moment (Mr. Fielding) that the resolution should stand for the time being, I defer to his request.

Mr. FIELDING: Thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

HALIBUT FISHERIES TREATY WITH UNITED STATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before public Bills and Orders are called, I observe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is back from his trip to Washington. I hope by this time the ways of secret diplomacy have been arrested and that we may know the purpose of the trip and what results were accomplished.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Yes. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is not in his place, but the request of the right hon. gentleman is quite reasonable, and I hope at the next session we will be able to give him some information on the subject. At all events the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be consulted in the meantime.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

On the Order, for resuming the debate on the motion of Mr. Neill for the second reading of Bill No. 6, respecting Immigration:

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, when this debate was on before the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) advised the House that he would bring down a bill dealing with a kindred subject, and it was then tacitly understood that this matter should stand until that bill had received some consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Tuesday, March 6, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the name of Mr. Gauvreau be substituted for that of Mr. Cardin on the joint committee of both Houses on the printing of parliament, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

That the name of Mr. Cardin be substituted for that of Mr. Gauvreau on the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): With the consent of the House I would move:

That the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 15, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, be given leave to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): With the consent of the House, I beg to present the first report of the special committee on Bill No. 15.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 46, respecting the Community, General Hospital, Alms House, and Seminary of Learning of the Sisters of Charity of Ottawa.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 47, respecting a certain patent of Clarence P. Landreth.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): By leave of the House, I beg to move:

That the first report of the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THE BANK ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Can the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) kindly give the House any information as to when a bill dealing with the revision of the Bank Act will be brought down?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): If not this week, in the early days of next week.

HALIBUT FISHERIES—TREATY WITH UNITED STATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I desire to answer a question that was asked last night just prior to adjournment by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), concerning the treaty that was signed at Washington on March 2. This treaty is for the preservation of the halibut fisheries in northern Pacific waters, including Behring sea. It provides for a close season from November 16 of each year to February 15 following, both dates inclusive. It provides for certain dispositions to enforce that restriction. It provides also for the appointment of a commission composed of two members from each country, to investigate the life history of halibut and to make a report to both governments as to the best means of preserving those important fisheries. The treaty is for a term of five years, to be continued thereafter until two years after either party has notified the other that it wishes to put an end to the treaty. It will be printed in due time, but in the meantime I desire to lay on the Table of the House a typewritten copy of the treaty.

Mr. DUFF: Who signed the treaty?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): As regards the negotiations in relation to this treaty, was there any change in the status of Canada in connection with the British Embassy at Washington?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will answer the question of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) will draw his own conclusions. The treaty was signed by the United States of America, Mr. Charles Evan Hughes, Secretary of State for the United States, acting as plenipotentiary for the President; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada, acting as plenipotentiary for His Majesty the King.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that neither the name of the British Ambassador nor that of anyone representing Great Britain appears in the treaty, nor was any representative of the British government consulted as to its negotiation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The treaty is signed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, having full authority from His Majesty the King, to sign it as his plenipotentiary.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there any change in the status?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were the contents made known in any way to the British government prior to the execution of the treaty?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then my hon. friend agrees that there is no change in the procedure.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, my right hon. friend may draw his own conclusions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly will draw mine, but I was asking the minister what his were.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This treaty will be considered by a committee of the House and by the House itself, and when that is done I think it will be ample time to discuss the merits of the treaty and even the phase of the subject raised by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have another question to ask regarding the subject. Will my hon. friend tell us upon what decision of this parliament the treaty was negotiated?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The treaty provides for certain dispositions which were recommended in 1918 by the International Commission appointed by both governments—by the government of which my right hon. friend was leader and by the government of the United States. Among many other recommendations, a treaty had been prepared at the time in regard to the salmon fisheries of the Fraser river, and it was signed but was never ratified by the American Senate. Another treaty had been prepared but was not signed, and one of its dispositions was the very one which is now agreed to in the present treaty. That treaty, I say, was never signed; but it has been

unanimously recognized by the experts of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries of both countries that it was highly desirable to enforce the close season, to say nothing of the other dispositions which had been recommended by the International Commission. I may say also that this disposition has been recommended unanimously by the members of the parliamentary committee which was appointed last session to investigate the subject of the fisheries in British Columbia. As to the question which my right hon. friend raises, I do not know of any treaty which was discussed in parliament before being negotiated. The discussion always takes place afterwards.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I cannot agree with the hon. minister. I should like the minister, before he comes to the discussion of the bill itself, to be good enough to look up some of his own speeches and those of his leaders on the subject of secret diplomacy.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not like to read my own speeches; I enjoy much more the reading of my right hon. friend's.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members had better reserve any further remarks on this subject until the question comes up regularly before the House.

JAPANESE STOWAWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): May I ask the government whether an investigation will be held into the circumstances surrounding the landing at Vancouver a few days ago of the Japanese freighter Taibu Maru with 29 stowaways, and also into the escape of six of these stowaways from the detention sheds at Vancouver? This is a very illuminating incident.

Mr. SPEAKER: No comment can be made at this stage on such a question which has reference to matters of fact. I would suggest to the hon. member that he put his question on the order paper.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

National Defence—militia services—annual drill, $1,050,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are these estimates based on any commitments of Canada in regard to any war, actual or contemplated, in Europe? I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made the statement that the policy of his government now is not to engage in any future war, especially in Europe, without consulting parliament. The House, therefore, ought to know whether or not these estimates have been prepared with a view to any commitment in regard to participation in or preparation for war on the American continent or outside of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not aware of any commitments other than such as have been customary in the past.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What part of this vote was expended last year?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): The whole of it will have been spent at the end of the year. Some bills are not yet in, but some $800,000 of the vote has so far been expended, and the balance will all have been used up by the end of the year. The committee will find that these estimates have been, in the main, reduced a little from last year. In some of the items I ask for an increase and in others a decrease. In the present case I ask for an increase, because the extra $50,000 will permit us to provide fairly good training. Last year we partially trained about 33,000 men. This year we hope to be able to do a little better with $50,000 additional. On the whole these estimates for Militia services will be found to be about $63,000 less than last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What training was done?

Mr. GRAHAM: The number authorized to be trained for periods of nine days and twelve days last year was 33,900. The number trained up to January was 24,531, and it is expected that the balance will be in by 31st March. Some of the headquarters and unit training is not yet completed.

Mr. HANSON: How does the number of day's training per man compare with that in previous years? I understand the men were trained eight days last summer.

Mr. GRAHAM: They were trained nine days at local headquarters and twelve days at camp.

Mr. MEWBURN: How many men trained in camp under canvas, and how many at local headquarters?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will get that information. I would imagine that a greater number trained at headquarters in previous years.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Take the ordinary military summer camps, how many were held last year, and where?

Mr. GRAHAM: There were trained at local headquarters for nine days 22,000 men, other than artillery.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I mean summer camps.

Mr. GRAHAM: There were trained in camp 8,851.

Mr. HANSON: What infantry regiments were trained under canvas, and at what camps? I am under the impression that there was no infantry training at any camp last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: The statement by districts is rather lengthy, but I will give the committee particulars for military district No. 1. They are as follows:

Unit	Period at Local Headquarters	Period at Local Camp	Period at Practice Camp Det. only	Camp	Numbers Trained	Amount Paid
						$ cts.
1st Hussars, London Ont.	9				217	2,736 65
9th Grey's Horse, Wingham, Ont.		9		Port Elgin	260	8,921 88
11th Brigade, C.F.A.—						
Hdqrs., Guelph, Ont.	x		x			
29th Battery, Guelph, Ont.	6		6	Petawawa	62	1,518 36
16th Battery, Guelph, Ont.	6		6			
No. 1 Signal Company, London, Ont.	9				30	372 27
Corps of Guides—						
No. 1 Cyclist Co., London, Ont.		9		Carling Hgts.	15	450 60
1st Infantry Brigade—						
Hqrs., London, Ont.		9		"	16	305 70
The Middlesex Lt. Infantry—						
1st Bn. (185th Bn. C.E.F.), Strathroy, Ont.		9		"	220	4,002 24
The Perth Regiment—						
1st Bn. (110th Bn. C.E.F.), Stratford, Ont.	9				168	2,618 17
The Huron Regiment—						
1st Bn. (161st Bn. C.E.F.), Clinton, Ont.		9		Carling Hgts.	152	2,852 48
The Western Ontario Regt.—						
1st Bn. (1st Bn. C.E.F.), London, Ont.	9				297	3,885 48
The Bruce Regiment—						
1st Bn. (160th Bn. C.E.F.), Walkerton, Ont.		9			240	3,726 40
The Oxford Rifles—						
1st Bn. (71st Bn. C.E.F.), Woodstock, Ont.	9					Not yet paid
The Highland Light Infantry of Canada—						
1st Bn. (34th Bn. C.E.F.), Galt, Ont.	9				170	2,341 84
The Wellington Rifles—						
1st Bn. (153rd Bn. C.E.F.), Guelph, Ont.	9				164	2,163 87
The Elgin Regiment—						
1st Bn. (91st Bn. C.E.F.), St. Thomas, Ont.	9					Not yet paid
The Lambton Regiment—						
1st Bn. (149th Bn. C.E.F.), Sarnia, Ont.		9		Carling Hgts.	105	1,779 27
The Essex Fusiliers—						
1st Bn. (18th Bn. C.E.F.), Windsor, Ont.	9					Not yet paid
The Kent Regiment—						
1st Bn. (186th Bn. C.E.F.), Chatham, Ont.	9					"
2nd Canadian Machine Gun Brigade, London, Ont.	9				156	2,112 11
1st Divisional Train—						
No. 1 Co., London		9		Carling Hgts.		Not yet paid
No. 2 Co., Guelph		9		"		"

Unit	Period at Local Headquarters	Period at Local Camp	Period at Practice Camp Det. only	Camp	Numbers Trained	Amount Paid
						$ cts.
No. 15 Field Ambulance, London, Ont.	.....	9	.....	Carling Hgts.	.....	Not yet paid
No. 1 Mobile Veterinary Section, London, Ont.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	"
No. 1 Section, C.A.V.C., London, Ont.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	"
No. 1 Det. C.O.C., London, Ont.	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	38 25
No. 1 Section C.P.C., London, Ont.	.....	.....	.....	.....	44	652 29
Western University Contingent, C.O.T.C., London, Ont.	12	.....	.....	.....	9	78 50
					2,327	40,556 36
Plus general expenses	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15,272 76
Total expenditure for District to January 31, 1923	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	55,829 12

x As specially authorized.

Those are the particulars for only one district. There are thirteen districts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many men were at the annual camp at Carling Heights—a thousand? —two hundred and fifty? It was a very small camp.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will have to get those figures for my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON: I would like similar figures for Aldershot and Camp Sussex. I understand there were very few men at either place.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The comment that one hears in regard to the annual drill as performed in Canada last year is that the million dollars which parliament appropriated for that purpose was very largely wasted. Very little drill has been performed. The camps are hardly recognizable compared with the camps that were held in years gone by. A system has been established, and perhaps a good one too, of drilling volunteer units at their local headquarters. Instead of turning them out to annual camp they are permitted to do their annual drill periodically throughout the whole year. That no doubt is a good system. But wherever I have been, and particularly in Ontario, the comment I hear on every hand is that the old time enthusiasm for militia service is, not gradually but rapidly, disappearing, and that little or no encouragement has been given to it by the government. There is no doubt, from the comment we hear in this House, that if the service were to be blotted out altogether a number of hon. members would applaud the proposal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Now, that is not my view of the situation, and I am satisfied that it is not the view of the vast majority of the people of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER: You are mistaken.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But in regard to militia training we have started to go down hill, and during the past twelve months we have gone down so rapidly that it now becomes a question whether the expenditure of a million dollars of the people's money on such training as was given last year is not an absolute waste. There come times, even in the history of this peaceable land, when we call on the militia; in fact, only a few months ago this government had to call upon the militia in various parts of Canada and send them down to the Maritime provinces to preserve law and order. They were not able to get a sufficient military force in Nova Scotia; they came up to Montreal, to Kingston, to Toronto, to London, before they could get enough men to send to the Maritime provinces.

Mr. POWER: Does the hon. gentleman think that if training had been going on in the immediate vicinity of Sydney at the time of the strike, it would have been judicious for the government to send men from that training camp to the scene of the strike?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not see any reason why they should not do so.

Mr. POWER: Would the hon. gentleman himself have done it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The militia of Canada is essentially a loyal body of men who are in favour of the preservation of law and order. It has been for that purpose very largely that the militia of Canada has been maintained since Canada became a country. The minister to-day comes forward and asks for $50,000 more to continue his annual training. Last year his first proposal was to have $1,400,000 appropriated for this purpose, but a disturbance arose among his followers on the question and he moved a reduction of $400,000. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) was himself active last session in endeavouring to bring about a reduction of the vote far below the million-dollar point, but—probably after a caucus or a conference of some kind with the minister—he yielded and the amount was allowed to stand at $1,000,000. For anything that is before the House to-day, and for all the training that took place in Canada last year, $1,000,000 should be ample. The minister has not, in my hearing at all events, justified his proposal to increase the amount this year by $50,000. It is apparent to anybody who goes about Ontario—I do not speak for other provinces—that there is a lack of enthusiasm among militiamen themselves in regard to military training and military organization; they feel that instead of being encouraged they have been discouraged by this government. That may be the will of this House of Commons, but in my judgment it is a great mistake. We should keep up an establishment at least equal to that which we maintained in pre-war days. In those days there was no charge in this country of militarism; I never heard it, if there was any. If we keep up the same establishment and give the same class of training as we did three, four or five years before the war, the military spirit will be maintained and the enthusiasm of the militia organization stimulated. But you have not that condition to-day; the manner in which the subject has been handled by the government and by this House has brought about a reduction of enthusiasm and a depreciation in the value of our military organization. We find ourselves, as we did last fall, in this pass: that where trouble of any kind is threatened, even on a minor scale, it becomes necessary to scour the country as far as London to get a handful of men to send to the East to quell a disturbance, or at least to keep the peace. If the old spirit existed; if the old militia units were organized and received proper training and encouragement, men would have been available in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick for all necessary purposes. Let us get back to the old basis of training. The minister says he trains 33,000 men. That is a fair number, if the training amounted to anything. But the men come in in small driblets, a few at a time; they turn out at local headquarters and indulge, I suppose, in a good time for an hour or two and report it as drill. It is the best they can do. The men cannot be got; they cannot be induced to enlist in the various units; consequently the units are far below strength and both officers and men are discouraged. Unless the minister takes some steps to bring about changed conditions, the whole military spirit in the country is going to die out.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is something in what my hon. friend says; the amount now asked is smaller than the appropriation in pre-war days. But I would point out that we are asking for an amount which is within $109,000 of the amount spent in the last year my hon. friend was in office. The reports from my officers indicate that the training last year was just as perfect as it was the year before. The cost of living may be going down a bit, and that may account for the decrease. I must take exception to my hon. friend's statement that the militia men are not enthusiastic; unless the officers all over Canada are deceiving me, the condition is very much the reverse. I visited a good many of the headquarters this year and I found great enthusiasm prevailing. The majority of the officers understand that we have to get back to pre-war conditions, that we have to cut down the expenditure in this connection as in connection with all other services; and I feel that in doing that I am serving the country and not neglecting any interest. My hon. friend referred to the fact that the department had to go to London and elsewhere to get troops for a certain occasion. The law provides that in a case of that kind you must take the permanent force. If we train a million men in the volunteer force they are not, under the act, to be called on, except for the time necessary to replace them by members of the permanent force. On that occasion we called on none of the volunteers; we strictly followed the act and called on members of the permanent force. If he were dealing with the numbers in the permanent force, my hon. friend's criticism might be applicable, but the act does not provide that the volunteer force shall be called out, except in an emergency, and even then it is to be replaced as rapidly as possible by the permanent force. Section 81 of the Militia Act, dealing with aid to the civil power, says:

> The district officer commanding in any locality, if he is present in the locality and able to act, or if he is not so present, or from sickness or other cause is unable to act, the senior officer of the active militia

in any locality, not from sickness or other cause unable to act, shall call out the active militia, or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, when thereunto required in writing by the civil authority hereinafter designated in that behalf: Provided that so far as the permanent force is available, a sufficient number of the force is to be employed upon the duty of preventing or suppressing such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance before recourse is had to other militia corps, and shall replace such other militia corps if so called out upon duty so soon as and to the extent the permanent force shall thereafter become available.

So, as a matter of fact, the permanent force is the force that the department, under the act, is supposed to call on in such cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend surely has not understood that from the section. It says, in substance, "Shall call out the active militia, to be replaced so far as available by the permanent force." Only to the extent that the permanent force exists is it to be called on. If there is not sufficient permanent force in the district, then the active militia is allowed to remain. The active militia is available there above and beyond the permanent force for the purpose of quelling a disturbance. It has been so used time and again.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not so informed by the officers of the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The law is there.

Mr. GRAHAM: The law is quite plain. If you have a permanent force available, you are to use it, but if it be not available, in other words if it be not in the district or close at hand, you can use the active militia until such time as you can replace it with the permanent force. That is as I read the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And to the extent the permanent force is there. If it is not there to sufficient extent, you may use the active militia. This goes only to confirm the point made by my hon friend for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the active militia is available for these purposes. The permanent force referred to is the permanent force of the district; if not, why is the district officer commanding mentioned?

Mr. GRAHAM: The district officer commanding is in that locality. The officers of the department, and the act bears them out, I submit, are my authority that we are to call out the permanent force if they are available. If they are available, it does not make any difference where they are available so long as we can get them, but if they are not immediately available, we can call out the active militia until such time as we can replace them with the permanent force.

Mr. HANSON: Reference has been made here on two or three occasions to the occurrences last summer in the Maritime provinces, especially in Cape Breton. I think that in view of the panic that seemed to strike some people down there in the island of Cape Breton, some explanation is due the House and the country as to the circumstances under which the permanent force or that portion of the active militia, whichever it was that was called out, was called out. Why was there any necessity at all of having a large number of troops rushed into Cape Breton before there had been a single overt act of violence so far as I am informed—and I followed the newspapers pretty carefully at that time. Was there any panic on the part of the officials of the British Empire Steel Company? Did they ask for the militia, or who was it that was responsible for calling out these men? How many men were called out, and who is going to pay for them? I think all these are very pertinent questions, and I should like to hear something from the Prime Minister on this point as well as from the Minister of National Defence, because I remember last year when a discussion was going on in this House with respect to the Mounted Police, the Prime Minister expressed a very pointed opinion that only in the very greatest emergency should the active militia be called out to maintain the civil authority in Canada. There was so far as I am aware absolutely no excuse, no justification whatever, for calling out the permanent force in Cape Breton last summer. I believe it was an abuse of the powers given under the Militia Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend about the Militia Act. I did not anticipate this matter coming up to-day, though it is perfectly in order, because I have to ask for a supplementary vote this present year to pay the expenses of the troops that were called out. When that item comes up I shall have all the information here, and if my hon. friend would let the discussion remain over until that time, it will be only a few days before we can have a thorough discussion of it.

Mr. HANSON: I am quite agreeable.

Mr. LOVETT: Why was the 95th Regiment in my constituency of Digby-Annapolis, ordered out under canvas at Aldershot last summer and a few days later the order countermanded? I would also like the minister to favourably consider giving this regiment drill this summer.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not the details with me but I will venture the answer, and I think

it is probably the correct one. It is the custom in the department at an earlier date than the estimates get through the House to notify the units that are to train, but last year the estimates were cut down to such an extent that many units were unable to train. I think that is the answer. I shall be glad to give consideration to what my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. SHAW: Would the minister tell us what proportion of the amount last year was expended on drill for infantry units, and then indicate the amount that was sent for drill purposes among artillery units, machine gun units and other branches of the service?

Mr. GRAHAM: I can get that information for my hon. friend. The details I have here are not separated in that way.

Mr. SHAW: I wanted the information for a specific purpose. I find myself in hearty accord with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for South Wellington. I do not agree with him, however, in his view that a larger amount of money should be expended for this particular purpose. I think that this money is largely wasted. In order to determine the value of this training I think you have to take into consideration the different branches of the service that are trained. As I recall pointing out last year, the value of this annual drill so far as infantry units are concerned is practically nil. I think it is of very little value. If you consider the training given you must necessarily come to the conclusion that so far as infantry training is concerned, it has two specific purposes. It is either training men for war purposes, or training them so that they will be able to carry out any functions they may be called upon to perform under the provisions of the Militia Act in aid of the civil power. That latter, fortunately, very seldom becomes the unpleasant duty of any militia unit in this country.

With regard to training men for war service, the important thing is the physical training. It is conceded, and was conceded last year, that it takes a period of six months to train a man for war. Now all the training any infantry unit needs for that service can be acquired certainly within a month. The great essential is to put the man in proper physical condition. That cannot be done in a matter of a week; it cannot be done in a matter of nine days; it cannot be done short of the six months required. It seems to me that under these circumstances the training for infantry units of the character which is carried on is practically valueless. However, with regard to the machine gun and artillery units and other technical branches of the service, this annual training may have some special value.

Let me indicate what happened last year, and I simply cite this to show that the training is not carried on economically. Last year artillery units were brought from the city of Vancouver for the purpose of firing a few rounds at Sarcee Camp in Calgary, a distance of 640 miles. Artillery units were brought from Saskatoon, and I think from Edmonton, for the purpose of discharging a few shots, and getting a certain amount of training, after which they went home again. That is not training men economically for these technical branches of the service. I am relying for my information on the newspaper reports, which I presume are correct. I see no reason why the man at Vancouver cannot take out the gun which he brings with him to Calgary, and fire a few rounds in some selected spot there, and the same with the man from Saskatoon. Why should it be necessary to bring these men at great expense over long distances, bringing their artillery equipment with them, and I have no doubt their shells also, just to spend a little time at the camp and then go back home to their usual vocations? It does appear to me, therefore, that it can be charged with truth that this training is not economically performed so far as the technical branches of the service are concerned, and that so far as the infantry is concerned, the training is practically valueless. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I desire to know from the minister the amount of this vote which would, in the ordinary course, be expended for the special technical branches. It was my purpose to move that the balance be eliminated from the vote altogether.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can give my hon. friend the figures in numbers of men as I did a few minutes ago. I gave him the number of artillery men—

Mr. SHAW: I want the figures in terms of money.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think I have that.

Mr. SHAW: Could the minister state the amount approximately?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will have to have a calculation made. As to the number of men in training the figures are: Infantry trained in camp, 8,851; men trained at local headquarters, including those trained in machine guns, 22,011; artillery trained at local head-

quarters, of which 2,329 attended firing practice in camp for 6 days, 3,038. That would hardly bear out what my hon. friend said that the artillery men were simply firing a few shots when they were in training for six days.

Mr. SHAW: Of course they were not firing every day.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose they were firing every day when the weather was favourable.

Mr. LANCTOT: Before this item is voted I desire to offer a few remarks intended not for the committee alone but for the country as a whole. I am not of the same opinion as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), the former Minister of Militia, who stated a few minutes ago that the present Minister of Defence should go further and spend more money for militia purposes. I do not agree with that hon. gentleman; I ask the Minister of Defence, in the interest of the people, to spend less money for this purpose.

It will be remembered that last session I expressed opposition to the vote then asked for of $1,400,000. The Minister of Defence had to suspend the consideration of his estimates for about two weeks and then was obliged to reduce the amount asked for. That action on his part was not satisfactory to me nor to many of the people of this country, but I thought that this year the minister would do better. Under the circumstances I am surprised that the minister is asking for such a large amount; it is altogether too much. It is all very well for volunteers in the cities to go in for drill and to receive pay for it; but I do not see why young men in the country districts should at great expense be carried from one part of the country to the other for a period of nine days. For what purpose is it? Really to have a little fun—that is what it amounts to—at the expense of the country. It is claimed that it takes six months' training, at least to fit a soldier to go on the firing line. Well, if the young men are only trained for six days a year—although I have not made up the calculation—it seems to me that it would take practically a century before they could become qualified soldiers. Therefore, I am opposed to such a scheme.

I am a man of peace, as you know, Mr. Chairman, I have always been a man of that type, and as I am getting older from year to year I shall continue in that frame of mind. It is hard for me to realize that all the members of this House are in favour of training our young men to engage in some future European war. Such an idea is repugnant to the majority of our people, except perhaps the politicians. Is it not admitted by almost everybody that we have been virtually ruined as a result of our engaging in the last European war? I think we occupy to-day a very unenviable position, bearing as we do such an enormous burden in connection with our National Railways and having to support such an immense debt as a result of the war. For my part I do not see how we are ever going to get out of these difficulties. Therefore, when men say, in this House and outside of it, that we should prepare ourselves for a future war I do not accept such advice, neither do the people of the country. It is altogether opposed to common sense, in view of our past experiences and present conditions, that anybody should suggest our going ahead and training men and spending more money for some war in the future. That is my point of view.

4 p.m.

I know very well that the so-called big men in the militia want money voted from year to year for military purposes and for the training of the militia. They want to demonstrate to the people that they are doing something, otherwise they would lose their jobs.

An hon. MEMBER: Who are those men?

Mr. LANCTOT: They are the brigadier-generals, the colonels, the majors and the officers of other ranks. Now the minister is asking for $50,000 more than we voted last year for annual drill, and $100,000 more for the cadet services. Will this expenditure be to the benefit of the country? I say, no. Whenever the need arises to maintain the peace in Canada we have to call upon the permanent force. If I am not mistaken the minister told the committee a moment ago that he had to despatch troops from the permanent force to Cape Breton when a disturbance occurred there. Why, I ask in the name of my electors, is it necessary to spend nearly $13,000,000 this year on the militia, the navy and the mounted police? After the recent war was brought to a close we were told that the last war had been fought, and that we were through with war forever. In spite of that we are still being called upon to vote these large expenditures for military purposes, at a time when the people are being taxed in so many different ways. Let me say, for example, that it will take a great many two-cent stamps to even begin to pay the $13,000,000 referred to. Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that the time has arrived when this government should say: We are going to have a rest now in the matter of military expenditure; we are going to cut

by one-half these expenditures for at least five years to come; and if in the future some of our boys want to go and engage in European wars let them go on their own account and let those who foster such action help to bear the expense? That is my opinion. In future, if I am still a member of the House and if anything of this kind is proposed either by my party, or by the Tory party, or by the Progressive party, I will tell you frankly where I shall stand—my policy shall be "Not a man, not a dollar." I move that this item be cut in two; that is to say, that instead of $1,050,000, one-half of that amount should be voted.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment requires to be in writing. If the hon. member will present it in writing, it will be submitted to the committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would gladly support some such amendment as that moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Lanctot), not because I want half that amount expended, but because this seems the only way possible to protest against the larger expenditure. As representing a Canadian constituency and a rather important one, I must protest against expenditures for military purposes. I think I may speak, not merely for one constituency, but for a large section of the labour people across this country from coast to coast, who almost unanimously protest against continued military expenditures. I notice that the items for militia, the naval service and the air force, amount to nearly $13,000,000. If we add to that the estimate for the mounted police force, which is more or less a military police force, although it is under another department, we have the enormous sum of over $15,000,000 which is being expended in this country for preparation for some future war or for some possible disturbance at home.

We ought to ask ourselves very definitely, as I said last year, against what enemy we are proposing to go. Are we proposing to keep down by military force any rebellion at home? What province in Canada is regarded as disloyal; what section of the community is regarded as disloyal, that we need to maintain a large military force in order to quell any possible rebellion? To-day we have had called to our attention the fact that the permanent force was used in the Cape Breton district during the past summer. I wonder whether that was a wise movement or not. I happened to be down there a few months after the occurrence, and not merely the labour people who were immediately involved, but business men, editors and others in that district were unanimously of opinion, as far as I was able to gather, that this was a very unwise move. I wonder if the committee is aware that the military were sent down there in spite of protests of mayors of the towns involved. Is the committee aware that a force of some 1,500 returned men lined up in opposition to the military, and it was only the restraint, alike of the returned men and, I am glad to say, of the officers commanding the forces that were sent down, that prevented a fearful tragedy in that district? Was it wise that men from Ontario and Quebec should be sent down to Nova Scotia to try to subdue a number of the very best citizens of Scotch extraction, resident for several generations, of Canada? Surely, there are some other means of settling our industrial disputes in this country than by sending our militia from one province to quell a rebellion of Canadian people in another province.

Are we preparing against any other foe at the present time? I would like the government who are responsible for bringing in these estimates, to tell us whether they contemplate any action against the United States to the south of us—we with our eight or nine million people and over one hundred million on the other side. Could we make any defence there, if defence had to be made by means of military force? Are we proposing, as the last speaker said, to take part in any future European conflict? Whether or not members of the government or members of the committee know this, a very considerable proportion of the people of Canada will not again stand for that kind of thing. It is all very well from time to time in this House to utter praises about loyalty to Empire and so on. Some of us claim to be as loyal Canadians and as loyal British subjects as there are anywhere; but we do not believe in some of the policies that have been pursued in the past in the name of the British Empire or in the name of the Canadian people, and the number of those who hold that opinion is rapidly growing. Are we preparing for any European conflict? We may well pause and ask ourselves such questions.

Probably we are going along simply on the old principle that preparedness is the best way to avoid war; that preparedness is a sort of insurance against war. That doctrine has been proved absolutely false by the events of the last few years. Preparedness carries with it no guarantee whatever of peace, and I take it that the big thing we have to learn these days is that the guarantees of peace do not consist of large armies, or of a large naval force or of an air force or anything of that kind. The guarantees of peace are altogether

different. We have been told by leading thinkers in nearly all countries that we have entered a new age. We have been warned that if we pursue the old methods, we are inevitably bound for catastrophe. I take it that we in Canada are at this time in a peculiarly favourable position to begin to work our way out into new methods for ensuring and perpetuating peace. We are on this North American continent side by side with a friendly nation to the south of us. We are closeley united by ties of blood with Great Britain, France, and I am glad to think also, through a considerable part of our population in the West, with large numbers of European peoples. We have no hereditary enemies; we have no enemy that stands at our gates. Under such circumstances, I should like to think that we would cut down these expenditures and take our part in showing the world a better way. I notice that we are not asked to make this year any grant to housing, for which last year we paid $10,000,000 or about that sum. We are not asked to make any grants to the unemployed. Many of these unemployed are men who in the last war were called to serve our country, yet to-day are walking our streets without work. We should take care of the wrecks of the last war before we begin to train our boys for the next war.

There is another item on which I do not intend to speak, but it is closely connected with this. I refer to the training of cadets. Here again, the same question arises. Are the people generally anxious to maintain the enthusiasm which some hon. gentlemen in the House would like to see maintained for military things? From all sections of this country, from grain growers' locals, from labour bodies, even in some instances from bodies altogether outside of this kind of organization, we have resolutions coming in asking that anything like a glorification of militarism should be put down. All sorts of international bodies are meeting in Europe asking that we should join in a campaign against militarism. It is no use our talking about disarmament or declaiming against great military establishments in Europe unless at home we begin to put our theories into practice. We have a far easier task in Canada than is the case in Europe. We have not the animosities and standing armies they have in Europe. We have not the old established systems nor the military caste that they have in Europe. It is easier for us to begin the task here. I will gladly support any motion looking towards a reduction of our military estimates with a view to eliminating them altogether just as soon as possible.

Mr. MEWBURN: I must take exception to the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Woodsworth). I congratulate the minister on having increased the vote by $50,000; indeed, I think it is hardly enough. The country decided many years ago to have a militia force in Canada and it will be time enough to cut down the estimates when that decision is reversed. I agree with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), however, that some of the $1,000,000 voted last year was wasted. I do not wish for one moment to be understood as criticizing the very highly experienced officers, whose technical knowledge is of such considerable value, whom the minister has on his general staff. I do not believe that any better officers can be found anywhere. They were handicapped, I believe, in their endeavour to train the militia of Canada last year by reason of the reduction in the vote. But I do think that some of the money that was spent might have been devoted to better advantage in concentrating on certain units in the country. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) that with the artillery, machine gun and other technical units a greater effort should have been made to train the men in camps and to concentrate in the work carried out. As regards the infantry, I believe that better results could have been obtained had the whole of the force been trained at local headquarters, and I refer particularly to the city corps. I realize the difficulties the rural corps have, possessing no local headquarters. But as regards city corps in all our cities, I must say that these men have been in the past and are to-day, a wonderful credit to Canada. Of the small pittance meted out to them for training during the maximum of nine days provided for, I think I am safe in saying that not one cent went into the pockets of the individual officers, non-commissioned officers or men. These men are endeavouring to build up their units, a good many of which are up to the old peace establishment; and they cannot do this without expenditure of money. As I pointed out, these corps, previous to the war, augmented their regimental funds by husbanding their resources, and the money that was given for training was put back into the units for the purpose of increasing their efficiency. I know that the city corps spend in training, a good many more than the nine or twelve days that they are paid for. They train all winter; the non-commissioned officers hold classes of instruction; and there is rifle shooting practice throughout the summer. This work is very commendable. But I think it was an error to have small spasmodic camps throughout the

country where a few hundred men were assembled, and from which they could not get any material benefit. I have great pleasure in supporting the vote and am delighted that there has been an increase in the expenditure for cadet service. If we want to build up the patriotism which we need in this country we must devote our energies to the young men who engage in the cadet service. My friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) objects to the militia and the mounted police; I daresay he speaks from some experience. But we know what advantage there was in having the mounted police and the militia during the late trouble in Winnipeg, and it is a credit to the country that we had men who were loyal enough to stand by the nation at that time.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I do not know that under the present system the annual drill could be carried on at all if the estimate were cut in half. Is the past system in connection with the annual drill to be continued or not? I understand from the minister that there are thirteen military districts in Canada, and I think I am right in saying that the province of Manitoba comprises one, Saskatchewan one, and Alberta one. I had a conversation with a military man before leaving the West and he informed me that negotiations were under way towards amalgamating these three districts into one, the headquarters to be either at Winnipeg, at Regina or at Calgary. I do not know, of course, whether that is correct or not, but I had that conversation with a lieutenant-colonel who, I presume, had some information on the subject. But assuming that these negotiations are under way, would not that be a fair way to reduce the expenditures in connection with the annual drill? As this gentleman pointed out to me, if you decrease the number of military districts you will decrease the number of staff officers who draw the large proportion of the money we vote annually for drill. The minister might say whether there is any truth in that rumour and whether such a system is to be put into force in the Dominion, of reducing the number of districts.

Mr. GRAHAM: That matter has been under consideration, but I would not say in negotiation. Only yesterday I handed to my chief of staff, General MacBrien, than whom there is no more efficient officer in Canada, a letter that I had received and requested his opinion on it. In reply I got from him a letter which unfortunately I have not with me, and in which he is very much averse to amalgamating these districts, for reasons which he stated. He thinks the training would not be as efficient as under the present system, would be less practicable, and more cumbersome.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many military districts are maintained now?

Mr. GRAHAM: I said thirteen before; I ought to have said eleven.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They were numbered one to thirteen, but two, I understand, were never in existence.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the men trained under this item who were actually sent to quell the apprehended riots in Nova Scotia. I think the committee should now be told upon whose authority they were sent; who were sent; what expenditure was incurred; whether that expenditure has been collected; if not, what steps have been taken to collect it, or whether the government intends to take action in the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: An hon. member asked me practically the same question a few moments ago and he was satisfied when I suggested that that discussion be reserved until I bring down an estimate for the payment of these expenses, when I shall give all the details in regard to the units that were sent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The estimate is not in these items; I was looking for it. Does the minister say that we shall have to pass these estimates and wait for a supplementary estimate before we can get an explanation of so important a matter as that which is connected with this very vote now before the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not say anything of the kind. I say that I shall have all the details when I bring down the estimate. I can give at the present time a general explanation, and I should like my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) to listen to what I am about to say. Under the act the Defence department has no alternative but to send troops, when they are properly and legally requested, to any place where law and order are likely to be violated or where the good government and peace of the country are threatened. The Militia Act distinctly says that the troops so sent are in aid of the civil power. In some of the municipalities where trouble was threatened last year the mayors made no requisitions, but the Militia Act provides that in such a contingency the county court judge may take action. In this case Judge Finlayson, a county court judge, made the necessary requisition

according to law, and thereupon units of the permanent force were sent from Ontario and Quebec into that section to the number of between 900 and 1,000. The expense was approximately $60,000. Under the circumstances it is difficult to say who shall pay this expense. The municipalities did not requisition the troops; the county court judge did. Up to date, speaking from memory, no municipality has been billed for this expense. What action will be taken in the future I am not prepared to say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In respect of what municipality or municipalities did Judge Finlayson make his requisition?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is the county court judge for the county of Cape Breton.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There must be a municipality affected, and the county court judge must requisition in respect of that municipality.

Mr. GRAHAM: Glace Bay is where the trouble threatened. So far as I know Judge Finlayson complied with every requirement of the act in making his requisition.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Did I understand the minister to say that under the act the Minister of Militia had no option but to send troops when requisitioned?

Mr. GRAHAM: When properly requisitioned it is the duty of the Defence Department under the law to send units of the permanent force for the preservation of order—not to supersede the civil power, but in aid of that power.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then why were such troops not sent to the town of Sydney Mines, Dominion and New Waterford when they were requisitioned for these places?

Mr. GRAHAM: The troops were concentrated at one point under the district officer commanding. The details as to placing the troops would be under his charge.

Mr. BOYS: Was the place in question municipally organized?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: That being so, it seems to me that under Section 84 the county court judge would have no jurisdiction.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that under the act he has jurisdiction.

Mr. BOYS: Section 84 provides:

> If the place where such riot or disturbance occurs or is anticipated is not municipally organized, the county or district court judge, or one of the county or district court judges, having jurisdiction in such place, or if there is no such county or district court judge, then any judge of a superior court who has jurisdiction in such place may make the requisition.

But it seems necessary that the territory should not be municipally organized to give the county court judge jurisdiction.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think if my hon. friend would read Section 82 he would find that it covers the point he has in mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 82 provides that the first duty to make a requisition shall be on the mayor or some substitute, but if he refuses then the county court judge may act. Section 84 provides that if the place is not municipally organized the first duty is on the county court judge. As the minister defends his action on the ground that the law gives him no option, will he not say to the House that he approves the act as it stands. Or, if not, why did he not recommend that it be amended last session? Or does the government intend to amend the act this session?

Mr. GRAHAM: The question of amending the Militia Act has never come before the government. If it were to be amended I presume I would make the suggestion; I have not done so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Militia Act in that regard, then, is satisfactory to the government?

Mr. KYTE: I do not think I should permit this discussion to terminate, Mr. Chairman, without adding a word, as I am in possession of local knowledge which does not appear to be enjoyed by other members. The strike was declared in the district of Glace Bay without the usual formalities which are generally regarded as essential. The mayor of Glace Bay is a member of the miners' organization and a prominent and active member of the United Mine Workers. He refused to be a party to calling out the militia. Therefore nothing was left for the citizens of Glace Bay to do, if they were to get that protection which they were entitled to under the law, but to go to the county court judge for the municipality, who resided in Sydney. This requisition was not made until grave acts of disorder had been committed by the strikers. The men were called out and the officials were left in charge of the mine. The strikers picketed the mine and refused food and other refreshments to be taken to these officials. Subsequently they made a threat to withdraw the pump men and thereby destroy millions of dollars' worth of property,— a threat that has not been usually resorted to heretofore in this

country. The fact that the Grand President of the United Mine Workers, Mr. Lewis, repudiated the strike, upon the ground that the strikers had no authority and no jurisdiction for withdrawing the pump men, goes to show what a serious condition existed in the community. Troops were called out at the request of the citizens of Glace Bay, who were not concerned as respects the quarrel between the mine owners and the workmen, but who were concerned in the preservation of law and order so that life and property might be protected in the community. I repeat, the mayor of Glace Bay being an official of the striking organization, and having refused to requisition the troops, the only thing to be done was to get Judge Finlayson to act, and it was upon the authority of the citizens that he acted.

Mr. HANSON: What evidence is there before the committee or the department that the mayor of Glace Bay refused to act? We should have that evidence.

Mr. KYTE: The minister—

Mr. HANSON: While I am on my feet, may I ask, was it ever the intention of parliament that the Militia Act should be invoked unless riots were anticipated in a community? I do not understand that riots were anticipated in Cape Breton. What was anticipated was damage to the company's property by reason of the pump men leaving their posts,—something that might be very likely to occur and which the company ought to have foreseen.

Mr. KYTE: That was not the only thing that happened.

Mr. HANSON: That was the main thing.

Mr. KYTE: My hon. friend for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) was many hundreds of miles away from the scene of disorder and therefore he cannot possibly have local knowledge of what happened. It is my fortune, or misfortune, to represent that constituency in this parliament, and it was my business to know what was going on. Therefore, I informed myself, and I now state upon the authority of that knowledge and upon my honour as a member of the House that, judging the situation from every point of view, having regard to the menace that was offered to the life and property of the citizens of Glace Bay, there was no alternative but to call out the troops. If the citizens had waited until the mayor made the necessary requisition, the pump men would have left their posts and the mines would have been flooded.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not say the strikers were justified in threatening to call out the pump men. I do not say the whole strike was

justified. That is not the question. The question is whether or not conditions arose which, under the act, justified the sending of the militia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) is a lawyer; he surely would not argue, merely because damage might be caused to property owned by the company through the pump men going out, that that would be apprehended "riot" or "disturbance of the peace" within the meaning of the Militia Act. Not at all. The Militia Act does provide for aid to the civil authority upon requisition, but only where there is apprehended riot or breach of the peace which it is beyond the power of the civil authorities to control. Upon that being certified by the proper authority, then the government sends the active militia. I would like to ask the hon. member, what was the apprehended "riot"? What was, as the act reads, the "disturbance of the peace" that actually existed or was anticipated as likely to occur? There are the words of section 80; these are the words of the subsequent section. What was it?

Mr. KYTE: I stated that the mayor of Glace Bay, having been appealed to by the citizens of the town to call the troops, refused.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point.

Mr. KYTE: They went to a judge of the county court, and he signed the order. The breach of the peace consisted of assaults committed upon the officials who were remaining in the mine for the purpose of protecting the property. There is where the breach of the peace commenced, and it was to prevent further breaches of the peace and futher disorder, that the troops were asked for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were individual assaults in a mine or so beyond the power of the civil authorities to control?

Mr. KYTE: They thought so when they applied to the mayor for protection, which he refused to give them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be likely that the mayor was right? The mayor would look at the act and say, "Is there anything here in the way of breach of the peace or anticipated breach of the peace on a scale beyond the power of the civil authorities to control?" If the mayor felt that there was not, it would be his duty to refuse to requisition. I must say that the facts as given in the newspapers at the time did not disclose to my mind any such breach of the peace. If the hon. member knows of anything more than an individual assault or two, I would like the committee to be informed of it.

Mr. KYTE: Individual assaults and the apprehension of more extended assaults and riots is what moved them to ask for protection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were the reasons for the apprehension?

Mr. DUFF: I rise to a point of order. This discussion is out of order. If there is to be any discussion on the Cape Breton situation it must come under another vote, not under this one. It should come under the estimates for the permanent force or for the payment of the expenses of those troops.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know where it would come under the estimates for the permanent force when it is the active militia that was called out.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was the permanent force that was called out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no active militia called out at all?

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, there should have been. If any were called out under the act, the active militia should have been called, to be supplanted later by the permanent force.

Mr. DUFF: Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Rule 13, subsection 5. reads as follows:

Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I do not think that this discussion is relevant.

Mr. CANNON: Before I give my vote on the amendment I would like to have certain information from the minister which might direct me one way or the other. The item is for $1,050,000 for annual training. What amount will be used for annual training in cities and what amount for annual training of rural corps in summer camps?

Mr. GRAHAM: I gave a while ago the information with respect to the summer camps and the training at headquarters. The amount for permanent force training out of this vote is $45,000; miscellaneous appropriations, $14,000; transport of artillery and so on, $100,000; schools of musketry, $16,000; schools of signals, $10,000. I will give the expenditure by districts.

Mr. POWER: Could we have it according to battalions?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not given according to battalions. The amounts were estimated by the Chief of Staff who works out the details himself.

Mr. POWER: Surely he must know.

Mr. GRAHAM: He might know the details, but they are never given, to my knowledge, in the estimates. The amounts for the respective districts are as follows: Military District No. 1, $77,000; No. 2, $148,000; No. 3, $87,000; No. 4, $98,000; No. 5, $58,000; No. 6, $69,000; No. 7, $40,000; No. 10, $67,000; No. 11, $61,000; No. 12, $62,000; No. 13, $53,000.

Mr. CANNON: The minister says that $58,000 will be spent in Military District No. 5, which includes the city and district of Quebec. How much of that amount will be spent for the training of the 8th Royal Rifles and the 9th Battalion, and how much for units like the battalions from Dorchester county or Quebec county?

Mr. GRAHAM: The details as to the different battalions have not yet been worked out. I gave information as to the battalions trained last year. I pointed out to the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Lovett) that his regiment had been notified early in the year but had not been trained. Notifications to the different regiments will go out in a few weeks, but until the estimate is passed there is no money available on which the commanding officers of the districts may work. With respect to Military District No. 5, the details for last year were as follows: 7th Hussars, 9 days at local camp; 11th Hussars, 8 days at local camp; 13th Brigade, C.F.A., 57th Battalion, 6 days at local headquarters, 6 days at Petawawa; 82nd Battery, 6 days at local headquarters, 6 days at Petawawa; 6th Regiment, C.G.A., Headquarters, Levis, 8 days at local headquarters and 4 at Halifax; No. 1 Company, Quebec, 8 days at local headquarters and 4 at Halifax; No. 2 Company, Levis, and No. 3 Company, Levis, 8 days at local headquarters and 4 at Halifax; 5th Divisional Engineers, Headquarters, Quebec, 9 at headquarters; 15th Field Company, 9 at headquarters; 6th Field Troop, 9 at headquarters; No. 5 Signal Company, 9 at headquarters; 4th Signal Troop, 9 at headquarters; Montmagny Regiment, 1st Battalion, 9 at local camp.

Mr. CANNON: What was the amount for that?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was $1,474.55. Le Regiment de Beauce, 1st Battalion, 9 days at Levis.

Mr. POWER: How much was that?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was $1,489.65. Fusiliers du St. Laurent, Rimouski, 1st Battalion, 9 days at Levis, $1,656.95; Le Regiment de Levis, 1st Battalion, 9 days at Levis, $1,603.20; Canada Quebec, 1st Battalion, 200 men trained at headquarters; Quebec, 1st Battalion, 9 days at headquarters; Les Chasseurs Canadiens, 9 days at Levis, $1,516.45; Les Franc-Tireure du Saguenay, 1st Battalion, Chicoutimi, 9 days at Levis, $1,699.45; Laval University, 12 days at headquarters; 5th Machine Gun Brigade, 9 days at headquarters.

Mr. CANNON: The reason I asked the question is this. I favour annual training in the cities, but I am strongly against wasting money on annual training outside the cities, on what is called the rural training camps. I do not know much about the results obtained in other sections of Canada, but I know that in our own district the results from these rural camps have been absolutely nil; it has been a waste of money. I do not wish, either, to embarrass the minister. His goodwill has been shown in many ways. He has endeavoured to administer his department in such a way that public moneys are not wasted on military adventures which are of absolutely no use to our country. Last year the estimates were considerably reduced. This year they have not been increased, except by a very small amount.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are reduced on the whole.

Mr. CANNON: Reduced on the whole, but there is an increase in this annual training item. The amendment suggested by my hon. member (Mr. Lanctôt) to cut in half this item might be good if it would mean the wiping out of the annual training at the rural camps, but, should it hamper the annual training in the cities, it ought not, I believe, to command our support. I should like to know from the minister whether it would be possible if this item was cut in two, to give the city corps proper training, and if not, what amount would be necessary for that purpose. I am perfectly willing to vote that amount, or on the other hand if it were possible to find out exactly what the rural training is costing, I would be one of the first to support any amendment to deduct that amount from this item.

Mr. McBRIDE: I for one would certainly take exception to training being given to people in the cities and not to people in the country districts. The people who want it most are the young men in the country. In 1921 we had the pleasure of having a camp out our way. When these young men some fifty-four of them, went in to camp they had no training whatever, they were just like a crowd on the street; but in two weeks' time every man knew his place and it was a pleasure to see them come in, unsaddle, and clean their horses and turn them out. When going to camp they knew nothing about it. If there is any class of people who need the training, and are taking an enthusiastic interest in it, they are the people in the country, and not the city people.

Mr. POWER: I wish to make some references to the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). When he was discussing this matter he intimated that I was reflecting on the loyalty and honesty of the militia of Canada. I asked him a certain question, and I had a purpose in mind in asking that question. I expected to get an answer, but I did not get one. However, I wish to call his attention to the fact that I had no intention of attacking the militia of Canada, either the rural or the city battalions. I simply wished to find out whether he himself, would, as Minister of Militia make himself responsible for sending untrained troops to the scene of a riot. I am under the impression and I firmly believe I am right, that five, six or seven days' training at a rural camp does not fit a man for military duty. It has been said time and again in this House that it requires at least six months' training to make a soldier, and a man who is not perfectly disciplined is the last man to whom we should entrust the use of death-dealing weapons. We had some experience in the city of Quebec during what was called the conscription riots. At that time the government of the day sent down to Quebec thousands of untrained troops in order to quell the so-called riots which the newspapers had advertised all over the country. Troops were sent down to Quebec who had never handled a rifle, and some of them, I am sure, had never seen a rifle before. On the evening of the day when they disembarked, they were lined up in front of the Canadian Pacific railway station at Quebec, handed loaded Ross rifles, and sent out to keep peace and order in the good city of Quebec. The result, as every one knows, was that a large number of these men, already inflamed by the stories which they had read, and probably by some of the violent denunciations of the province of Quebec which they had heard from some of my hon. friends, were so excited that within a very short time when the first few snowballs were thrown at them they opened fire and a considerable number of people were wounded and some, unfortunately, killed. I submit to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Guth-

rie) that troops of that character should certainly not be sent into any disturbed district. Troops who have been trained for only eight or nine days, no matter how good they were when they entered upon their military career, have not had sufficient discipline, cannot be sufficiently well controlled by their officers to be sent out on any such expeditions. I submit that for the consideration of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia. I hope he will take it into consideration and not think that I was attributing to the militia of Canada any disloyal or selfish motives.

With regard to the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Lanctot) I would suggest that he reduce it somewhat. As nearly as I could figure from the answer given by the Minister ot National Defence, the expenditure on the rural corps is about one-fifth of the total. While the minister was giving us these details I added the amounts expended on six rural corps; they amounted approximately to $10,000. That, on a total of $58,000 for the particular district with which I am familiar, would be probably about one-fifth. So, if my hon. friend (Mr. Lanctot) would ask that this amount be reduced by one-fifth, I think he would be carrying out his own views and would probably meet with the approval of a large number of hon. members. I understand that very many hon. members opposite see no reason why there should be a distinction between rural and urban corps. There is this difference. There may be some reason for training urban troops; personally I do not see it, but I am told that there is. If there is, it is because these soldiers of the city are close to the scene of their operations; they can very easily repair every night to the local drill hall and carry on their training work; and they can meet outside the time allowed for drill, and so can cultivate esprit de corps—they can have a real militia organization of some kind. On the other hand the young men from country districts often live too far apart from one another to maintain any permanent organization of any sort. As a rule it takes them one day to get to camp and one day to return, and another day of the camp period is Sunday; so that they have but five or six days a year at most at camp, and the training given to them is, to my mind, utterly useless; it is of no value whatsoever.

Apart from that, I do not consider that at the present time we require any military camps, a matter upon which I have already expressed my views to this House. We have in Canada a sufficient number of trained troops for any eventuality which may arise. It is true that last year some hon. members said that those who had taken part in the last war should not be forced to go to the next outbreak of hostilities. Great commiseration was expressed for those who had participated in the great struggle which began in 1914, and certain members were horrified to think that these veterans might be called upon to go to another war. But it will be remembered that during the course of last summer, when a little scare arose throughout the country, the first to volunteer for active service overseas were veterans of the last war, in fact the government was deluged with offers from them. Now, I stated last year, and I repeat—without fear of contradiction this time because the facts have borne me out—that in the event of another war breaking out in the near future, the first men to volunteer and the first men to go will be those who took part in the last great struggle. Taking that for granted, and I think every hon. member must agree with me, we have in Canada three to four hundred thousand trained troops. And we do not need any more; in that number of trained men we have an ample force to protect us in case of any trouble arising. Let us, then, consider why we should have any training at all. I have already said that in my opinion we should not have any, but apparently I do not seem to be able to find a sufficient number of members here to support my views on this matter. However, I am prepared to go to the length of meeting the committee a little more than half way, and to ask the minister to reduce his estimates by the amount which he has included for the training of rural battalions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think if my hon. friend proposed to break up the militia that would be the easiest way to do it. It would be easy to say that in Canada we were going to make a distinction, as to the young men that we allow to join our militia or to have any training, between the cities and the country. That would be a mistake from the militia standpoint, I think. It may be true that in the sections named by my hon. friend the rural units do not train to such an extent as the city units do; but in many parts of this country the rural units are more enthusiastic than the city units are, and some of the best officers in the militia belong to rural units. I imagine that such a distinction as my hon. friend proposes to make could not be seriously entertained. Think of the effect it would have all over the country.

The hon. member (Mr. Power) has referred to the fact that many men who had
5 p.m. been overseas were enthusiastic in volunteering their services once more

last summer. That is true, but is it fair, bearing in mind the sacrifices which they have made to take this stand? "You say you will go again. Hurrah! The rest of us will stay at home including the young men, who are just as anxious to go as those who have already served overseas." I am not a militarist or anything of the kind, but as I have already said, if there are to be wars we must have a militia. The Dominion of Canada unanimously agreed years ago to take over the militia from Great Britian. We have had a militia force ever since that time, and it is our duty to maintain such a force of reasonable proportions at an expense that will not be too great.

I have been asked whether these units could be trained for less expenditure. They might, but I think I should not be asked—and if I were I could not consent—to make any distinction between the rural units and the city units so far as the expenditure of money for the training of our young men is concerned. This amount of $1,050,000 is less than it was n pre-war times, notwithstanding that the ost of maintaining the militia is at least from 50 to 75 per cent higher than it was then. Personally I could not recommend to the House that we should reduce this item at all. I believe the people of Canada will be with us in endeavouring to maintain a militia force of respectable proportions at as cheap a cost as such a force can be maintained for in this country.

Mr. GOOD: Would the minister tell us what the effect of reducing last year's vote was?

Mr. GRAHAM: The effect of the reduction last year was—I am not making a comparison with the year before because I think the training was practically as good as it was the year before, but with previous years—that a larger number of men were trained in that the units were more nearly up to strength than they were years ago. In other cases some of the units were not trained at all. I may say that the Chief of Staff, in order to give full military training, asked me for a vote of $1,750,000, but the amount was reduced, with his full consent on discussion with him, to the present vote of $1,050,000. I think this is a very moderate estimate of the amount required for training.

Mr. BOYS: With reference to Military District No. 2, which is Toronto, I would like to know what proportion of the allotment of that district was devoted to the rural battalions and what proportion to the city battalions. So far as my knowledge goes, and I realize it is very limited, the battalion in my own county went to camp about one-half strength. They were anxious to go stronger, but the money was not available.

Mr. GRAHAM: What one was that?

Mr. BOYS: The 35th Simcoe Foresters. I want to join with the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) in putting in a word for the rural battalion. If we are to have drill, we must have it in the country just as much as in the city, and if the battalions are to be cut right down to one-half or one-third strength, I do not believe you will get satisfactory results. Before I cast a vote, I should like, if possible, to know what the ratio of expenditure was last year, and whether or not it is the intention to maintain that ratio for next year. If it is as low as has been suggested by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), namely about one-fifth, I would suggest that the amount that should be devoted to rural battalions should certainly be increased.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is the intention of the Chief of Staff to spend a proportion of this $50,000 on rural units, as the city units have every facility for training at home. They can select their time of year for training and they do not have to leave their vocation to do any training. They can attend to their regular work in the day time and train at night. My idea—and I think this is the view of the Chief of Staff—is to increase the amount for the rural units rather than to reduce it.

Mr. BOYS: I am glad to hear that. Can the minister give me the actual expenditure for the ten months gone by?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It must be borne in mind that in recent years the number of rural battalions is very much less than it was heretofore. Many battalions which were formerly rural have, in the last three or four years, become city battalions for the very purpose of allowing them to train at their local headquarters instead of going to camp. But there are some very valuable militia units yet which are rural battalions. The one referred to by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) is one of them; the York Rangers is another; the Huron Regiment is another. All of these, I have been informed, could have gone to camp last year, at almost full strength; but through lack of money for the purpose of drill or training, they were not permitted to go at full strength. There is not, however, to-day the same proportion between rural and city units that there was four years ago. The rural units have become

very much reduced in number, because so many of them have now, by their own desire, and at their own request, become city units.

Mr. BALDWIN: While I do not wish to embarrass the minister in any way, I cannot refrain from making a few remarks on this most important subject. Probably there is not a member in this House or a man in this country who would use cold steel or cold lead more quickly than I would to put down any mob or rebellious crowd in Canada. By the cutting down of the estimates last year the minister won great credit throughout this country and great approval by the electors. There has been in the past an enormous waste by these annual drills, and this has been set forth very forcibly by the remarks of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). Many years ago these annual drills were in the month of October, which was the season of the year when these drills did not interfere with agricultural work. But since these annual drills have been held in that beautiful month of June, when the crops grow fast and the weeds grow faster, when the bugs are trying to destroy our fruits and the vegetables of our land, it is a crime to call the farmer and his sons from the soil to go through these drills in the heat of the roasting sun.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BALDWIN: There is a good deal of laughter, but I want to tell hon. members who are laughing that this is no minor affair. If hon. members were called to drill in the scorching sun of June, they would see those soldiers blistered almost from head to foot. The officers have to call them off and to give them only a very few hours' drill a day, or some days no drill at all. I can assure hon. gentlemen that I am against this attempt to make soldiers, men to defend our country, by giving them a few days' drill at such great waste of our public money. It has been well said in this House to-day that we have some 400,000 soldiers who have returned from the great conflict, who will have discipline enough in their craniums to serve for a generation yet. We know that great conflict cost this country the appalling sum of about $2,000,000,000. We know that the taxation of this country is enormous. I come from a rural community and I know what the rural people think; I know what the boys and the men who go, think—they think this is a waste of public money. I agree with what has been said as regards the large communities. There is where the pugnacious people, the warlike people and the strikers are. In the rural sections there are none of those warlike individuals, and I am sure you cannot take the farmer and his sons and his horses away to quell riots at Winnipeg or Glace Bay or any large riotous community. I am in favour of a standing army large enough to quell the riots of these great centres. The great American republic have not had this annual drill. They have had a standing army quite sufficient to quiet any trouble in that great country. I would not object to voting money that is imperatively needed to keep soldiers who are trained, and well trained, to cope with any element that might rise against the state.

Let me tell some of the ridiculous things in connection with this waste of money on annual drill. Probably these estimates would go through fully as easily if the two ex-Ministers of Militia were less conspicuous in these debates. How attentive they were in their seats last year and how they beat the drum, and how they made it appear so imperatively needful for us to keep up the estimates or even give more! They thought that these estimates should all be increased. Let me say—and I presume there are scores of others in this House who know of the appalling waste of money—I will not use this locally—but there are certain grafters amongst captains, majors, colonels, and those higher up. They go to the veterinary to help them and say: "Have you some old horses that look fairly well, that are about ready to die? Can you not buy up a few old plugs at $25 a head? You have been with us for many years and although you are crippled and no good, we would like to keep you. Get the best old nags you can and get them through at $175 or $200 a head." These horses are subjected to rough treatment and sometimes, being hitched by the feet they contract acute bronchitis! They are given such drastic medical treatment that in a short while they simply cease to exist. Then there is the chesty, stiff-necked fellow that buys the hay, and oats, and feed. If I were to tell all that I believe and know it would appal the committee. Although I was never a soldier, I have it from their mouths that this sort of thing was done to rob the country in pre-war days, and that being the case I can assure you that I am for cutting down the estimates. That nation is the happiest whose people do not engage in wars. Our sons and daughters are leaving this country to go to the peaceful land to the south of us, notwithstanding all that we are doing. I regret the fact, but I think we ought to devote some of the money to a real effort to retain our own people. Surely no enemies are threatening us. Certainly there are none to

the north, I am sure there are none to the south of us, and neither east nor west have we anything to fear. The Monroe doctrine would protect us from foreign invasion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALDWIN: It is laughable and yet serious. Are we going back to the aboriginal age when the savages used war paint and devoted their time to the extermination of one another? Yet, when we spend all this money on war wherein do we differ from the savages? Have we no implicit confidence in our own people and our neighbours? Wherein is the difference between the mothers of this country who are proud to bear sons for a sacrifice in European wars and those mothers who cast their children into the Ganges or the Euphrates? Some people suspect that there is an enemy behind every post and pillar and under every woodpile and under everything that can conceal a possible enemy. It was with much regret I heard so many hon. gentlemen advocating a year ago the expenditure of money for the furtherance of war enterprise. First, last and all the time I am a pacifist. But I am not enough of a pacifist not to fight to the last ditch if my personal rights or the national welfare be encroached upon. I do not wish to embarrass the minister, and while I might not go the length of voting for the amendment that is now before the committee, I do say that there should be less expenditure in this murderous, slaughterous game in which there are so many grafters and spendthrifts who are enriching themselves and wadding their own pockets. The civilized world is looking to disarmament, and I do not think that we should spend money in training our young men to take part in war. I do not think we should raise money—I was almost going to say, by extortion—from the pockets of the people when the farmers of the country are in such deplorable straits, when they have to pay such high taxation, such exorbitant prices for everything they get, and when they receive such unsatisfactory prices for the commodities they produce. If there is anything we can do, however small, towards paying off public debt we certainly should do it; and one way is to prevent the squandering of public moneys. Possibly anything I may say in the way of reducing the estimates will be futile, but undoubtedly in my opinion they should be reduced, especially in regard to something that only tends to build up a war machine for which there is no necessity. Our population is not increasing and there is no enemy in sight. And Heaven knows we do not want to mix up in European troubles, because those untold millions would absorb without very much trouble the comparatively small number of young men we could equip. Let me conclude by hoping that the minister will not be influenced too much by the two ex-ministers of militia who sit opposite.

Mr. IRVINE: What did the minister mean by saying that we could not have a country without a militia?

Mr. GRAHAM: No nation is properly equipped that has not a defence force.

Mr. BOYS: Will the minister give me the information I asked for?

Mr. GRAHAM: Fourteen units went into camp; the unit to which my hon. friend refers, which camped at Borden, being 160 strong.

Mr. BOYS: What I want to know is the amount of money devoted to the rural and city battalions respectively, and the number of men who went from those battalions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall get that information to-night.

Mr. LANCTOT: I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Baldwin) did not say to what extent he wanted the item reduced.

Mr. BALDWIN: Ten per cent.

Mr. LANCTOT: In view of the attitude of some of my hon. friends I would amend my motion by substituting $210,000 for $525,000 or one-fifth of the estimates. That would be more reasonable and it would test the feeling of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) moves that resolution 88 be reduced by $210,000.

Mr. SPENCE: Every hon. member should be in real good humour now, and I would suggest that this is the proper time to take the vote. I hope the hon. minister will get this item through without any reduction whatever. Last year he very liberally allowed his estimates to be cut down, and he has since found that that was a mistake, as he has had insufficient funds to maintain the militia at the proper standard of efficiency. He has learned from experience that he needs this money, and I hope every hon. member will give him every dollar he wants.

Amendment (Mr. Lanctot) negatived on division: Yeas, 33; Nays, 77.

Item agreed to on the same division reversed.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been called to my attention that the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) has not voted.

Mr. MARTELL: I beg to differ. I voted against the amendment.

Cadet services, $450,000.

Mr. SHAW: What is the reason for the increase in this item?

Mr. GRAHAM: I want it to be understood that I am more interested in this vote than perhaps in any other that may come before this committee. It is not true that the cadets are trained as soldiers, although part of the training may be of a military character. I maintain that the training given to these boys in their tender years is doing a wonderful work in building them up physically and making real men of them. I supported this vote enthusiastically for years when I was in opposition, and I have regretted on many occasions during the past twelve months that it was reduced last session. These boys in large numbers are given a summer outing with training that goes to make them real men in miniature. I have had some experience of the value of cadet training in my own family, and consequently I speak with some knowledge of the subject. Boys who are inclined to be weaklings physically after going through the course of training for two or three years develop into fine young fellows and become straight physically, mentally and morally. I admit that I was humilated last year when the city of Toronto had to organize a tag day in order to provide the funds to give their boys cadet training. I helped the boys out in an indirect way by lending them whatever camping equipment they required. I am strongly in favour of this physical training for boys. It is given in the schools throughout our country. A boy can go through the course and be really made a man and yet never be a soldier at all, although I admit that a young fellow who is a graduate cadet makes the best military man you can get anywhere because he has the physique to start with. It has been said that this training is only taken advantage of in one or two provinces. The province of Quebec has a greater number of cadets than any other province, and this year they carried away the trophy.

Mr. BUREAU: And Three Rivers did it.

Mr. GRAHAM: A small place called Three Rivers got this trophy—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM:—and I might go further and say that they did their training with rifles supplied by one, Bureau, and presented to them by himself personally. I will give the committee the enrolled strength of cadet corps at January 31st, 1923, by provinces:

Ontario: London, 6,841; Toronto, 16,976; Kingston, 6,836; Total, 30,653.

Québec: Montréal, 32,214; Quebec, 13,432; Total, 45,646. Nova Scotia, 4,329; New Brunswick, 1,587; Manitoba, 10,376; British Columbia, 5,838; Saskatchewan, 3,959; Alberta, 5,453. Total, 107,841.

These cadets are spread all over the whole Dominion. Last year we did not have enough money to give the boys their training camps, and I think we did an injustice to them from the physical standpoint. I am solely responsible for this additional $100,000, and I think the money cannot be spent in any better way than by training our young men and so improving them physically, mentally and morally.

Mr. HOEY: Is this work undertaken in conjunction with the provincial Departments of Education, or is it under the direct supervision of the militia authorities? My contention is that the physical development of the boy is part of his education, and that it should be fundamentally the duty and the privileges of the provincial Departments of Education to undertake this work. Therefore I should like to know if this work, with which I have a great deal of sympathy, is wholly detached from the Department of Defence as such, that is, as a military organization.

Mr. GRAHAM: These cadet corps can be organized only with the full consent and approval of the educational authorities in each province. The Defence department, out of this vote, sends physical instructors wherever they are wanted, in order to give the training. Loans are made for rifle practice and so on.

Mr. SHAW: I think all will agree that the young men and the young women should receive in our schools the best possible opportunity for physical development. A great many people, however, do object strongly to the effort made—shall I say?—to camouflage military training under the guise of physical training. As the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) has stated, physical training is carried on in every school in Alberta, the teachers being trained to give the best physical instruction to the children under their charge. Then, in addition, there are the cadet corps under the jurisdiction of the officers of the military district in which the school happens to be located, and this military training is carried on in addition to the physical training which is given in the schools. I repeat that physical training is highly desirable, but I think it should be given as such, for that purpose and that purpose alone. May I, under this item, direct the attention of the minister to a resolution adopted by a com-

mittee of students at the University of Toronto? It says:

> Inasmuch as the Dominion of Canada is a member of the League of Nations which has been created to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security, we, the students of the universities of Canada with a view to promoting the ideals of the league by bringing Canada into closer contact through intellectual co-operation with the nations of the world, and in the belief that only through the development of a mutual understanding between races and nations can war be eliminated as an agent of settling international disputes, go on record, through our representative organizations as in favour of the forwarding of a resolution to His Majesty's government of the Dominion of Canada, requesting:
>
> That the government of the Dominion of Canada set aside annually a sum of money sufficient for the purpose of awarding scholarships to the countries and in the manner as hereinafter set forth:
>
> 1. Twenty-two scholarships to be awarded to graduates of the universities of Canada for the purpose of pursuing post-graduate studies at any university in any country chosen by the students elected to these scholarships.
>
> (a) The distribution of these scholarships as between universities to be based upon the enrolment of students in the universities of Canada.
>
> (2) Seventeen scholarships to be awarded among the members of the British Empire excluding Canada, not more than two scholarships to be awarded at any one time to any one British dominion or colony except that five be awarded annually to India and that two be awarded annually to native African students.
>
> (3) Sixty-five scholarships to be awarded on the following basis: South America 5; China 4; Japan 4; Russia 5; Korea 2; Hungary 2, Austria 2; Czechoslovakia 3; Spain 2; Italy 3; Bulgaria 2; Roumania 2; Turkey 2; Greece 2; Portugal 1; France 5; Germany 5; Holland 3; Denmark 3; Norway and Sweden 4; Finland 2; Poland 2.

The suggestion of this student body is that the government might take out of the moneys which otherwise would be devoted to militia purposes a sum sufficient to provide scholarships in order that Canadian students might go to some of these foreign lands and in order that students in foreign countries might come to Canada, the result being the promotion of a real spirit of international fellowship. I suggest that instead of promoting military affairs by the expenditure of vast sums of money at this particular time in our history, when these moneys are so urgently needed for other purposes, it would be advisable to consider the allocation of a substantial sum to meet the suggestion made in this resolution. I commend it to the minister as something that would make for that for which we are all striving—a better spirit and better fellowship among the nations.

Mr. BUREAU: How would these scholarships be awarded? Would it be done through the provinces, or through the various educational institutions?

Mr. SHAW: The resolution outlines in detail the scheme which the students suggest. They provide what is called an allocating board to allocate these scholarships.

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. BUREAU: Who would select the allocating board? When the federal government begins to interfere with educational matters, the thing becomes quite complicated.

Mr. SHAW: Probably it would not be as difficult as it might appear. The resolution suggests:

> That an allocating board be set up for the purpose of receiving the applications of those students elected to scholarships in Canada from their respective countries, for the purpose of allocating these students to the different universities in Canada according to course desired and the academic standing of the student.

It goes on to say that the board should consist of nine members, and there is reference to the manner in which its personnel is made up. There might be some difficulty in working out the details of the scheme. I simply present the suggestion made by these students as one which would be well worthy of the best consideration of the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. STANSELL: With most, if not all, of what the minister has said with regard to this vote I find myself in hearty accord. I would like however, to ask a question suggested by the stand taken by certain hon. members in connection with another vote, namely, that there should be a separate vote for rural and urban districts in matters such as these. I do not find myself in accord with that suggestion. I believe that all laws should be designed to give equal opportunities to all, so far as that is possible, and I am not at all in sympathy with any suggestion that there should be a different standard for rural and for urban residents. What I want to know is this: how far has it been found possible to extend the benefits of this training to the rural districts? I can understand that it might be more difficult to extend it to the rural districts than it would be to apply it to the urban centres, but I would like to know just how far it has been found possible to make its benefits available to the boys in the rural districts.

Mr. GRAHAM: The benefit to be derived by the rural students would be this: the department has instructors who instruct the teachers. Last year there were I think, five thousand in line for instruction. These, in turn, instruct the cadets and can give the physical training in any school in the Dominion.

Mr. STANSELL: To what extent have the rural districts availed themselves of it?

Mr. GRAHAM: In forming separate cadet corps, perhaps not to a very great extent. But in many of these schools there are little companies of cadets, and owing to the training given by our officers the teachers are able to give the necessary instruction to both boys and girls.

Mr. MacLAREN: In supporting this vote for the cadets—a work which, I am satisfied, is accomplishing a great amount of good—I would suggest to the minister for his consideration that it would be of great advantage to absorb some of the other boy movements that now exist in this country, more particularly the Boy Scouts. I think there is loss of energy and of organization between the Cadets and the Boy Scouts. I believe it would be very much to the advantage of the Boy Scouts were they absorbed into the Cadets. It would increase the number of the Cadets very largely and would avoid the present division. I think that under the recognized discipline of the Defence department there would be considerable advantage to this country and to the Boy Scouts themselves by their absorption into the Cadets.

Mr. ROBINSON: The trouble with the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) is that a boy can join the Boy Scouts when he is eight or ten years old, but he cannot become a Cadet until he is sixteen. I think you will find that in most towns the Boy Scouts ultimately join the Cadets when they are old enough.

In reply to the hon. member who spoke about the cadet movement in rural districts, I may say that the cadet movement is usually in connection with schools, and the children in rural schools—I am speaking more particularly of Nova Scotia—are mostly young; that is, if they want to go beyond a certain grade they have to go to the towns, and there they come in touch with the cadet movement. The physical drill is taught in both rural and urban schools. You could not very well have a cadet corps in the remote rural sections because there are not enough boys who are old enough to form a good cadet corps. I think it will be found, however, that the Boy Scouts generally do join the Cadets when they become old enough.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the age given by my hon. friend is hardly correct. The cadet age, I think, is from twelve to eighteen. You cannot merge the Boy Scouts and the Cadets. I do not think that there is an effort made as my hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) suggested to camouflage militarism in the cadet movement, and in proof of that let me give just one illustration. Of the 6,800 Cadets in this district around Ottawa and Kingston, only 2,080 took rifle training, and that was voluntary on their part. There is no effort made to impose military training on them at all.

Mr. SHAW: Are not these cadets trained in all the military manoeuvres and in military drill?

Mr. ROSS: Only so far as marching goes, and that is not military drill in the sense of rifle shooting and so on. Physical drill is a part of military training, but has only lately been absorbed in the cadet movement as a result of the Great War that is done to harden a man. Physical training was a school preparation. I do not think any person connected with the cadet movement has camouflaged militarism, and when you consider that of the 6,800 Cadets in this district who took physical training, marching and such drilling as the teachers could give them, only 2,080 took rifle drill, I think you have the answer to that suggestion. I think that is worth bringing up.

Mr. BUREAU: With reference to the remark made by my hon. friend from Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) I would like to say a word. It was my privilege some time ago to attend the presentation of a trophy to a cadet corps. The general of the division, General Armstrong I think, was represented at that presentation. One of the speakers spoke from a military point of view, but the general's representative said that the object of the training was first physical training, and then moral training. It was to teach the boys discipline, and he laid down this principle, and it is true I think, that a man cannot command if he does not first know how to obey, and the first thing a boy had to learn was to obey.

But apart from the physical training, the moral training I think is very important. We talk about developing citizenship in this country. We know—I am talking to men of experience—that human nature is pretty selfish, and that if you were to boil down almost any kind of man, 95 per cent of the whole thing would be selfishness. That is the individuality of the man, and the idea of individuality is opposed to the idea of collectivity. Now in any well organized community what we want to do is to develop the idea of citizenship. I might be asked how I connect that up with the cadet movement. Well, as I was telling the boys in my town, "When you were training and marching and drilling, you never thought of Tom, Dick or

Harry. You were thinking of the school you belong to. It was your Alma Mater you thought of, and you forgot yourself. When it came down to competing with the other, you thought about your corps, and not about yourself." That is the idea to develop in the child if you want him to grow into a good citizen. Teach him to forget himself a little bit and think of others. That is what makes a good citizen, to get rid of the selfishness, and think not so much of the individual good as of the collective good, and because of the moral results we get in this cadet movement I am wholly in favour of it. I think the minister is not doing too much. I think he did well to take it upon his own initiative to put this amount aside.

Physical training is also a very good thing. If you want to be a man, you want to be able to walk alone and defend yourself. That gives a man the idea that he is something, and when you get a boy to respect himself, he respects other people too, and respects property. No man has a right to ask his neighbour to respect him unless he first sets the example and respects himself, and I think this is a great school in which to teach the boys to be proud of their persons, and to learn respect for themselves, respect of other persons and of property. I think this vote ought to go through, and if all the other votes that come before us for consideration were the same as this, I would be happy to sanction them and to give them my support.

Mr. IRVINE: I would ask the minister who just spoke how he expects to train a boy to respect himself if he trains him to forget himself.

Mr. BUREAU: I have never preached in any church, Mr. Chairman, but I think that the greatest virtue of all is self-abnegation, and that is what I mean when I say that the boy is taught to forget himself. It may be that my English is defective, but if the hon. gentleman knows so much and cannot understand me I can tell him in French what I mean, in which language I can command all the words I require. If my hon. friend who is a former preacher cannot forgive a man for misusing a word in a language that he did not learn at his mother's knee, I can use French; I have enough of it.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not think there is any necessity for the minister to get a little warm simply because I asked a question arising out of his own discussion. I was trying to get at the basis of this training of the boys. He tells us that first of all they are trained to forget themselves. I am not saying that is a bad thing or a good thing. I merely wanted to get at the gentleman's philosophy. Then he says, after they have been trained thoroughly to forget themselves and practise self-abnegation they are trained to respect themselves, and I merely wanted to find out how it was possible for a man to know what he was at all after he had forgotten himself. And, having thus forgot himself, how he could respect himself is difficult for me to understand. I want to make my protest, Mr. Chairman, against the passing of this item, and I quite realize it will only be a protest. I want to make it along the lines that have been laid down by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) I believe that this movement constitutes a recruiting ground for the militia, that it is one of the means of instilling the spirit of war, the narrow spirit of nationalism, the spirit of conflict in the young generation. In short it is one way of instilling the spirit of militarism, the thing we have been trying to get away from. I repeat that it is a recruiting ground for the militia, although the minister tells us that the training given is not a training for soldiers. If it is not a training for soldiers, if that is not the fundamental purpose of this cadet movement, then why not allow this matter of training in physical form and so forth, to be given over to the public schools as suggested by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey)? We were told when the House was discussing the motion of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) on race track betting that it was not the function of the government to moralize or demoralize the community. In that case why should the government take this matter up so strenuously? If it is moral training you want it is not the business of the government, we understand, to do that. If physical training is desired that is not the business of the government either. If this is what the Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham) says it is, viz: not training for soldiers but training for mental and physical development, that belongs to other departments and can be done more efficiently by them. This government has no business to do anything along that line, and no appropriations for such purposes are in order under militia estimates.

I believe this vote may be successfully opposed on the ground of liberty. While our boys are not compelled to enter the cadet movement yet we are compelled to pay for the cost of the training, and there are great numbers of people who are very much opposed to this thing being thrust upon the community. In spite of that opposition they are not allowed to get rid of paying for it, they are compelled to pay their share of the cost. In

that way it is an interference with human liberty to compel taxation for that which is not sanctioned by the community. The community would vote the cadets down if they had an opportunity, and I would challenge the minister to submit this one question alone to the people of Canada through a referendum. It would not be carried; the people would not have it, they do not want it. We have other bodies doing the work of mental, moral and physical development. Every public school is carrying on physical training; the Boy Scouts do physical training. Why should we subsidize this, a governmental, paternal thing, to deal with the morals, the mentality, and the physical condition of our boys when other institutions are already attending to these phases of collective responsibility? I base my opposition to this vote on the ground that it is camouflaged militarism as the hon. member for Calgary West stated, and because other institutions are already doing the work to which it is said to be related and doing it in a better and more efficient way.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. LEWIS: I wish to assure the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) of my sympathy and support, and I do not think his position is a very enviable one when we are discussing the estimates of Militia or National Defence; but I am very glad to say that I feel in my heart that he is not afraid of the situation and that he is able to meet the arguments that are presented in favour of a decrease in our national defence. As regards the item that is before us, the minister is to be commended for increasing this amount for the development of the health of the youth of our country. I myself have had an opportunity for a number of years of being with the young men of my community and taking them out for two weeks' training. I feel assured that it is of great benefit to the boys in my community to undertake this training, this mental and moral discipline. But there is one phase of the matter that I feel somewhat detracts from the movement, and that is this. I quite agree that it is advisable in the interests of the health of our young people, that this cadet drill should have all the encouragement that it is possible to give it. I do not altogether agree with the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) who suggested that this parliament has nothing to do with the health of the people of this country. The health of the boys and the girls of a country is one of the greatest assets of that country, and nothing that can come before us at the present time is of more importance than the physical and mental well-being of our boys and girls. There is a great deal of good in this movement for which we are asked to vote the sum of $450,000. It will develop, not only what we believe to be the health of the boys, but also that which is so essential to national life—I like to call it the "gang spirit." In this movement, there is the spirit of emulation, the spirit of discipline, and when the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau), commenting upon this situation said "The boys are able to forget themselves," he spoke one of the noblest truths that enter into our modern civilisation. I do not altogether see the point of the statement of the hon. member for Calgary East that he did not see the connection between forgetting yourself and this movement. As far as I have been able to study philosophy, I think one of the greatest teachers said that the greatest freedom that a man could enjoy was when he forgot himself and when he willed the moral and social good of other people. The spirit of emulation and discipline which is found in the physical drill in the cadet service, is one of the finest things to help in making good men and good citizens. But there is one point that seems to find disfavour to a large extent with the people of our country, and that is the feeling somehow or another, whether it be right or not, that there is an attempt to introduce in this service the militaristic spirit that is prevalent. Personally, I am not at all afraid of the word "military" or "militaristic." I myself am the father of five boys, and if the time ever came when it was necessary for those boys to be called upon to defend their country, I should think that I had been lacking in my duty and that there had been something wrong in the training in the home if those boys did not respond. Yet at the same time I do not think this should be connected with what is called the cadet movement for physical training. It is the duty of the state to train men in a threefold way: physically, mentally and morally. This physical training, I believe, comes within the province of the state. But if in some way this federal government could cooperate with the provincial authorities, who have to a large extent the supervision of the education of the youth of the land, and if this government could assist them financially so that the boys and girls could receive the necessary physical instruction which is required

to develop them, without fear of the suspicion that in some mysterious way the boys are being trained into soldiers, I do feel that the government would have the approbation of all the people of Canada. As matters are, however, it seems that this work must come under the Department of National Defence.

Now, as regards physical training under the direction of the provincial authorities, it is well known that every teacher is not qualified to give boys and girls physical instruction. In my own district there are men who are physically unfit to give proper commands and demand discipline; and in other ways it would be impossible for the average school to send its boys for two weeks' training on the camp ground. But if the Department of National Defence would limit its supervision to giving military instruction to the teachers, providing a course for them, or lending them tents or other necessary equipment, without in any way imparting a military taint to the assistance it gives, I believe the department would be doing one of the finest things for the boys in Canada to-day. I should be delighted if some measure could be conceived whereby the same privilege could be afforded the rural boys. I live in a rural constituency and when I come to Ottawa and see the boys in the public schools here getting physical training and the moral discipline that necessarily goes with it, it does seem to me that we in the rural parts of the country are handicapped. And that is why I am pleased to take thirty boys to camp two weeks every year. The member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) submitted a proposal this afternoon which I feel that I could support, but not at the expense of this item. I think that the suggestion that comes from Toronto University is a good one, that we should have international scholarships by means of which educated people and ambitious boys and girls from various countries could meet us on a common plane and become acquainted with us, discussing our ideals of citizenship and our traditions, while we might learn something of their traditions and their outlook on life. That would be one way by which we could get into closer friendly relations and a better understanding with other nations; and to the extent that we understood them we should remove the fear of war. I should be quite willing to support the minister if he set aside a sum of money for that good purpose; but I would not support it at the expense of the physical training of the youth of the land, for I believe that such training is one of the greatest assets we have in building up a virile citizenship.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Mr. SHAW: Under our constitution the subject of education rests with the provincial governments, no matter whether it be physical, mental or moral education. How then does it come about that a vote which the minister justifies on the ground of education, and apparently on that ground alone, has come to be a matter for disposition by the federal government? I want to know the legal basis upon which this vote is asked?

Mr. GRAHAM: If we adhered to the strict interpretation of the British North America Act, there are many activities which the federal government now engages in that could not be carried on. For instance, we are dealing with technical education federally.

Mr. SHAW: That is perfectly clear; you are giving a grant for that purpose, which is to be used by the provincial governments in some particular manner.

Mr. GRAHAM: We give the grant on a fifty-fifty basis. The federal government sent a commission of investigation all over the world where technical education was carried on to any extent to gather information on the subject; and a lot of money was spent for this purpose out of the technical education vote. The idea is that where possible the federal government should work in harmony with the provinces where it is thought that some mutual good can be accomplished. Take the question of agriculture. The federal government conducts a system of experimental farms. But strictly speaking, according to my hon. friend, that is really education,—agricultural education,—and the federal government should have nothing to do with it. On the contrary, we work in harmony with the provinces in that matter. They have agricultural schools and we conduct experimental farms all over the country giving agricultural education. Then there is the question of good roads: We join with the provinces in the construction of good roads. True, we give a grant, but it is subject to approval by our engineers; and we have a staff in connection with the Railway department looking after the construction of roads in the various provinces in order to ensure that they are up to standard. The housing scheme also might have been relegated to the provinces themselves from a technical point of view; but the federal government passed a vote and took a hand in the attempt to solve the problem. The simple fact is that we cannot draw too fine a line. The object of the government, I take it, is to develop the citizenship and resources of the whole Dominion; and the greatest of these resources is found, not in the bowels of the

earth, not in the timber, nor the lakes nor the streams of the country, but in the boys and girls who are growing up. And if, by avoiding rigid technicalities, we can join forces with the provinces for the development of all the resources that we possess I think we are doing a good work. Nor do I believe that we are violating the spirit and the real intent of the British North America Act.

Mr. GOOD: There is in my judgment very much to commend itself to us in this vote. The work which is being undertaken by those who have charge of the cadets is an important, a desirable and a necessary one. But in my opinion it is unfortunate that it should be carried on under the auspices of the Department of National Defence,—unfortunate because that supervision seems to create a suspicion that the boys who are being trained are subjected to a militarizing process. While I am disposed to support the vote, it does seem to me that some attention ought to be given to the problem of shifting the supervision from the Department of National Defence to our educational authorities. In all the schools now we have physical instructors who are doing very necesary and good work; and I think it is highly desirable that this work should be linked up a little more closely with our educational system, with the Boy Scout movement and things of that kind, as something separate and distinct from the activities of the Department of National Defence.

Item agreed to.

National Defence—militia services—clothing and necessaries, $300,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose the reduction of $40,400, is due to the lower costs prevailing now?

Mr. GRAHAM: In a measure. This vote fluctuates. We had a lot of material left over from the war. One year we may run out of the regular size of caps and clothing and these deficiencies have to be supplied, while perhaps another year we may run out of some other size, and the vote will be a little higher.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Arsenal, Lindsay, $9,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How is it proposed to spend this $9,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: In caretakers' salaries, fuel, light, etc. These are the particulars:

Salary of chief caretaker, $1,008; salaries of three other caretakers, $2,860; allowance for one caretaker in lieu of quarters, $180; cost of water, fuel and light, $1,830; rental of railway siding, etc., $3,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There was some talk last year that the Lindsay arsenal was to be sold. What has been done in the meantime?

Mr. GRAHAM: The property is now in the hands of the Public Works department for disposal by lease or sale, and they are in touch with the authorities of the town of Lindsay, who, I believe, have been discussing the possibility of securing an industry to rent a portion of the property.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What has become of the machinery?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is all there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is proposed to be done with it?

Mr. GRAHAM: A good deal of the special machinery has been sent to the Quebec arsenal. There is other machinery there that I think could be used by an industrial concern.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Has all the cartridge-making machinery been removed to the Quebec arsenal?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not all of it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much has been removed?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that quite a substantial part has been moved to the Quebec arsenal, which can be used there and for which there is room.

Mr. BOYS: The policy of the department, I presume, is to discontinue the Lindsay arsenal and confine ammunition manufacturing to the Quebec arsenal?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the object. The Quebec arsenal can produce more than all the ammunition we may need in peace times.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does there remain at Lindsay a full unit for the manufacture of cartridges?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not quite in a position to give that information. It is not the intention of the government at the present time to manufacture any more ammunition at Lindsay. That will be borne in mind whatever machinery may be taken away.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is evidently the intention of the government to close the arsenal at Lindsay and dispose of it if possible. What has been the cost to the country of establishing this arsenal?

Mr. GRAHAM: When the policy was announced last year of closing this arsenal—and it was closed a year ago—I gave all

that information in detail. I regret that I have not it at hand now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember when some particulars were given, and I remember as well that the hon. member for the district at the time stated to the House some things that he evidently believed to be facts, going to show that there were shady, or perhaps improper, circumstances connected with the purchase; in fact he intimated that the purchase was not made on the square in the interests of the country. I happen to know that he has since received all the facts, proving fully that the greatest care was taken in regard to the purchase and that it was honest in every detail to the last cent. I hope he will now be good enough to give those particulars to the House.

Mr. BUREAU: How do you happen to know?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know; I have seen them.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Arsenal, Quebec, $390,000.

Mr. LEWIS: What is the reason for the $15,000 increase in this item considering that the cost of labour and materials has decreased?

Mr. GRAHAM: The cost, of course, depends on the amount of material produced. Formerly we had two arsenals; this year all the work is being done in one.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it small arms ammunition that is made in this arsenal?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; and we make up to as heavy as 18-pounders.

Mr. LEWIS: It was stated last year when we were discussing a similar item that we already had in Canada a great many of the larger shells—enough to last at least a year or so. I was wondering whether shells of this kind were being made, or whether the arsenal was turning out small ammunition only.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount of gun ammunition to be manufactured during the coming year is 500 rounds of 18-pounder and 500 rounds of 4.5 howitzer.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How many rounds of ammunition were manufactured last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimated production of the Dominion arsenal at Quebec last year was as follows:

Cartridges, S.A. ball .303"—7 millions.
Cartridges, S.A. Ball .303" for D.R.A. 200,000.
Cartridges, S.A. Ball .303 tracer mark VII, 10,000.
Cartridges, S.A. dummy .303" 500,000.
Boxes, ammunition .303" 7,710.
Bandoliers, .303" ammunition 144,000.
Chargers .303" cartridges, 1,540,000.
Cartridges .22" long rifle 9 millions.
Boxes for .22" 900.
Cartridges, S.A. pistol .455" 300,000.
Cartridges, blank, pistol .455" 50,000.
Boxes for pistol ammunition 840.
Puffs, powder, 4 drms. R.F.G. 2, 1,000.
Puffs, powder, R.L.G. 2, 1,000.
Puffs, powder, 4 oz. 500.
Puffs, powders, 2 oz. 500.

The total estimated cost was $425,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister has simply read the estimate of last year. I did not ask him for that information. I want to know what was actually manufactured and how near it would be to that estimate. If he cannot give me that information, will he be kind enough to tell us how many rounds of ammunition were used last year in the different camps and elsewhere? The minister told us last year that we had in stock about 45,000,000 rounds of ammunition, but that that was not enough; and we were to make another 10,000,000 rounds last year. Unless we know how much has been used we are not able to see whether or not it is necessary to keep this institution going. We have reduced the number of men who are to use this ammunition, and it seems to me that the amount used last year must have been less than in former years.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is impossible to state the amount of ammunition of every kind used by the militia and by all the rifle associations. My hon. friend asks how much we manufactured. The returns will not be in until 31st March, but it is expected that the amount estimated will have been manufactured by that time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can the minister tell us how much small arms ammunition he has on hand now?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not that information.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is strange that we are asked to vote $390,000 for ammunition and no information is forthcoming as to what we have on hand, what was manufactured last year, or even what was issued by the department last year. I notice what appears to be a clerical error in this estimate; the amount of Mark VII to be manufactured is given as 40,000,000. I fancy that should be 4,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And so all the way down the column; two figures have been added at the end which I fancy are clerical errors. There is provision for a large quantity of

small arms ammunition in this estimate—more, I think, than there was for last year. I doubt whether as many men were trained last year as there were the year before, or whether as much ammunition was actually used. I see further down that it is proposed to manufacture 500 high explosive 18-pounders. May I ask whether the supply of 18-pounders which was brought from England at the close of the war, and which caused so much talk at election time, has become exhausted, making it necessary to manufacture additional quantities of these high explosive shells?

Mr. GRAHAM: I gave the statement a few moments ago about the 18-pounders. I will give the remainder of the statement, which comprises the information given to me by the technical officers of the department. The amount of ammunition on hand of these natures—that is, high explosives—represents less than 50 per cent of the equipment reserves required, based on pre-war scales. The amounts to be manufactured do not meet the current year's expenditure for practice and are barely adequate to ensure that the machinery and equipment for the manufacture is in order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister please answer the other question: is the supply of 18-pounder high explosive shells which was obtained from England at the end of the war, and concerning which much comment was made during the last general election, now exhausted, so that it becomes necessary to manufacture more of that kind of ammunition?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say the supply has been exhausted. The statement I have read is an answer to that question. It says, if it says anything, that even with the production which is proposed we shall have less than 50 per cent of the amount required to maintain our reserves.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is quite clear, then, from the statement of the minister, that notwithstanding all the noise that was made during the last election concerning the alleged enormous quantities of high explosive shells that were "recklessly and extravagantly" brought into this country, the total supply of this ammunition in Canada to-day is only 50 per cent of what the reserves should be, according to pre-war requirements, and the minister finds it necessary to come to parliament to-day and ask for a vote to increase the store of these very shells by five hundred for the coming season, carrying out exactly what I and others on this side of the House said, that we have only accepted from the British government material in the way of shells for the training of our own Canadian militia which will be used by the militia or kept in reserve. This ammunition is being used and the reserve to-day is only fifty per cent of what it was in pre-war times. It must be borne in mind that the shells which were brought into Canada cost this country nothing. Those who attended the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee last year—which did not report the facts to this House, by the way—will bear me out when I say that no better bargain was ever made than the bargain which was made by the Canadian authorities with the British government whereby all that valuable ammunition came to this country practically without the expenditure of a dollar. Unfortunately we did not get enough of it, and now we have to go on manufacturing five hundred additional for the present year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine that originally the cost was taken into account, so that the Canadian people would be charged in the final settlement.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You have not followed the inquiry.

Mr. GRAHAM: Although we paid nothing, I think you will find that originally the cost was taken into account.

Mr. GUTHRIE: General MacBrien says that it was practically a free gift.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am explaining the conclusion I arrived at after looking into it. My hon. friend, I think, has lost sight of the fact that with that amount of ammunition we received also some gun ammunition, sixty-pounders, which has no connection with the eighteen-pounders we are discussing.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That was for Halifax.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice that the shells the minister has just referred to are costing $12 apiece. Would it not have been much better to have bought these shells than to have made them? You can buy them far cheaper than that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where?

Mr. CHAPLIN: In the Old Country. You could probably get them for nothing, like some of the other shells we got before. These shells did not cost as much in war time as they are represented to cost here. Twelve dollars apiece is a higher price than what was paid in war time for them. How are we to know whether the stock of small arms ammunition is enough or not unless we know

how much has been used during the past year? Last year the minister told us that we had so much in stock, but he is not able to give us even that much information now. He also told us how much we had used during the year, but he cannot give us that information now. Surely the War Department, such as we have, must keep some account of what ammunition they give out to the different places. There is no ammunition being given out in cold weather. It is all used during the summer time, and it seems to me only reasonable that the minister should tell us how much was used during the last summer.

Mr. GRAHAM: Conditions are a little different now from those existing when I gave that information last year. Last year, I think, it was in June when these estimates went through and we had full returns from the arsenals and from every district as to what had been used. These returns will not be in for some weeks. Consequently I am not in a position to give that information this year as it is not in the department as yet. As to the purchase of shells overseas, does not my hon. friend (Mr. Chaplin) know that there are many things in this country that we can buy cheaper in Europe than we can make here?

Mr. HOEY: He is becoming a free trader.

Mr. GRAHAM: A free trader in ammunition. As a matter of fact during the war, factories were going twenty-four hours a day, with three shifts, and producing an immense daily output. The conditions were far different from an arsenal where you have to keep up your organization, where you have your overhead and all that kind of thing, and only a limited production. I think my hon. friend will see, although I do not admit that this ammunition was produced very much cheaper during the war, that with that enormous production in war time, with the factories running twenty-four hours and turning out an almost unlimited quantity, the ammunition could be produced more cheaply than under the conditions prevailing here today.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would remind the minister that the shells he speaks of were made during the war, when the rate of wages was twice what we should be paying now.

Mr. GRAHAM: Wages have not gone down as much as the hon. member imagines.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I question if there is any overhead in our case. These shells are made in a government institution, and there is no overhead at all. This is only the actual cost. The minister says that I am a free trader. I am, as far as ammunition is concerned. I tell him that as far as this ammunition is concerned we can get these shells practically for nothing. They have been dumped into the sea, lots of them, and a little more timely precaution might have secured us enough to last for a few years, instead of our having to manufacture a paltry number now. It is true that the shells cannot be made so cheaply in small quantities. But why make them in small quantities when we can get them for practically nothing?

Mr. VIEN: In answer to the hon. member I might point out what was disclosed at the Committee on Public Accounts last year with respect to the ammunition which came from overseas. When the hon. gentleman says that eighteen-pounder ammunition could be got for nothing overseas, he forgets that the figures for our requirements in respect of that ammunition were given by the late government to the British government. The ammunition was of such a character that it could not last beyond a definite period, and when it reached the port of disembarkation it was marked "Not good after" such a date.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Seven years.

Mr. VIEN: I have seen the marks myself, and in many cases they were marked as good for not longer than three or four years. Moreover, this ammunition was taken by the various Dominions, and the rest of it, as the hon. gentleman has stated was dumped in the North Sea. That ammunition was not given for nothing, and hon. gentlemen who think that it could be stored in Canada for nothing are totally mistaken. It had to be brought over from the ammunition yards in England and on the Continent at a heavy expense. Those who know anything about the matter also know that for eighteen months shifts of men have been employed to put that ammunition in proper shape and make it safe. There are still many men employed at Levis at present in making these shells safe. As it is they are not in a safe condition. Safety pins have to be removed from the caps. These various shells have to be repainted and definite marks put on them. So, hon. gentlemen are totally mistaken when they say that these shells could be brought over at no cost at all to this country. The balances which were left in the hands of the British government were either destroyed or dumped into the North Sea, according to the information which was given to the committee last year. For these reasons I doubt very much indeed if any other ammunition was available overseas after

the requirements of Canada had been given to the British government by the officials of the late administration.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Reference has been made to the debate which took place on the militia estimates a year ago. I have a copy of Hansard of the date upon which this matter was before the House and it is not possible to find there the record to which hon. members opposite have been referring for the reason that I find that seventeen pages have been omitted from Hansard as printed and distributed for the benefit of members and for record purposes. Now, if the information referred to is not in the records, and if seventeen pages are omitted from the Hansard which has only been distributed by the government since parliament met, I think it is a most remarkable thing. I have a very distinct recollection that when this item was up a year ago an hon. member who sits to the right of the minister got up and moved for a reduction in the estimate for the arsenal, but there is no record of that in Hansard. I do not understand how this omission of seventeen pages of very important matter occurred. I think it is somewhat significant, however, that hon. members opposite who were so loud in their protestations against voting moneys for anything of a military nature should be silent when an item such as this, calling for a large increase in the expenditure on the arsenal in Quebec is up for consideration. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) referred to the outcry which arose when it was found that shells were being brought out from the Old Country and unloaded at Quebec some time ago. Yet not a word is being heard to-day in reference to this matter from those who made that outcry. It would seem that you can reduce the militia estimates as much as you like providing the expenditure on the Quebec arsenal is increased. That appears to suit hon. gentlemen opposite and not a word of protest is uttered; but if you do anything in the nature of training men to serve their country in an emergency there is a loud protest made by those hon. members and also by hon. members who sit to my left.

I regret very much many of the things that have been said this afternoon in regard to military training, particularly those criticisms offered as to the training of cadets. It is unfortunate, some hon. members say that the training of our cadets should be associated with anything of a military nature. The arsenal at Quebec is intended to supply ammunition for the training of men for military purposes, yet hon. members opposite and hon. gentlemen to my left have been protesting against anything in the nature of military training. I could have wished that some of the things that have been said this afternoon could be omitted from the records as seventeen pages of the Hansard of last session have evidently been omitted. I think the latter occurrence should be inquired into, and that the House should be fully informed how such an omission took place.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In last year's estimates there is an item providing for nine million 22 inch cartridges for long rifle use. Can the minister state how many of these cartridges have been used?

Mr. GRAHAM: As I pointed out a short time ago we have no returns from any of the districts and will not have until the end of the year. Last year we had all this information because the estimates were not before the House until June. The fiscal year closes on the 31st March, and we do not get these returns until after that date.

Mr. HANSON: Are there not monthly returns from the arsenals? Business houses would have such returns.

Mr. GRAHAM: We do not get monthly returns.

Mr. HANSON: It seems to me there should be a monthly return from every arsenal showing the output, the quantity shipped, and the balance on hand. I have no doubt that if the minister would inquire he would find that monthly returns are available.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that such is not the case. Let me remind my hon. friend there is only one arsenal.

Mr. HANSON: Now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say there are no monthly returns—

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —showing the output of and the stock on hand? I remember answers being given as to monthly returns in previous years.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have looked through Hansard for several years and in one instance I find that my predecessor gave exactly the same answer with reference to a different branch of the service, that he had not the information desired. I am not surprised at that, because apparently it is not possible to get it.

Mr. MEWBURN: I am inclined to think that if the minister made inquiry he would find that in the case of every military district

they know exactly from day to day the amount of ammunition shipped and the amount on hand.

Mr. POWER: That would not be a monthly return from the arsenal, that would be simply a statement of what they have in store.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I find that last year in the estimates there were nine million cartridges to be made. This year only a million of the same class of cartridges are to be manufactured. It seems to me that fact is significant in itself; there must be a pretty big stock on hand or the number manufactured would not have dropped down to a million as compared with nine millions last year. It seems that we cannot get definite information from the minister, but somebody ought to be able to furnish it.

Mr. BOYS: Up to date what amount of last year's appropriation of $375,000 has been expended?

Mr. GRAHAM: About $300,000, to the end of January.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think we should have some explanation as to why 17 pages have been omitted from Hansard?

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that his remarks are not relevant to the item under consideration. The matter he speaks of is one which should come before the printing committee of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like the hon. member to inform the committee what pages have been omitted from Hansard.

Mr. BOYS: Could the minister tell us to what extent the shells, or other ammunition, received at Quebec, about which there was so much talk, have since been used for
9 p.m. practice or other purpose at the military camps? Even an approximate estimate will satisfy me.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot give an estimate of what number of shells have been used. Of course a great number must have been used. The ammunition is distributed all over the country, and not stored at one place. So far as shells are concerned, even with this estimate we shall be left with not more than 50 per cent of the amount required in reserve.

Mr. BOYS: Could the minister give the committee any idea in dollars and cents as to the cost of manufacture? Would it run into thousands of dollars? Could he give even an approximation of the amount.

[Mr. Mewburn.]

Mr. GRAHAM: It would take some little time to make the estimate. We would have to get the sizes, quantities and all that kind of thing. That is a question my hon. friend surely would not anticipate would come up on the estimates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I remember when I had the honour of presenting these estimates to the House, my deputy was always prepared with a book showing exactly what the reserves of ammunition amounted to. We could tell what they were in small arms ammunition and in artillery ammunition. Perhaps, if the minister would inquire now, he would find in that book a page with that statement on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have never been able to find that information in any book of Estimates, either last year's, this year's or that of the previous year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister gave that information last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: He gave it offhand.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister was just joking last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, he was not.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister told us on page 2086 of Hansard of last year just what the quantity of the reserves was.

Mr. POWER: Tear that page out too.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is one of the pages that could not be torn out.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have been waiting patiently, fully expecting the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) to move to reduce this item. He did so a year ago and I am a little surprised, because I was criticised for some of the criticism which I offered, for it was stated that credit was due to the Minister of Militia in that he was reducing an expenditure which was to take place at Quebec. Surely, under present conditions, with the reductions which have taken place in many of the other items, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not consent to this increase for the arsenal at Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Since my hon. friend has informed the committee that those seventeen pages of Hansard have disappeared, I am losing all credit for that amendment of last year, and under the circumstances, I would not think of moving another one.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the minister was entitled to any credit, we would give it to him notwithstanding the absence of the pages from the record.

Mr. BOYS: If the minister were given an opportunity, I presume he could find out the value of the ammunition we are discussing, in other words, the ammunition which was received from Great Britain, about which there was so much discussion, and which has since been used—how much there was of it, and what it is worth according to the Canadian price of manufacture. I would like to have that information. If it cannot be got now, I would suggest that this item stand, because when that information is given, I wish to make two or three references to some of the evidence taken before the committee which dealt with that matter, which evidence, I think, never reached the House. We are anxious that the House and especially the people of the country should know the facts regarding this ammunition. There are some illuminating and startling facts contained in the evidence of Col. Harrington and General MacBrien on this matter. When I get the information I am now seeking, I should like to make those references which, perhaps, would not be appropriately made without the information.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I think the request I made, that the minister give us the quantity of ammunition that is being used in the country for practise purposes during the year, is a reasonable request and one in regard to which the information can be easily obtained, and that information should be brought down to the House at the same time.

Mr. GRAHAM: All right; we will let the item stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) tell us what pages are missing from his Hansard? Every page of the debate is in the copy of Hansard that I am holding in my hand. I do not know how my hon. friend got hold of that particular copy.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was ruled out of order when I endeavoured to bring the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the copy of Hansard which my hon. friend has just handed me, it looks as if those pages had been cut out.

Item stands.

Grants to associations, etc., $100,000.

Mr. MILLAR: What are the names of the associations that receive these grants and the amount given to each?

Mr. GRAHAM: Services Association; Cavalry Association, Artillery, Infantry, Medical, Engineers, Army Service Corps; Rifle Associations in the different provinces; University Rifle Association; local rifle associations.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance, military properties, $250,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the appropriation this year, certain services are placed, that heretofore have been under the engineering appropriation, such as $8,000, removal of snow from streets, grounds and roofs; $1,000 for power to be used, Connaught Rifle Range. There are several small votes of that kind that in other years we paid under the engineering appropriation.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister should have told us that, when we were considering the engineering appropriations, because it would have shown an increase if those items had not been taken out.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Does this item include anything for repairs, extension or improvement of military properties at Brockville or adjacent thereto?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is not really for repairs such as my hon. friend has in mind. That is rather for maintenance. I know what my hon. friend has in mind is the rifle range in the vicinity of Brockville. Last year some money was expended on that in the way of draining, which comes under a general vote, I think the engineering vote.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There is in this item nothing for anything of this kind this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is nothing specifically; but we have a general appropriation, and we treat these requests as they come up.

Mr. SHAW: Does this item include rental of buildings that would be used for headquarters of a military district?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Public Works department looks after the renting of buildings.

Mr. SHAW: Am I justified in saying that the expenditure indicated on this page of the Estimates is not the total expenditure for defence purposes?

Mr. GRAHAM: In the same way that the total expenditure for post offices or any other public service never includes the amount of rental for the building, that matter being looked after by the Public Works department.

Item agreed to.

Ordnance arms, lands, etc., $66,000.

Mr. HANSON: What does this item cover?

Mr. GRAHAM: To a large extent it covers the inspection of munitions.

Item agreed to.

Pay of staff, $255,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: For the year 1921-22 the vote under the head of Pay of Staff was $265,000, last year it was $255,000, and this year it is the same, a reduction of only $10,000. I was under the impression from the debate that took place last year that the Pay of Staff was an item that was to be largely reduced when the reorganization of the various departments took place, and all these departments were put under the head of National Defence. I do not know that I am disposed to criticize the item very much. I know I did defend it two and three years ago most strenuously, but the chief attack on that occasion was made by my hon. friend for Quebec South (Mr. Power).

Mr. POWER: He is of the same opinion still.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He pointed out to the committee the tremendous number of high ranking officers which this country was maintaining. I forget how many generals and major-generals he stated.

Mr. POWER: Twenty-one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And he argued that the pay of staff was entirely disproportionate to the force which we had in Canada. Now, I know of one or two changes that have taken place. I know that the Inspector-General has been retired on pension, and that pension does not appear in this item. He was drawing, I think, about $8,500. The department has saved that and perhaps another $1,500 in some other direction, because the saving apparently is $10,000. But the whole array of high ranking and high paid officers still remains. I always maintained that they were necessary to the service, I always maintained, and still maintain, that they were not overpaid, but, on the contrary, in many cases were underpaid. But I am waiting for my hon. friend for Quebec South to give the committee the benefit of his knowledge and to state his views in regard to this particular item, bearing in mind the attitude he took two and three years ago.

Mr. POWER: I have no doubt a large number of these high ranking officers have since retired, but that would not alter my views on the matter as expressed two years ago. I agree with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham) that we have too many high ranking officers. I do not think that those we have are overpaid, but there are too many of them all through the militia service of Canada. We have generals where we might have captains, colonels where we might have sergeants, and majors where we might very well have men of the rank and file. I think that the abuses which crept into the service during the term of office of my hon. friends opposite have been such that it has been almost impossible for anyone to get rid of these officers; and in spite of the well meant and strenuous efforts of the minister who now presides over the department, some of these men who were there during the time of my hon. friends across the floor are still there and apparently cannot be got rid of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is pretty weak.

Mr. POWER: In many cases, as my hon. friend from Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) suggests, they themselves have not the virtue of resignation; and the minister when he took office found them so firmly entrenched in the positions they occupied during the war that it was impossible for him to get rid of them. I think the minister is doing his best. He has retired at least three that I am aware of, General Burstall, General Gwatkin—

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was out long ago.

Mr. POWER: Perhaps—General Swift, and another whose name I cannot just at the moment recall.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who took the places of these men?

Mr. POWER: I do not know, really. If the leader of the Opposition is too shy to ask the question I will ask the minister for him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have asked him.

Mr. POWER: I have known my right hon. friend and admired him a great many years and I never knew him to lack the virtue of frankness in stating openly what he thought. But in his behalf I will ask the minister to see to it that next year we have fewer of these highly paid officers and that an investigation be made in the department to see whether it is not possible in certain branches of the service to have officers of lower grades carry on the work which is now being done by those who are highly titled and consequently much higher salaried.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I sympathize with my hon. friend for Quebec South in the di-

lemma in which he finds himself. In the old days he was as bold as a lion in his criticism of this very item. He moved for substantial reductions and divided the committee.

Mr. POWER: Will the hon. member vote with me if I make a similar motion to-night?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I was not in sympathy with the motion.

Mr. POWER: I would move it right away if he would promise to support it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I opposed it then and I would oppose it now. But my hon. friend is entirely wrong when he says that abuses crept in under the former administration. He knows why there are so many high ranking officers in the department to-day, but he has not told the committee. It is because of the war. These men obtained their rank, not here in the department but on the field of battle, and coming back they were not reduced, simply for the reason that they had attained their rank in the field.

Mr. VIEN: Does the hon. gentleman not admire more those generals who served with great efficiency on the battlefield, and who, on returning, went back to their ploughs?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I admire them all. I admire all who served efficiently on the field, and I certainly would be the last one to degrade in rank a man who achieved that rank on the field of battle, no matter what his subsequent calling in life might happen to be. That is why these officers who are still attached to the department have their present ranking.

Mr. POWER: Why not degrade them in pay? You did it to the junior officers throughout the service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. POWER: How many junior officers holding the rank of major now serve as lieutenants in the regular forces? Why not apply the same principle to the generals?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are only a certain number of offices to be filled. The government cannot employ all the deserving officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, that would be impossible. But where their services are required they have been retained, wherever possible in the ranks which they attained in the field. I quite see that the minister cannot disturb that arrangement. It would be most improper in my humble judgment to do so. But what strikes me as being odd is that our permanent force has been reduced since last year. It has been a good deal reduced since my time. When I was minister we were reducing the permanent force. I notice the vote is reduced in these estimates, but the pay of the staff keeps up. That is the point I would bring to the attention of my hon. friend for Quebec (Mr. Power), who was bold enough three years ago to move for the reduction of this item when we had a larger permanent force, and who to-day is as mild as a lamb in the face of a minister friendly to his own cause, and humbly, to what three years ago he called an iniquity and an outrage.

Mr. STEVENS: What officers have been retired during the past year who are paid out of this item? And have any other officers been appointed in their places with or without pensions?

Mr. GRAHAM: Speaking from memory, and notwithstanding the statement of my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), General Gwatkin was not out of the service but was acting chairman of the Air Board. He has been retired, not with a pension, because he draws a pension from the imperial authorities. He was given one year's leave of absence, I think.

Mr. STEVENS: What was his salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was made up of what we paid him, added to his imperial pension.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think $7,500 in all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think we gave him $3,500 or $4,000. General Burstall was retired, but is still drawing his pay during leave of absence.

Mr. STEVENS: Will he draw that this year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Up to October. Part of the remuneration of General Fiset, our deputy minister, is in this item. He is on leave of absence until next autumn. Then we had a reduction in the staff which perhaps accounts for a large portion of this decrease. When General Williams resigned in Toronto to take over the provincial police one branch of our department was abolished and the remainder of the staff were transferred, General Elmsley being sent to Kingston, General King to London and General Parry to Toronto. As a matter of fact, so long as the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned are drawing their pay on leave of absence the reduction due to their retirement cannot appear in the estimates.

Mr. STEVENS: Has anyone been appointed in the place of those who have retired?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. BOYS: Were General Williams and General Fiset retired on one year's leave of absence with pay and also with pension?

Mr. GRAHAM: They do not get any pension until after their leave of absence expires.

Mr. STEVENS: But they will?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. General Fiset was retired on leave of absence on account of illness. So far as this vote is concerned, none of these gentlemen have been replaced.

Item agreed to.

Permanent Force, $5,290,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What does the permanent force consist of to-day?

Mr. POWER: Officers and their batmen.

Mr. GRAHAM: The permanent force to-day is composed of the following:

	Officers	Other Ranks	Total
Royal Canadian Artillery	67	616	683
Royal Canadian Dragoons	20	250	270
Lord Strathcona's Horse	18	187	205
Royal Canadian Engineers	41	212	253
Royal Canadian Corps Signallers	6	45	51
Royal Canadian Regiment (Infty.)	38	353	391
P.P.C. Light Infantry	34	226	260
Royal 22nd Regiment	16	179	195
Royal Can. Machine Gun Bde.	15	...	15
Instructional Cadre	3	130	133
Cadet Officers Specially Employed	8	...	8
Royal Canadian Army Service Corps	31	230	261
Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps	32	73	105
Royal Canadian Army Ordnance Corps	36	419	455
Royal Canadian Army Veterinary Corps	6	7	13
Royal Canadian Army Pay Corps	21	67	88
Corps of Military Staff Clerks	9	187	196
General List (Officers)	26	...	26
	427	3,181	3,608

The number that this estimate provides for is 3,516.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What was it a year ago? I did not think it was 3,608 last year. It has gone up instead of down.

Mr. GRAHAM: These are the figures:

1921-22, 3,978; 1922-23, 3,608; this year, 3,516.

Mr. HANSON: That is a very small reduction. What was the figure for the Royal Canadian Dragoons?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The figure is 391.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. HANSON: Is that corps stationed at the Stanley Barracks, Toronto?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Is it the policy of the department to keep the corps there? I think these men ought to be moved some distance away from an urban centre to give them an opportunity of indulging in proper drill and manœuvres so that they may become more efficient. To-day their quarters are too restricted and they are not able to carry out manœuvres of any consequence.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is absolutely right. As a matter of fact we are at Stanley Barracks now on sufferance of the city of Toronto, our quarters at Rosedale Heights having been burned to the ground a few nights ago. The necessity of furnishing accommodation in Toronto has to be considered. To provide money for the purpose we have placed on the market through the Public Works department the St. Andrew's school property, purchased for war purposes, and the property owned by us at Rosedale Heights. If we could sell the St. Andrew's school property for approximately the amount it cost us the proceeds would go a long way towards establishing proper accommodation at Long Branch. There is sufficient land there to give all the necessary accommodation for training, and so on, and there are excellent barracks. The Defence Department hopes before long, with money obtained through the sale of militia property, to be able to work out a scheme to provide proper accommodation for the permanent force in Toronto at Long Branch.

Mr. SHAW: In view of the suggestion that the department is over-officered, will the minister give us the number of men in the Strathcona Horse, and the number of officers and non-commissioned officers, with their respective ranks?

Mr. GRAHAM: Eighteen officers and 187 men. The ranks of the officers are as follows: 1 lieutenant-colonel; 5 majors; 5 captains; 10 lieutenants; 2 warrant officers; 24 sergeants; 12 corporals; 11 lance-corporals.

Mr. SHAW: The figures the minister gives us are ample evidence in support of the charge that has been made. If my recollection is correct, on service that number of men would be in charge of 1 senior captain, 1 junior captain, and 4 lieutenants.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are providing for 2 majors, 1 captain, 4 lieutenants and 175 other ranks.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many members of the permanent force are in the military district which has headquarters at Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM: The number is 528.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What was the force there in September last?

Mr. GRAHAM: I should not think there would be much change. I have not the figures here.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was there any part of the permanent force in the adjoining military district with headquarters at St. John during last September?

Mr. GRAHAM: About 53, all ranks.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then in these two military districts there were approximately 600 of the permanent force at the time of the unfortunate strike or disturbance that took place there a few months ago. I understand that at that time the permanent force alone was called upon in aid of the civil power. I also understood the minister to take the view this afternoon that the law was that the permanent force in the first instance must be called on, and after that, if necessary, the ordinary volunteer units of the active militia.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said the law provided that if the permanent force was available it would have to be used; if it was not available and there was an emergency, the volunteer force should be called upon temporarily, but to be replaced by the permanent force.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is what I intended to convey to the committee; perhaps I misstated the point. My view of it is that the law does contemplate the calling out of the ordinary militia, the volunteer units, in the first instance. If language means anything, that is what the Militia Act of Canada provides. I just want to place the matter as it appears in the statute before the committee and let the committee judge for itself. This is a plain matter of fact and a plain matter of law. It will, I fancy, either now or hereafter have to be decided, and it is just as well that we consider it under this vote, which deals with the permanent force. Section 80 of the Militia Act is the law on the subject, it provides:

The active militia,—

That includes the volunteer forces of Canada as well as the permanent force.

—or any corps thereof, shall be liable to be called out, within or without the municipality in which such corps is raised or organized, for active service, with their arms and ammunition, in aid of the civil power, in any case in which a riot or disturbance of the peace requiring such service occurs, or is, in the opinion of the civil authority hereinafter designated in that behalf, anticipated as likely to occur, and, in either case, beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, or to prevent or deal with.

Now, the administration of civil and criminal law in this country is not left to the Dominion government; it rests with the provinces. A riot, a disturbance or breach of the peace, would constitute a breach of the criminal law of Canada, and it is the duty of the provinces, acting under the authority given them in the criminal law and under the constitution, to take cognizance of all such matters and deal with them. In other words, that is not the duty of this government or of this parliament; the province itself must take the responsibility and apply a remedy. The provinces have established municipal institutions; they have delegated provincial authority to the municipalities.

Mr. POWER: May I interrupt the hon. member? We had an unfortunate riot in Quebec in 1918. Why did the hon. gentleman, who was then a member of the Cabinet, not insist that the province of Quebec should take care of that riot?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, the circumstances were entirely different from those which prevailed in this instance. It was a time when Canada was actually at war and we had large military forces in the country, and it was—

Mr. POWER: Not openly at war with Quebec, was it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, no, not in Quebec.

Mr. POWER: Not openly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The disturbance there was in connection with a matter with which this government had power to deal; I assume that is the distinction. However, I want to state my case, and if my hon. friend does not—

Mr. POWER: The mayor of Quebec did not call on the federal authorities.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, the federal authorities acted on their own initiative and should bear the cost. I fancy they did bear the cost.

Mr. POWERS: They have not paid the victims yet.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My only desire is to lay the facts before the committee and let the committee judge. The municipalities maintain a system, in their police forces, for carrying out the law. If under any conditions the provincial system of police is not sufficient, then any municipality, acting through its head, may requisition the active militia of Canada in

aid of the civil power. If the head of the municipality refuses to take action, then power is given to the county judge having jurisdiction in that municipality. It comes back to the municipality, you see. The municipality is the one specially affected. It is to the head of the municipality that power is first given to request the calling out of the militia; then to the local judge having jurisdiction over the municipality where the disturbance arises. So it was in this case. I am informed that the head of the corporation involved and the municipality refused to take action. It was open then to any inhabitant to go to the judge, and on laying the case before him the judge could take action. Following up the provisions of the statute, he would make a requisition in the form given in the Militia Act, which would be forwarded to Ottawa, and upon that the government would act.

Now, how should they act? What I submit was the first thing the government should have done on receipt of that requisition was to call out the active militia in that particular district, in that municipality or at least in that locality.

Mr. POWER: How does the hon. member read that in the act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am going to read the act now.

Mr. POWER: I thought he had read it.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is trying to edit it.

Mr GUTHRIE: Section 81 provides:

> The district officer commanding in any locality, if he is present in the locality and able to act, or if he is not so present, or from sickness or other cause is unable to act, the senior officer of the active militia in any locality, not from sickness or other cause unable to act, shall call out the active militia, or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, when thereunto required in writing by the civil authority hereinafter designated in that behalf: Provided that so far as the permanent force is available, a sufficient number of the force is to be employed upon the duty of preventing or suppressing such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance before recourse is had to other militia corps, and shall replace such other militia corps if so called out upon duty so soon as and to the extent the permanent force shall thereafter become available.

What I maintain in regard to that section is that the whole thing pertains to the locality. Any one reading that enactment which I have just read must come to the conclusion that it is the officer in the locality that can do it.

Mr. DUFF: It is the officer commanding the district.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let us look at the situation. The government had between five and six hundred men in that particular district at the time of the strike at Halifax. Were they called out, may I ask the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly, but there were not five or six hundred men whom you would call fighting men.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They were available men for the purpose. Then the next step was to call out the active militia of Canada in that locality.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in that locality.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why, if my hon. friend's contention was correct, the two or three hundred men he could call out in that locality would not be sufficient. He would have to scour the country and go to Vancouver to get enough men to put down a disturbance. The thing is preposterous.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say that at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As a matter of fact, he did not have to go to Vancouver, but he did go from Halifax to St. John, and from St. John to Quebec, and from Quebec to Montreal, and from Montreal to Kingston, and from Kingston to Toronto and London, and all that time there was apprehension of a riot or disturbance in Cape Breton. The meaning of the law to my mind is as plain as plain can be. The officer in the locality is the one you should make your appeal to. He calls out the permanent force in the locality.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not say so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then his recourse is to the ordinary active militia of the locality, but instead of that the minister, under some authority which I suppose he obtained from the Minister of Justice, some opinion which he obtained from the law officers of the Crown, scoured the country from Halifax to London, Ontario, to secure a force of men, at a cost of some $60,000, to go down to Nova Scotia to suppress this apprehended strike. Now what did it all amount to? I take the statement of my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Kyte) this afternoon, the government whip in this House. There had been some little outbreak, some little breach of the peace, a blow or two had been struck. Someone became afraid. The mayor of the city was not afraid. He knew that under the Militia Act, if the military forces of this country were brought down there at his request the municipality would have to pay the cost. That has been the law for a very long time and has been enforced in this

country. If a municipality seeks to have the militia called out in aid of the civil power, the law says that it shall pay the cost.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has not always been collected.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may not be possible in many cases to collect a debt, but under the Militia Act, this becomes a debt due to the Crown. All that the government can do under the circumstances is to get judgment, and I venture to say that if the government press they will get the claim. After the permanent force is gathered up, and the active militia in the locality, and I have no doubt there were lots of them, enough at least to put down such a petty little disturbance as occurred in Cape Breton on that occasion—

Mr. GRAHAM: Had the hon. member been minister and under the act got a requisition duly signed by a man authorized to sign, and giving his reasons therefor, would he or would he not have complied with the act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would have complied with the act to this extent. I would have utilized the permanent force I had at Halifax and the militia units in existence in that neighbourhood, and would have done the whole thing at one-quarter the expense incurred by my hon. friend, and I would have asked the municipality to pay it.

Mr. GRAHAM: How would you ask the municipality to pay it? If the hon. member will look at the records he will find that he and his government attempted to collect very few, if any, of such accounts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am talking about the facts of this case. I am not aware of the facts in other cases.

Mr. GRAHAM: You should be. You were there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But this case I tried to explain as I went along. Now they could not get the mayor to act. He understood the responsibility. But the refusal of the mayor, if the judge acts, does not relieve the municipality. The judge can bind the municipality. if he is the judge in the district in which the municipality is situated, just as firmly as can the mayor. Someone went to a judge, and to a county judge having jurisdiction over the area. Personally I do not know who it was. My opinion is—it may be only rumour—that it was someone who had to do with the British Empire Steel Corporation. There was a strike on at their works and some difficulty had arisen there. They became afraid of what might happen, and someone went to the judge and persuaded him that conditions were such that he should request that the active militia in Canada be called out. I assume that when the minister brings the papers down, we shall find out exactly who did go to the judge. But somebody went who had an interest in the matter, because the mayor of the municipality had refused to interfere. Then the minister sets about to gather up the permanent force in this country from as far west as London, and to bring them down to Nova Scotia to settle what looks on the face of it to be either a small breach of the peace, a small disturbance, or perhaps something that involved some danger to the company's property. My hon. friend from Cape Breton South this afternoon led me to believe that if steps were not taken to prevent disorder, it might result in the men abandoning the pumps and refusing to permit other men to work at them, and that damage might ensue to the company's property.

Assume that all is correct; I assume it is. Suppose damage did accrue to the company's property. The company has the same remedies as a private individual to recover that damage. If damage, through the wrongful act of somebody else, occurs to my property, or to the property of any hon. member in this House, the law is there: We must take advantage of it and recover the damage. We cannot in every instance, although we apprehend that damage will be done to our property, call out the militia of Canada to stop it. I submit that if all they feared was damage to property they had no right to call out the militia at all. They had only right to call out the militia in aid of the civil power "where," in the language of the statute, "a riot or disturbance of the peace requiring such services occurs or is, in the opinion of the civil authority hereinbefore designated at that district, anticipated or likely to occur." A riot or breach of the peace either in being or likely to occur, is the sole reason for calling out the militia. Now the government called the militia out. They gathered up the permanent force from half way across Canada and sent it down to Nova Scotia at a cost to this country—I will not say yet to this country—of sixty thousand dollars odd. In the first instance the Militia Act provides that that money shall be paid by the government, and that the government shall have the right to collect it from the municipality. The municipality which seeks the aid shall pay the cost. That is reasonable, that is proper, I submit. At all events that is the law, and we cannot change the law unless we repeal the act under which this transaction took place.

Now I was somewhat alarmed this afternoon, as were other hon. members on this side, when the minister merely hinted that he proposed to bring in some measure—a bill or an estimate, or something of the kind—to saddle upon the Dominion of Canada the cost of taking the permanent force to Nova Scotia to stop this trifling disturbance which took place last September—that occurrence which some feared might result in a breach of the peace and others feared might result in damage to the company's property. The minister intimated during the discussion this afternoon that he proposed to bring in an estimate to pay that $60,000 out of the funds of the people of this country, when the law says it shall be paid by the municipality. The mayor says he did not request it, and would not, but the judge—he is above the mayor under this statute—having jurisdiction over that municipality said "We must have the military force of Canada," and he would bind the municipality to pay for it just as well as the mayor or the warden, the power being exactly the same. Now, I submit, with all deference to the opinion of others, that it will be going a tremendous distance if this country is to be saddled with the cost, to the extent of $60,000, of putting down a little disturbance in Cape Breton. Surely a couple of hundred men, which the minister undoubtedly had at Halifax, would have been more than sufficient to quell that disturbance or to have given security to the people that no great damage was going to be done to the property of that municipality. Failing that, in the locality, as stated in the statute, there were any number of militia men, any number of militia units that might have been called out. At all events sufficient men could have been procured for all practical purposes at less than one-half the cost which is fixed by the minister in his statement today as something like $60,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is not going to be allowed to mislead the committee—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GRAHAM: —unintentionally, because of the payment of $60,000. He has admitted that the country had to pay that in the first place. He knows, as an ex-minister of the Crown, that the only way that we could get the money to meet the expenditure involved when there was no vote for the purpose, was by a Governor General's warrant. A Governor General's warrant was issued which was drawn on to the extent of approximately $60,000. That amount of money must be replaced by a vote of parliament and for that purpose an estimate will be brought in to supplement the estimate for the present year. That course would have to be taken irrespective of the collection of the money from the municipality so the fact need not worry my hon. friend. A vote would have to be brought in regardless of the fact of whether the municipality pay the money in three months or six months in order to cover the amount of the Governor General's warrant.

Now as to the other point my hon. friend made, I am not going to quarrel with him about the law. I imagine that I got as sound advice as he could possibly give, although I respect his opinion. He was not the responsible man to interpret the law to me under the circumstances, and my legal instructions were that the Militia Act meant what it says: That in the first place if it were emergent the permanent troops available should be taken. If there was an emergency and the permanent troops were not at the moment available then we could call out the volunteers; but it is apparent that the act did not contemplate the volunteers being called out for that purpose when it says, in language as plain as the English language can state, that as soon as possible the volunteer force must be relieved and replaced by the permanent force. If the English language means anything the language of the act means that. Now that is what was done.

Another thing. My hon. friend says the cost would be very much less had what he suggests been carried out. But he forgets this fact: When you call out the volunteer force you have to pay the men on that force from $1.25 up to $10 per day, while the permanent force are under pay and get nothing extra for such service. Therefore if the cost of transportation was equal in both cases the expense for pay in the one case would be twice as much as in the other. So I think my hon. friend will find if he works the matter out and looks carefully at the law and what the practical result of each operation would have been that it did not cost the country any more to bring the permanent force to Cape Breton than if we had violated the law and called out the volunteers.

Mr. MANION: In view of the minister's statement this afternoon that the cost to the country will be roughly $60,000 and that they may put in some claim to the municipality, if the facts are as stated and if the permanent force were called out by the government at the request of the judge, and the judge made the requisition for troops at the request, say, of the British Empire Steel Corporation—

Mr. DUFF: It is not fair to say that. It was not made at their request at all.

Mr. MANION: I have not made any statement, I am saying—

Mr. DUFF: You say "at the request of the British Empire Steel Corporation." That is not fair.

Mr. MANION: I have not made any statement at all. I am saying that if the facts turn out to be that the judge requisitioned these forces at the request of the British Empire Steel Corporation—

An hon. MEMBER: We will read you an imaginary letter in a moment.

Mr. MANION: —is there any reason why the British Empire Steel Corporation should not be asked to foot this bill instead of the people of this country? That is what I should like to ask the minister. Is there any reason why the company should not be billed, if the militia or the permanent force were called out for the purpose of protecting their property, and according to the statement made here there was very little necessity for the permanent force to be called out for that purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a hypothetical case. In the first place the judge
10 p.m. is authorized by the Militia Act to say whether it is necessary to call out the force or not. It is not for my hon. friend or for any other member to say. The law provides that the judge shall say whether it is necessary. The judge said that the military forces were necessary and they were provided under the act. Now, let me ask my hon. friend this: Would he exclude from the citizenship of any place men who were even of the British Empire Steel Corporation?

Mr. MANION: No, I would not, but if it turned out that the British Empire Steel Corporation asked for this force to be called out unnecessarily I think they should foot the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: The judge decides whether it is necessary or not. Perhaps hon. gentlemen will have a better chance of judging the facts in this matter when the correspondence is brought down, which will take place when the vote to which I referred is called. I do not think it would make any difference. No matter to what part of the community a citizen belongs, if he is a citizen of a certain locality, if he is in the grocery business, the steel business, the law business, even the medical profession, he has a right to be protected. The fact that he belongs to some corporation is no reason why we should say that he should not have a right under the statute to call for protection.

Mr. MANION: I am not speaking of that at all. He would have a right to protection; but according to the statement made this afternoon, the threatened riot was of very small importance—

Mr. DUFF: That is not correct either.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman seems to be an advocate in this House for the British Empire Steel Corporation.

Mr. DUFF: That is not a fair statement and I will not stand for it. I will not allow the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) to say that I am an advocate of the British Empire Steel Corporation. He had better clean his own skirts first before he touches mine.

Mr. MANION: If the hon. gentleman's skirts are as clean as mine, he will have no reason to complain.

Mr. DUFF: They are a great deal cleaner.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Lunenburg has been interrupting me at every sentence, on behalf of the British Empire Steel Corporation.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member had no right to mention the British Empire Steel Corporation's name.

Mr. MANION: That is a question of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River has the floor. I would ask him to address the Chair on the subject.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, and address it in the proper way.

Mr. MANION: I have been addressing the Chair and I wish to go on doing so, if the hon. member for Lunenburg will permit me. If it should turn out that it was on the request of the British Empire Steel Corporation that the militia were called out, the British Empire Steel Corporation should foot the bill, and I have no reason for retracting that statement. Have any requests been made so far to the municipality or to anybody to foot the bill to replace the money that the government have had to pay out on that account?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I replied to that question to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon. So far as I know, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not hear the reply; otherwise, I would have expressed the opinion I express now. This trouble occurred last autumn; we are now in the month of March, and I cannot understand how a matter would be allowed to stand so long. I presume by this time there will be another council, and the hon. gentleman will not be able to deal with the men who were members of the council at that time. The minister intimated this afternoon that inasmuch as the requisition came from a judge, there might be a difference as to responsibility. I do not know where he gets that idea. I venture to say that he did not get it from the Department of Justice. The statute is clear on all questions of dispute, and there is no doubt on that whatever. If the requisition was regular, it was under the act. It it was not, the government had no right to interfere at all. If it was regular, then the liability of the municipality is precisely the same if the requisition proceeded from the judge as if it proceeded from the mayor, warden, or other officer, as the case might be. On the question of liability there can be no doubt, provided that the government had the right under the act. The minister has said that they had. Still, we are now about eight months off and no assessment at all has been made against the municipality.

Mr. MARTELL: I rise to a point of order. This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, you ruled that the discussion must be relevant to the item under consideration. Surely this is not relevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that need a ruling, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I will rule that the discussion is relevant and within the item that is being discussed by the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the municipalities have protested that they did not requisition these troops; that they were not necessary; that order could quite easily have been maintained without them; indeed, that the disorder was due rather to the presence of the troops. I am not saying that they are right; but I say that if the government acted regularly, then the municipalities are liable, and the government can present to this House no excuse for not promptly assessing the municipalities in accordance with the law.

While I am on that point, let me emphasize this as well. I quite admit that if the requisition comes in the regular way and contains the proper assertions as provided in the act, it is the duty of the government, as is stated clearly in the act, to provide from the active militia or from the permanent force, so far as it is available in the district and later from the permanent force, to supply the place of the active militia called out—it is the duty of the government to provide sufficient troops to take care of such an emergency as is feared. But the extent to which the government provides militia is not something that is fixed by the act at all; that is entirely under the responsibility of the government. The government is the judge of the necessity as regards the extent to which it shall send militia to take care of the situation. The government is not the judge as to whether militia should go or not. The warden, or if he fails, the judge, has that responsibility. The government gathers militia from the ends of this country right up into western Ontario, and sends them down to Nova Scotia at a cost to the country of some $60,000, a cost that under the act the country is never intended to pay. I know that it must be paid first of all out of consolidated revenue, and it might be very likely that a vote would have to be asked. But it was the duty of the government to assess this amount, and it looks as if there had been something wrong in the matter, or the municipalities would not be defying the government, and the government would not be standing aside apparently afraid to send them a bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, the amount of $60,000 named by me is an approximate figure. The bills for transportation are not all in yet. I agree with my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that the judge's jurisdiction includes the municipality. I hope I have not left the impression that the government does not propose to make any claim. The government does propose to make a claim as soon as it has all the bills in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is it that it takes eight months to get bills for transportation?

Mr. GRAHAM: The are not all in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister explain why they are not in?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not intend to discuss the question whether or not the forces should have been sent to Sydney at the time of the strike. In my judgment it is an idle waste of time to debate that here, because it was absolutely necessary that the forces be sent to Sydney. That is the judgment of all people who know anything of the circumstances prevailing at the time. All of Nova Scotia, in fact, all of eastern Canada was interested in the matter of having troops sent there, I do not, however, rise to discuss that phase of the matter; but I wish to suggest the

propriety of amending the law so that the cost of sending those troops to Nova Scotia in this particular instance should not be assessed against the municipalities. I do not think it is fair in the case of civil disorder in any part of Canada where troops are required to preserve peace or order, that the cost and expenses of the same should fall upon the municipalities. The statute is archaic in that respect; it should be changed, and the expense should be borne by the nation. Of course, troops should not be called out without grave necessity. There should be ample justification for calling them out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the power of requisition should be in the hands of the municipality and the costs assessed against the Government?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Perhaps the power of requisition should be taken from the municipality, and I think it should in many cases. Having that power in municipal hands does not work out well, because, frequently they decline to call out troops when they should be called out because they are alarmed about the contingent cost. I would suggest to the minister the propriety of submitting to his colleagues the question of amending the statute, so that the cost in such cases should be borne by the country and not by the municipality, and that they should also take into consideration possibly the question of placing the requisitioning power in other hands than those of the municipality.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would be the last to deprecate any steps that are absolutely necessary in the interest of the preservation of law and order. As to the actual facts in Nova Scotia, others are better judges than I am; but I do not concur with the hon. member that, merely because there were certain fears of loss of property, not due to riot or disturbance, there was a ground for sending the militia.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There was no question of fear; there was an actual danger of loss of property running into billions of dollars.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good; the law is the law. But the law does not provide against that; it only provides for the use of the militia upon requisition, such requisition to be based on the apprehension of disturbance or riot, and not upon any fear of the loss of property due to men leaving their work. That is not a disturbance or a riot. The hon. member says clearly that it was necessary to have the militia come from London. We had a disturbance in 1919 in western Canada, and I really think there was more apprehension and more cause for it at that time that there was in the case in Nova Scotia, but we did not use the militia. The municipalities never requisitioned the militia but the situation was taken care of by civil forces. It was quietly taken care of without very great expense, and a great emergency was met. The militia should be requisitioned only in very emergent circumstances indeed, and only when all other means have failed; and I should think it would be very serious to put it into the power of the government to decide when the militia should be used. The responsibility for the preservation of peace and order is a local responsibility under our constitution, and it is well that it is so. If that were not the case, then the cost of the preservation of peace and order would be far greater than it is now, and the acceptability of the means of preserving it to the localities affected would be much less than it is to-day. Now, inasmuch as the responsibility is on the municipalities, on the various bodies constituted by the provinces, it cannot be in the power of the Dominion government to say whether or not these bodies are capable of carrying it out. If they will assert that they are not able to handle a situation that exists and therefore ask the higher power to intervene, then the Dominion government intervenes to the extent that it is necessary to do so. And the Dominion government must be the judge of that question. But the municipalities must first declare their inability to cope with the situation. It follows from this, that it would not be possible for the Dominion government to be the deciding authority as to when the municipality is equal to the occasion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not suggest that the Dominion government should have the power to decide that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad I have got the hon. member to that point. Once you get to the point that the municipality must decide when it is necessary to invoke the assistance of the militia—and I am glad that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) agrees that the municipality must be the party to decide that question—then you cannot possibly have them assess the cost upon the country. They will easily come to the conclusion that they need help, that they are not going to employ extra police themselves, that they are not going to take the responsibility of action and suffer the probable loss of popularity. They will readily come to that conclusion so long as they

can do so at the expense of someone else. And that is why it seems to me that suggestions such as the hon. member makes would not be in the public interest. I do not know of any better system than that which we have. Let the local responsibility stand, and let the local liability for its results be there just as it is in the law to-day. If this were regularly observed there could be no question as to where the liability rests in this case. I am not seeking to bring it back on the municipality; I know that the responsibility and the liability are both defined if things were regularly carried on. If they are not regularly carried on, then it is this government that is responsible. And I do not understand why eight months should intervene between the sending of troops to Cape Breton and the ascertaining of what that expedition cost.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and wages, $250,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this the regular item?

Mr. GRAHAM: It has become necessary to transfer certain amounts totalling $28,990 required to pay the salaries of the engineering staff in connection with the Tuxedo barracks at Winnipeg. These buildings were originally a war hospital and were gradually taken over for military occupation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not an increased expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM: No; there is really a decrease of $3,000.

Item agreed to.

Schools of instruction, $115,000.

Mr. BOYS: Where are the schools of instruction, and what is the reason for the increase?

Mr. GRAHAM: These schools of instruction are located in the centres of population, one of which is in Ottawa.

Mr. BOYS: What work are they doing?

Mr. GRAHAM: They train officers and non-commissioned officers. The chief of staff states that owning to the lack of funds in 1922-23 the pay of non-permanent active militia officers attending the schools of instruction was cut out and very few officers attended. There are 1,800 unqualified non-permanent active militia officers chiefly young men who have not seen service overseas. The chief of staff is of opinion that these officers should attend the schools of instruction at the earliest possible opportunity, as their number is increasing daily. The increase is really for the instruction of these 1,800 unqualified officers.

Mr. BOYS: The minister refers to a lack of funds. Was there not a sufficient vote last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: In the distribution of the vote last year they cut out this item to which I have alluded.

Item agreed to.

Warlike stores, $160,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is the large increase explained?

Mr. GRAHAM: We gave a number of tents to the fire sufferers in northern Ontario, and although every person always promises to return what is loaned by the government, the Militia department is one place that is always forgotten by those who borrow. Then stores that we received from overseas having been depleted have had to be replenished. While this item is somewhat increased, it really fluctuates with the requirements, and this year it is heavy for the reasons I have given.

Item agreed to.

Compassionate Grant to Miss H. M. May, $94.67.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What is this item for?

Mr. GRAHAM: A compassionate allowance to Miss May for salary during a protracted illness.

Item agreed to.

Naval Service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is item No. 381 for adjustment of war claims which we might take up.

Item stands.

Adjustment of war claims—National Defence—

Militia Services	$4,000,000
Naval Services	274,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: This does not come under National Defence.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no notice given, and this huge item should not be entered on now.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then we will take up item No. 5, civil government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is better.

Mr. GRAHAM: This item always goes with the militia items, but it is not part of our current expenditure, of course.

Item stands.

Civil government—National Defence—salaries, $712,-681; contingencies, $50,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The details of this item I notice are to be found at page 6 in the Details of Civil Government Estimates which were recently brought down. The amount asked for this year is $712,681.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a misprint; it should be $762,681.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the report that was laid on the Table the total is given at page 7 as $712,681, against $701,797 last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: It comes to the some thing when we add the contingencies.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The result, as I have it here, shows a proposed increase of about $11,-000. My reason for drawing this matter to the attention of the committee is that ever since the conclusion of the war the civil government vote has been rapidly decreasing. When the war ended the department was pretty heavily laden with clerks whose services were only requisite during the war and demobilization. It is rather disappointing to find that instead of a substantial decrease for the present year the minister is asking about $11,000 more. What is the reason of the increase?

Mr. GRAHAM: The increase is more apparent than real; there is actually a decrease. The departments now constituting the Department of National Defence were amalgamated so far as the Canada Gazette was concerned, on January 1st. Now, there are two branches of civil employees,—one temporary, the other permanent. Under the new arrangement the department has been reorganized as to the permanent officials. As a matter of fact the estimates this year for the work to be done by the civil employees represents a decrease of $135,000 compared with last year. The apparent increase is $6,000 less than the statutory increases under the new classifications of the Civil Service Commission, which amount to about $18,000. So if we left it at that there would be a saving of about $6,000. Twenty-five members of the temporary staff —I speak from memory—are being made permanent, and 12 or 13 members of the permanent staff have retired, which makes an increase of 12. But the work will be done by the permanent staff and less than 100 temporary employees. Since December 31, 1921, the reduction in the amount paid to temporary employees—out of other votes, not out of the civil government vote—amounts to nearly $700,000; this year the reduction in other votes, will be about $135,000. So that what appears to be an increase is really in respect to what we call the permanent civil government staff, which will now include all employees but a comparatively few who have been paid out of other votes. There is, then, really a decrease instead of an increase.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The total increase for civil government votes in the various departments as shown in these estimates is $265,-000. It would look to me as if the increase has been pretty general.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no increase here; there is a decrease.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year the minister had 464 clerks; this year he has 476. Last year the vote for civil government in this department was $701,000; this year it is $712,-000; yet the minister says the increase is apparent rather than real. We were told last lear that by the amalgamation of the Department of Militia and Defence, the Department of Naval Service and the air force, wonderful economies would be effected, but anyone who paid much attention to the glowing language of the minister when he predicted these great savings will be disappointed. Last year the vote for the air force was $1,000,000; for the naval service, $1,500,000; and for the militia, $10,788,000, a total of $13,288,000. The estimates the minister now brings down provide for the air force $1,250,000, an increase of $250,000; for the naval service, $1,515,500, an increase of $15,500; for militia $10,036,000, a decrease of about $750,000. Adding them all together, I find that the decrease for the three departments is less than half a million dollars—and all the militia estimates are not yet down. I do not believe that any great saving is going to be effected. In fact, you can save down to the point where your expenditure becomes practically waste. You can cut your naval, air force and militia expenditure down so far that it is a question whether your expenditure is worth making; whether it would not be wiser to wipe the slate clean and have no expenditure at all. If the minister intends to have any force that is of value, he cannot cut below his present estimates. I did not believe when he made his statements last year with respect to proposed savings that he was going to end the year with any very great reduction of expenditure, and I find on looking over the public accounts and on examining these present estimates that no

very serious saving has been effected. During the trying period of demobilization following the war there was some excuse for rather high militia expenditure, but we are getting pretty far from that day now, and I am sure it is disappointing to those who took the minister at his word last session to find that notwithstanding the amalgamation of all these services the reduction proposed by his estimates is less than half a million dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am surprised at what my hon. friend says; he either did not hear my explanation, or he says it is untrue.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am only taking the figures in the estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman knows where this saving is; having been in the department, he is familiar with the matter, as some other hon. members may not be. The saving from December 31, 1921, until the end of this year in respect to temporary employees will be $679,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: From what vote have they been paid?

Mr. GRAHAM: A great many of them were paid from the war demobilization vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am discussing the votes that are before the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend forgets that these hundreds of employees were paid out of other votes. We are now going to run the department with very few temporary employees; the staff is practically all included in this civil government vote. I have pointed out that last year and the year before, an amount of $670,000 was paid out of some other vote, and there is a saving to that extent. Let me give these figures again. On December 31, 1921, the total salaries were $1,449,156; on April 1, 1923, the amount will be $770,051, a saving of $679,105. In the reorganization we are making permanent all employees whom the commission thought should be made permanent, and these are included in the vote. I have stated that there will be a saving of $135,000 in the coming year over the amount paid out last year—from other votes, not from the civil government vote, In militia and defence on April 1, 1922, there were employed in permanent work, but not paid out to the civil government vote, 402 persons, whose salaries amounted to $600,057. There were employed on war or other temporary work, 281, at a cost of $276,969. That makes a total of 683 employees, involving an expenditure for salaries of $877,026. In the naval service, 82 were doing permanent work, costing $119,700; 31 were doing temporary work, costing $20,130; total, 113, costing $139,830. In the air service, 92 were doing permanent work, costing $128,276; these were paid out of the general fund of the Air Board. These items make a total salary expenditure of $1,145,132. That was on April 1, 1922. The personnel this year for the Department of National Defence is 476 permanents, as against 576 in the three departments last year, and 48 temporary employees as against 312 last year, or a total of 254 employees as compared with 888 last year. The salary list this year is $770,051, a saving from the previous year of $375,081.

Let me point out in connection with the permanent work that there are 100 fewer employees doing permanent work now, or soon will be, than a year ago, although they are not all in the permanent Civil Service. That represents a saving of $135,352.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If the number of employees has been reduced to the extent the minister claims, how is it that he requires a new man at a salary of $6,000 under the name of Controller of Expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. The position of Controller of Expenditure was created by statute. I brought down a bill in this House endeavouring to map out a plan for the organization but this House and Upper Chamber amended it and declared by statute that at a certain date the then Minister of Naval Affairs should become the Controller of Expenditure. So far as its involving any extra expense, it is not very much now because the controller is also acting deputy minister, and he is getting one pay for doing the work of both positions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the Controller of Expenditure at this salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Desbarats.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He is also deputy minister?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is Deputy Minister of Naval Defence up to a certain date, which has not expired yet. The statute was so amended that Mr. Desbarats, who was then Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs, should continue as such up to a certain date when automatically he becomes Controller of Expenditure In the meantime General Fiset having retired, I have named Mr. Desbarats Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Defence.

Item agreed to.

Naval Service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister not a statement of naval defence to lay before the

House and an account of the achievements of the fleet? I noticed that on Christmas Day or New Year's he issued a message to the Canadian fleet at considerable length and of some rhetoric. Surely he can at least repeat that performance.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is difficult for any of us but my right hon. friend to repeat a brilliant performance. The second time it is usually not quite so good as the first. I did not issue any classic to the navy or to the fleet. I issued the statement to the naval service. The act under which our naval activities are carried on in Canada is called the Naval Service Act, and it does not refer to the navy, but to the naval service.

It was on the advice of technical officers that a new idea in the development of the naval service was proposed and accepted by the House last year. Under that policy the cruiser Aurora, which I always maintained, and the technical officers agreed with me, was not a wonderful success as a training ship, was put out of commission and the staff paid off with the allowances provided by order in council. That cost in the neighbourhood of $70,000, if I remember correctly. The submarines were also retired. In place of the old policy another policy was announced during the last session. It was that the two destroyers would be retained, one on each coast, accompanied by two mine sweepers on each coast.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Trawlers.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have learned that that is not the proper name to call them. They now have the dignity of mine sweepers. That is what they are for anyway. On the destroyers there are about 160 men all told. The mine sweepers will require about 25 men each, and the two on each coast are now being fitted out. One of the destroyers is now on the Pacific coast. So the fleet is divided into these two sections.

There are two lines of policy advocated by naval authorities. One is that it is the duty of a nation to prepare for high seas warfare, and the other is that its first duty is to develop the defence of its coast. There is a good deal of difference of opinion on this point among the authorities, but the technical officers in my department advise me that the latter is the proper thing for the Dominion of Canada, that is, training for the defence of our coasts. As the estimates only got through in the summer last year, we were not able to put the "Aurora" out of commission and pay off the officers and ratings until late in the fall.

Under the new system no training takes place except that carried on on the destroyers and among the permanent force. What is aimed at this year is this: The permanent force, officers and training staff, at Halifax and Esquimalt comprises approximately 500 men. These are practically all Canadians, and that I think should be a matter of pride to the people of Canada. The policy I might say is based on the fact that the present minister, backed up by the government, believes that for this young nation the proper policy is to train our own young men for naval service so far as it is possible to do so.

In addition to that there are 500 men of the naval reserve. These men are professional sailors. They need no training in high seas service, but training in gunnery, and all that kind of thing, will be given them so many days each year at our training grounds either at Esquimalt or Halifax. Canada has a very large naval reserve in her men at sea. In addition to that the Navy League has done, and is doing, good work. The Navy League, with which we hope to work, has already placed something like 200 boys on Canadian ships, boys who have got their training through the efforts of that league. In addition to the 500 men of the naval reserve, we are providing for the training af approximately 1,000 men of what will be known as the Volunteer Naval Reserve. I may say that the first offer to raise a company under this programme came from the province of Quebec, from a brother of one who is already in the navy, but up till the present time no active steps, except preparations for the development and training of the volunteer reserve, have taken place. At Esquimalt and Halifax we are now busily engaged in the preparation of the accommodation which will be required, and we have purchased and placed at these points the gunnery equipment for training purposes. There will be a school teacher at Esquimalt and one at Halifax to train the young men that come in the rudimentary knowledge that is requisite for naval service.

In addition to what I have mentioned we have a number of young men being trained in the British navy, not officers but seamen. About 25 of these have recently returned for duty in our own naval service. Furthermore, young Canadians have been periodically sent over to be trained as officers in the British navy. I might mention two of these young men, one of them being the son of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) the other a son of Mr. Justice Brodeur. Both are very bright active young men and will make their mark in the navy. The object of

the whole navy scheme, as I have tried to point out, is not to begin to try to undertake the defence of the high seas—that is impossible for the Dominion of Canada at the present time—but believing that in years to come as we develop we will require naval protection, as we require a militia, it is thought best, at least by the members of the government, that the present is the time to give our young men that training which will fit them, both as officers and men, to take their place in the naval service of Canada as it develops.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Who is the present admiral of the fleet?

Mr. BUREAU: The present member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff).

Mr. GRAHAM: There seems to be competition among the aspirants. However, I may tell my hon. friend the list of applications is not closed. At present the head of the naval service is Commander Hose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do these trawlers work in co-operation with the British fleet?

Mr. GRAHAM: They are mine sweepers but my hon. friend insists on calling them trawlers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, mine sweepers.

Mr. GRAHAM: They did very effective work on behalf of the British fleet during the late war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I refer to the work of our mine sweepers at present.

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been no war since we had our mine sweepers out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not doubt at all that so long as we are protected on the high seas, so that nobody can get to our shores, the trawlers will be quite effective to protect them. My hon. friend calls them mine sweepers instead of trawlers, but as long as the high seas are safe at the expense of somebody else I do not think it makes very much difference by what name they are called. I am, though, interested in this programme of training 500 men—either 500 at Esquimalt and 500 at Halifax or 250 at each place, I am not sure which—and 500 more of a volunteer reserve, training them for service in vessels that do not exist and that the government does not contemplate shall exist. I would like to know what training they are to get and what they are to do when they are trained; how much training they get each year applicable to the force at Esquimalt and Halifax and to this volunteer reserve? These men are to be trained for how long each year—trained at what and trained for what? How long are they going to use their knowledge when they are trained, and how much of the expense is borne by the government and how much by private subscription through the Navy League?

Mr. BUREAU: And what will be their daily diet?

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope I did not lead the House to believe that the Navy League was part of the organization. I may say that, with respect to the Navy League, the feeling is better than it was a couple of years ago. That seems evident from the correspondence we get and we hope to have some kind of working arrangement with them before very long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope so too.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend has asked me a qustion about training. This is the arrangement:

[Training—]

Every year all ratings will be required to perform a certain number of days' training at one of the naval bases for which they will be fully paid.

The training will vary from 14 days to 21 days according to the class of rating.

All ratings will be allocated to the different branches on entry and will be required for that branch before the completion of their first period of enrolment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: After the 14 to 21 days' training, what authority has the minister for saying these young men will be trained to be of value for anything? Has he authority from anyone to say that they will serve in the British navy, because that is the only fleet in which they could serve unless they are going to serve in the fleet of some foreign country? Has he any authority to tell us they would be of value in the case of any emergency at all? In a word, is the training of these men of any value at all when we have no place to put them?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is pessimistic. This country is going to move. I have tried to point out to him that in the years to come as we develop and as we expand we shall, under this system, have young men of our own to put into naval positions instead of bringing men overseas to fill those positions. My right hon. friend forgets that this kind of training takes place in the naval reserve in Great Britain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Over there they have a fleet in which to put the men they train.

Mr. GRAHAM: It takes place also in the United States. Wherever they have a reserve that kind of training takes place. Now

let me ask my right hon. friend a question: Is he in favour of militia training? If so let me ask him what good towards making a soldier does 21 days' training a year in the militia do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The training for the militia, as my hon. friend knows just as well as I do, is wholly different from the training for the navy. You can fit a man for service in the militia with a short training each year, although perhaps not under the system which my hon. friend provides for in the estimates he has brought down. However, that such can be done has been proved; but you cannot train men for the naval service with only a few days of service each year. If my hon. friend proposes to train them for a few days each year, what is he going to do with them when they are trained? He has no place to put them. What career have they got to look forward to after having gone through this training unless they serve in the navy of some other country, or unless the government contemplates some indescribable naval service which does not exist to-day? If they are training men for a naval policy that the government does not contemplate, then this is nonsense. it is futile. If the government contemplates a different naval policy from what it has to-day, possibly this can be understood; but at present we are simply a laughing stock.

11 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just a laughing stock, just wasting money. We are depending on another country to keep our high seas safe, knowing no enemy will reach our shores, knowing that the only things that can reach our shore are wasps and hornets that could not give trouble even to an invader.

Mr. DUFF: I am sorry my constituents are not present to hear the speech of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is one here.

Mr. DUFF: While they voted against him at the last election, they would certainly go to the polls and justify their votes at the next election, because what he does not know about naval matters or matters pertaining to the sea would fill more than the seventeen pages which the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) lost out of his book. I think I am on record in this House as regards naval expenditure, and I am not here to-night to take back one word that I have said on a number of occasions in the different sessions that have preceded this one; but when the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says that he does not know what will become of those men when they have trained for ten or twelve days, he is quite right.

An hon. MEMBER: Does the hon. member know?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I know, and I am going to tell you. The right hon. gentleman—I will be charitable to him—displays his lack of knowledge. The Naval department will get these men, not from the schools, but from the fisheries of this country, from the men who are to-day engaged either in the fisheries or in the merchant marine, not, thank goodness, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, which the leader of the Opposition is responsible for wasting $80,000,000 on, but the real merchant marine. These young men in the spring and summer will be engaged either in the off-shore fisheries, the deep-sea fisheries or the shore fisheries of this country; they will be earning money and bringing wealth from the sea into this country. In the fall of the year, when they give up their vocation of fishing, if I understood the minister's programme correctly, they will be taken to the naval base at Halifax. I think the minister would be beter advised if he would have the men at Lunenburg where they are; but they will be taken to the city of Halifax and trained at the naval dockyard there where the greatest extravagance took place during the time when the leader of the Opposition was a member of what was known as the Union government. After they have been trained for ten or twelve days, if necessary they can be taken out on the high seas and trained either on mine sweepers or the two destroyers which the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries accepted from the British government. I think the idea is an excellent one, although I am not much in favour of a Canadian navy. In the first place, I do not think this country can afford a navy; but it can afford a certain amount of training for our fishermen and sailors, because after they have the training there is no necessity for them to go into the British navy or the Americain navy or any other navy; they can return to their vocations and help to pay the public debt of this country. They will go aboard the ships of the Canadian merchant marine, and they will be of some value to this country.

If the Minister of Defence brought in an estimate of $5,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $50,000,000—and that would not give us half a decent navy—what would happen? We would have thousands of men taken from a productive industry and put into a non-productive industry, and we would try to make

ourselves believe that we had a Canadian navy. If we spent $5,000,000, could we defend our shores? The leader of the Oppposition does not know anything about the matter; he does not know whether it will take $10,000,000, $20,000,000, $50,000,000, or $100,000,000 to protect our Canadian shores properly. The leader of the Opposition, during the war, helped to vote $30,000,000 for what was called a navy to protect our Canadian shores, and we had to call on the United States government and the Japanese government to protect our Pacific and Atlantic coasts. That is the kind of naval policy my right hon. friend had; yet he dares criticise the present Minister of Defence for the volunteer naval reserve for which he asks in the small amount we are asked to supply to-night. It is amusing to me, almost as amusing as it was when the leader of the Opposition was talking about the strike at Glace Bay. He did not know a single, solitary thing about the matter; yet he dared get up and endeavour to make us believe that the county court judge had not the proper authority to call out troops. Of course, we do not mind the leader of the Opposition; he is a sort of joke on this side of the House.

The leader of the Opposition, of course, criticises this expenditure. What I would suggest to the Minister of Defence would be to clean up the mess in the naval dockyard at Halifax, which mess is the result of the work of the government of the leader of the Opposition during the war and since the war, and of what was called the Purchasing Commission which was never authorized by parliament and which was appointed by the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues against the wish of parliament. They spent about $8,000,000 in buying stores which were not necessary; they put them into the naval storehouse at Halifax with the result that, to-day, after the Minister of Defence has sold some of the stores at about a quarter of their value, because he had to do so, there are still at the naval dockyards at Halifax about $2,000,000 worth of stores, and the leader of the Opposition more than anyone else in this House is to blame for that condition of affairs. Therefore, he should be the last one to talk in this House about extravagance or waste of money.

At the present time, due to the bungling of the late Union, National Liberal, Conservative, Tory Government, the people of this country had saddled upon them five ships. These ships were no good to the British navy and those gentlemen of the late Union government had those ships thrust on them. This present government had the good sense to lay up the big ship called the Aurora but at the present time they have two destroyers, the Patriot and the Patricia. Those ships are useless for naval purposes; but they can be utilized, and I am going to sugest to the minister to-night a way in which they can be used. Some time last Ostober, one of those boats was sent through the Panama canal and she is now on the Pacific coast. We have only two boats and the Pacific coast is entitled to one. Instead of bringing her back in the spring and spending a large amount of money in order to do so, I would suggest that the minister leave her on the Pacific coast. We have on the Atlantic, one known as the Patriot, and I would suggest that the minister put her to some practical use. This boat is no good for any purpose of defence; but we have a serious situation, not exactly on the Atlantic coast, but on the Atlantic ocean during the summer time. I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) is not in his place, because this matter which I am going to discuss now, I am discussing as much for his benefit as for that of the Minister of Defence. Many fishing vesesls, carying some 3,000 men, proceed every year from Nova Scotia to the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, where they anchor and the men fish for about four months of the year. In addition to these Nova Scotia vessels which anchor on the banks and from which the men fish, there come over from France what are known and what the leader of the Opposition referred to as trawlers. I do not believe the leader of the Opposition knows what a trawler is any more than he knows what a mine sweeper is. A trawler is a fishing vessel which fishes with an otter-trawl. These come from France and they can fish off the Grand Banks as well as our Nova Scotia vessels. During the last two years these French vessels have committed great depredation to the fishing gear of the Nova Scotia vesesls, and it has been impossible for the fishermen of these Nova Scotia vessels to do anything to prevent the destruction of their gear. These French trawlers swoop down, sometimes in the day and sometimes at night, where the sailing vessels' gear is set and they destroy not only the gear itself but all the fish on it with the result that a great loss accrues to the fishing vessels of Nova Scotia. I would suggest to the minister that during the summer months when the fishing season is at its height the destroyer Patriot be sent to the Grand Banks of Newfoundland with the Nova Scotia fishing fleet. She will do more good there than she can going up and down the coast of Nova Scotia, and she would be able to afford protection to the fishermen.

Mr. GRAHAM: We shall have to let her off for the boat race.

Mr. DUFF: I shall come to that in a moment. I say that this destroyer can do more work accompanying the fishing fleet than she can patrolling the Nova Scotia coast. If any depredation is committed the captain of the fishing vessel can notify the captain of the destroyer, who can ascertain the name of the French trawler and bring the matter to the attention of the Canadian authorities. I think that some international arrangement should be made with the French and the Canadian governments whereby something might be done to put a stop to these depredations.

The Minister of National Defence referred to the fact that one of these boats might be used in connection with the fishermen's races. I must thank this government on behalf not only of my own constituents but of the people of Nova Scotia generally for his generous act last fall in attaching the destroyer Patriot to the race and giving her up to the international race committee. This destroyer did good work while the preliminary races were being held off Halifax. The minister was good enough to send the Patriot to Gloucester with the racing vessel Bluenose. During the races in Gloucester the citizens of Nova Scotia were proud to see the Union Jack flying from the stern of the Patriot. She was only small, it is true, but she did represent Canada. I must also thank the government and especially the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for helping us in our time of trouble during that race. It may be recalled by hon. members that a sad accident occurred at that time. One of the crew of the Bluenose accidentally fell into the dock and was drowned after the last race. The Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence, on learninig this fact, immediately telegraphed to the captain of the Patriot, with the result that the body of the sailor was taken to his home town in Lunenburg on the destroyer. On behalf of my constituents, on behalf of the International Fishermen's Racing Committee, and on behalf of the people of the province of Nova Scotia I wish to take this occasion to thank the government for their action in this regard.

Now, I think that if the minister carries out the idea of a volunteer reserve it would be a good thing for Nova Scotia. In that way perhaps a number of young men who, if they had no naval reserve training, wight think of becoming second-rate lawyers, would with this training become good sailors, mates and captains and good citizens. I am willing to give this volunteer naval reserve idea a fair trial, so that instead of having quibbling laywers we might have good citizens who would be able to help us in the production that is so much needed to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the resolution should carry until adequate expression is given to the profound gratitude of the House for the inimitable manner in which the hon. member (Mr. Duff) not only sounds the depths of ignorance of all other members, but displays his own supreme erudition on every subject under the sun.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say every member; I said you, and you alone.

Mr. BOYS: You are a burlesque.

Mr. DUFF: I did not refer to anyone else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an undying advantage to the House that we have among us one who can speak with pontifical authority on every subject from sewer gas to angels' wings.

Mr. DUFF: You should be modest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The non. member was moved by very deep and pathetic sympathy for me, ignorant as I was, not knowing even what was to become of these trained cadets after they had got the advantage of government service at Esquimalt and Halifax. In his sympathy for me, and for the House in having to listen to me, he rose to tell us all about it. "Why," he said. "the member does not know where these boys are coming from. I will tell him where they are coming from; they are coming from the fishing vessels, from the fisheries, and they are going to be trained at Esquimalt and Halifax. They are not going to be trained for any purposes of a military or naval character. No, that would be a waste of their time." I hope the minister got that. "That would be a waste of their time. They are going to be trained from ten to fourteen days and then are going back to fish, and they will be better fishermen as a result of the training the minister is going to give them on the trawlers."

Mr. GRAHAM: Mine sweepers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. So at last we have the exalted purpose of Canadian Naval policy as now practised. It is to make better fishermen of those who are now suffering the depredations of French vessels on the shores of Nova Scotia. It is to teach the boys how to catch more fish from the water in order to feed the people of Canada. That is the purpose of the naval policy of the Minister of National Defence, according to

this court of appeal of last resort from the county of Lunenburg.

Well, I thought I was only stating a very simple truth and one generally accepted when I said—without the advantage of this later information—that this $1,500,000 was wasted, in so far as the defence of our country is concerned or in doing of the slightest thing to contribute to that defence, which others are now providing. When I stated that this money was wasted I thought I was uttering the simple truth. I felt fairly confident I was right. I must admit that for the moment I forgot that the same assertion was made a year ago by the hon. member for Lunenburg. Had I remembered that he was of the same opinion I should have had serious doubts as to the soundness of my view. But now that I utter again his conviction of a year ago he is lost in dismay at my ignorance.

Mr. DUFF: I did not mention the word "ignorance"; I said lack of knowledge.

Mr. BUREAU: That is more technical.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let us leave the member for Lunenburg and come to the trawlers now christened the mine sweepers. Is the purpose of our naval policy really what the hon. member says it is? Are these vessels really to do what he says? Is the object of this training to send boys back to be better fishermen or to send them back to some mercantile marine, to be able, as I suppose, to handle the rigging of the mercantile ship a little better? Is the hon. member for Lunenburg rigt? Let us ascertain whether or not we have a naval service and whether we should vote a million and a half for what is actually being done to-day. That is what is before the committee for consideration. Do not let us deceive ourselves into thinking that we are lifting a hand by a burlesque of this sort to aid in that naval defence of which we share the advantage every hour. We are not. It would be far manlier of us to sweep the decks clear and say that we are not, and to stand before the world in our true colours. When we have a Minister of Defence who says we cannot go to the high seas because it would be too dangerous for the light craft that we have and that the high seas must be swept clear by someone else; when we have a Minister of Defence who is compelled to make such an admission, compelled by the exigencies of the policy of which he is sponsor, then we are doing nothing whatsoever in the way of defence, and it would be far manlier of us to say that we are doing nothing and to make the records of the House and the estimates show that we recognize the fact.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Now, it has been stated here that we met the last emergency without adequate provision ourselves. I know quite well we did. I know the necessity of adequate provision was scoffed in this House year after year. We were told that we were March hares and April fools because we ventured to suggest that something in the way of a manly effort should be made to provide against a contingency that seemed at least to be looming in the near future if not on the immediate horizon. We the Conservative party attempted to provide against that contingency, we attempted to bear some share that we thought befitted the strength of this country. We were stopped, we were not able to get the requisite legislation through. Then the war came upon us and we were without provision. We might of course have had something of the nature of what we have to-day under the Naval Service Act, but there was no possibility of getting anything under that act that would be of any use at all. There is no one knows that better than the minister who is now the Minister of National Defence. The only thing we could get was along the lines we sought to provide and were prevented by the Liberal majority in the Senate. That is why we had to depend upon the strong arm of the British navy when war came—an arm to which no ounce of muscle was added by this Dominion.

And here we are now. If we are not ready to do something in the way of naval co-operation that is at least worthy the strength of this, the greatest Dominion of the Empire, do not let us play with the subject. Do not let us put a million and a half dollars in the estimates and tell the world in one breath and through the mouth of the responsible minister, "This is naval defence"; and then through the mouth of his parliamentary deputy, "This is merely to make better fishermen of our boys—a method of increasing the fish production on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts." I think we ought to stand forth in our true colours. I do not think this proposal is of any value. It must be plain that it is not. To be training for a life that our fishermen cannot follow in any naval vessels of ours is useless. If they intend to follow a naval career in another country, the place to be trained is there. To be trained for action on vessels that do not exist, and that the minister will not say are in contemplation to exist—well, surely that is nothing better than a sham.

Now, would it not be wisdom to wipe out the vote altogether rather than to go on in this way? Do not let anyone say that this is my policy. I think we ought to do something

worthy of this Dominion. I do not think we ought to expend on a naval service the equal per capita of what the Mother Country does. She has responsibilities that are not ours in an equal share. But we ought to do something that is worthy of our standing, of our strength, of our responsibility, of our wealth, of our exposure here on two coasts, worthy of our place in the Empire, the place we have won. I think the government would be well advised to come before parliament with a programme that measures up to these requirements.

Mr. DUFF. Before the vote carries, Mr. Chairman, I would explain for the benefit of the leader of the Opposition why it is wise to spend this money on the volunteer naval reserve. I think it is well known to most hon. members that the men who join the British navy do not come from the colleges or the schools of the Old Country; they come from the British fishing fleets and the mercantile marine. It is a well-known fact to every hon. member that when the war broke out thousands,—yes, tens of thousands of fishermen and merchant sailors were transferred to the navy and did invaluable service in the North Sea and other parts. Does not every one know that even in our own country men were taken from the fishing fleets on the Pacific and the Atlantic coast and from our merchant marine? They were the only men the government could get for naval duty during the war. They were the men that the government, of which the leader of the Opposition was a member, used on the leaky trawlers and old tug boats with which they pretended to defend the shores of Nova Scotia. Is it not a well-known fact that the fishemen from the island of Newfoundland were perhaps the very best men among those that took an active part in the operations of the British navy at Gallipoli? And yet the leader of the Opposition has the temerity to get up in this House and say that the Minister of Defence does not know what he is going to do with these men after he trains them. If war broke out tomorrow, and Great Britain needed more sailors for her navy, we could send thousands of men across the ocean for service in the North Sea or anywhere else. It is not necessary that these men should join a naval vessel after they complete their training in our fishing boats or in the mercantile marine. Their training during the rest of the year is probably just as effective as any training they will get under this scheme of the Minister of Defence.

The leader of the Opposition must have forgotten history when he criticized what the Liberal party did for the naval defence of Canada. Why, if I were a Tory I would be ashamed to mention a word about our Canadian navy. Was it the Liberal party or the Tory party that brought down the Laurier Naval Bill? Was it not the Tory party which voted against that measure under which the Liberal party wanted to build ships for the defence of Canada? What did the Tory party do for naval defence? What naval vessels did we have to protect our coasts when war broke out? It is quite true that in 1912 the Tory government tried to vote $35,000,000 as a contribution to Great Britain for the building of three dreadnoughts, which would have been attached to the British navy in the North Sea. What use would they have been for the defence of Canada? And would they have been manned by Canadian boys? That was the naval policy of the Tory party in 1912. What happened in 1914 when war broke out? Had they spent one dollar for naval defence up to that time? No. Even the four ships that we provided under the Laurier administration were out of commission, due to the fact that certain Nationalists in the province of Quebec had the Tory party by the throat. Those vessels were tied up at the docks, the Niobe at Halifax and the Rainbow at Esquimalt. It took six weeks to put the Niobe in commission for war service. And yet the leader of the Opposition dares to criticize the Liberal party and the Liberal government in regard to their record on naval defence. If our policy had been carried out in 1910, Canada would have had an effective navy when the war broke out. But because the Nationalist friends of the Tory party would not allow them to continue the Laurier naval policy we were left totally unprotected against attack by the German navy. I think it is high time the leader of the Opposition stopped talking about what the Tory party did for the naval defence of this country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the resolution carries, Mr. Chairman, I must express my surprise at the developments which have taken place during recent years. It has generally been conceded that one of the most difficult positions to fill is that of an expert seaman on board a man-of-war, but apparently under the present system it is only necessary to teach men to be good fishermen and they automatically become good navy men. Nine days' training will equip an ordinary fisherman so that he will be equal to anything that may be required of him for the naval defence of this country.

I was also surprised at the references to the Canadian navy made by the hon. member

who preceded me (Mr. Duff) and what his party had attempted to do while in office previous to 1911. Notwithstanding the fact that they had occupied the government benches for about sixteen years, during all that time not a contract was let for the building of a single warship. They went out of office and that was the condition of affairs that confronted their successors. It was well known that it would have been impossible to establish shipyards in this country and do anything effective in the way of building ships of war in the short period during which the administration that succeeded the Liberal government was in power. An attempt was made to vote $35,000,000 for the building of three dreadnoughts on the other side, where the work could be quickly done and there was reasonable prospect of rendering aid at a time when it was needed.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member says we could not build warships in this country from 1911 to 1914, when the Conservative government was in power. Is it not a fact that under the Union government 63 ships were built from November 1918 to some time in 1920?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: My hon. friend's question is about as consistent as his argument that fishermen are competent to man ships of war. No one would suggest that these poor little wooden ships of the mercantile marine were competent to defend the coasts of this country or to go out and meet the enemy. Who ever would take that view must be—well, I will not attempt to describe the condition his mind must be in.

Mr. DUFF: The ships that the Union government built from 1918 on were not wooden ships; they were steel ships.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It was impossible to build shipyards here from which ships of war could be turned out that would be competent to meet the enemy—impossible, in any event, to turn them out in time. As late as June 1914, hon. gentlemen opposite were saying that no emergency existed, were pointing out that the sky was clear, that there were no clouds on the horizon, and that there was no need of taking any particular action in the matter of defence. It is also significant that even at that time the leader of the government, instead of taking notice of the criticisms that were being levelled against the administration, was organizing the various departments in order to be ready in the event of anything happening. The deputy ministers of the various departments and members of the Militia Council were a committee organized for that purpose. My hon. friend says that the Liberal party had a policy; but the Liberal party went out of power without doing anything. It is true they called for tenders for the building of ships, but those tenders were filed away for months and no contract was let; nothing was done. Now we find the government asking the committee to pass an item of this size without any pretence that anything effective will result. They say it is merely to equip trawlers and mine-sweepers. I can scarcely understand the minister referring in a jocular way to these trawlers as mine-sweepers, when he knows perfectly well that there is no necessity for mine-sweepers at this time; they are being employed, as the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has said, for fishing purposes. So we are voting this money for trawlers to go on the fishing banks of Newfoundland and elsewhere.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. member pointed out that one of these ships of the navy should be accompanying the fleet in its fishing operations off the banks of Newfoundland and also off the Pacific coast. It is the greatest burlesque ever brought before Parliament to ask the committee to vote money, supposedly for the naval service, but, according to one who claims to be an authority on the subject, actually for trawlers for fishing purposes.

Mr. LEWIS: I think the name "mind sweeper" would be appropriate, because you would have to sweep your mind diligently to find a word that would give to what we have now in the way of vessels for the purpose of defence the dignity of a Canadian navy. I have nothing to say about the Conservative or the Liberal party so far as past policies are concerned. Mistakes may have been made. If the Liberal policy of 1910 had been put into effect, we might now have a navy which could be regarded as a real defence unit. At present, however, we have nothing. It is admitted on all sides that we need a certain amount of defence on the high seas. We have extensive coast lines on the east and on the west and whether we like it or not, these are to-day being protected by the Mother Country. We may not claim that they need protection, but it is a fact that we are producing largely for export trade; our mercantile vessels must sail the high seas, and if our markets are to be kept open in different parts of the world it is essential that these trade routes should be protected. We as a part of the empire should

assume our share of that burden of protection We are just as well able to bear the burden as Great Britain is, in fact, the people of Great Britain are more heavily taxed than we are. A nation canot live unto itself, and if we have arrived at the point where we can call ourselves a nation, we must bear part of its burden. We have entered into the League of Nations and that League has declared that in some way or other the whole world must be policed. Are we, as a self-governing nation within the empire, taking our part in national defence? If the policy advocated by the minister is a step to that end, I am willing to support it. But I sincerely hope that the policy advocated by the Liberal party twelve or thirteen years ago may one day be put into effect, so that we may be able to hold up our heads in the world, of which we are one of the important nations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What has become of the students who were attending the naval colleges at Esquimalt and Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM: Provision was made by which the majority of them entered other universities. Some were admitted to the Royal Military College at Kingston.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They did not take to fishing.

Mr. DUFF: More's the pity.

Mr. GRAHAM: For education.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Wednesday, March 7, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) presented the Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization as follows:

In obedience to the order of your honourable House of February 13, 1923, your committee have had under their consideration Bill No. 11, an Act to regulate the sale and inspection of fruit and fruit containers, and have agreed to report the same with amendments: all of which is respectfully submitted.

INQUIRY INTO AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved:

That the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions be given leave to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST REPORT PRESENTED

Mr. McMASTER thereupon presented the first report of the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions as follows:

The special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions beg leave to present the following as their first report:

Your committee recommend that leave be granted them to sit while the House is in session and that they be authorized to have their proceedings and such evidence as may be taken printed from day to day for the use of members of the committee, and that rule 74 relating thereto be suspended.

Mr. McMASTER: With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the committee which I have just presented be concurred in. It is of advantage, I think, that we should be able to have our proceedings printed from day to day, and I may say that we have had a meeting to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the unanimous consent of the House that the motion be concurred in?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Order in council providing for distribution of amount voted for bounty to encourage the development of the sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Copy of order in council providing for the issue of licenses to United States fishing vessels.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

INSIDE CIVIL SERVICE

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I beg to lay on the Table of the House a partial return to an order of the House dated February 12th, showing the total number of employees in the inside Civil Service on the 31st March in each year since 1900, to the last nine months of 1922, inclusive. This is not a full return; the remainder will be brought down as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What are the names of the harbour commissioners for St. John, N.B.?

2. What salary is paid each commissioner?
3. Are any of the commissioners employed in any other capacity by the board?
4. If so, what are the names of those so otherwise employed, and amounts paid each, or any of them for such other services?
5. What is the total amount paid each commissioner for salary and other services or commissions during year ending December 31st 1921?
6. What dismissals or changes have been made by the present government in the personnel of the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. There are no harbour commissioners for St. John, N.B.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What are the names of the harbour commissioners for Vancouver?
2. What salary is paid each commissioner?
3. Are any of the commissioners employed in any other capacity by the board?
4. If so, what are the names of those so otherwise employed, and amounts paid each, or any of them for such other services?
5. What is the total amount paid each commissioner for salary and other services or commissions during year ending December 31st, 1921?
6. What dismissals or changes have been made by the present government in the personnel of the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Commissioners: Lieut.-Col. Guy H. Kirkpatrick (President); Mr. R. E. Beattie; Mr. Samuel Prenter.

2. President, $5,000. $4,000 to each of the other two commissioners. These salaries are paid out of the revenues of the harbour.

3. No.

4. None.

5. Annual salary only, Lt.-Col. Kirkpatrick, $5,000; Mr. Sam. McClay, $4,000; Major A. R. Mackenzie, $4,000.

6. Major A. R. Mackenzie and Mr. Sam McClay resigned and Messrs. R. E. Beattie and Samuel Prenter were appointed to replace them—effective 1st September, 1922.

HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What are the names of the harbour commissioners for Hamilton?
2. What salary is paid each commissioner?
3. Are any of the commissioners employed in any other capacity by the board?
4. If so, what are the names of those so otherwise employed, and amounts paid each or any of them for such other services?
5. What is the total amount paid each commissioner for salary and other services or commissions during the year ending December 31st, 1921?
6. What dismissals or changes have been made by the present government in the personnel of the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Commissioners: Mr. William Ainslie, (Chairman); Mr. John Newlands; Mr. William B. Sheppard.

[Mr. Copp.]

2. No salary.

3. No.

4. None employed.

5. None of the commissioners have received any remuneration of any kind in connection with the harbour matters.

6. The present personnel of the commission was substituted for the personnel of the previous commission on October 7, 1922.

FOUNDERING OF MONTE GRAPPA

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Was the foundering of the Italian steamer Monte Grappa in mid-Atlantic on or about the 14th November, 1922, brought about by the improper stowage of her cargo taken on board at the harbour of Montreal?
2. Is the government aware that this casualty has been the means of casting a reflection on the harbour?
3. In view of this, is it the intention of the government to hold an inquiry into the causes which led to the disaster?
4. Is it not a fact that the Port Warden as well as the Deputy Port Warden at the harbour of Montreal are incapable of speaking the French language, although the majority of those employed loading and discharging vessels at the harbour are French-Canadians?
5. In the event of future appointments being made to the Port Warden's staff, will the government give an undertaking that a person capable of speaking the French language is appointed?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The government has no information to the effect that the foundering of the Monte Grappa in mid-Atlantic on the 14th November last was brought about by improper stowage of cargo.

2. The government is fully satisfied that the casualty has not cast any reflection on the harbour.

3. There is no authority for holding an inquiry into a casualty of this nature. See section 776, chapter 113, revised statutes of Canada. If a definite charge should be made charging any person or persons with improper conduct in connection with the stowage of cargo, the necessary authority would be obtained to hold an inquiry under the terms of the Inquiries Act.

4. The secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade advise that neither the Port Warden nor Deputy Port Warden speaks the French language.

5. The appointments are made by the Montreal Board of Trade under the provisions of the Port Warden's Act, chapter 45 of the statutes of 1882.

VANCOUVER INCOME TAX OFFICES

Mr. CLARK:

1. What rent was paid for the Dominion income tax offices in the city of Vancouver in the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the floor space occupied in each of said years?

3. Has a new office been rented for Dominion income tax purposes in Vancouver?
4. Have the offices in the London building been given up? If so, why?
5. What rent is payable for the new office?
6. What is the floor space for said new offices?
7. Who are the owners of said new offices, and what are their addresses and occupations?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

By the Department of Public Works:—

1. Rental to Molsons Bank, 1920, $100; 1921, none; 1922, $150; Rental to London building, $3,850; 1921, $4,200; 1922, $5,550.

2. Floor space, Molsons Bank, 1920, 1,991 feet; 1921, none; 1922, 360 feet; Floor space, London building, 1920, 4,000 feet; 1921, 4,000 feet; 1922, 5,580 feet.

3. Yes, space in Board of Trade building leased from February 1st, 1923, for a period of five years.

4. Yes, as Commissioner of Taxation stated that offices in the London building were neither suitable nor large enough.

5. $11,400 per annum, lessors to pay taxes, water rates and insurance, and provide heating, janitor and elevator services.

6. 10,441 square feet.

7. The Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada, Head office Waterloo, Ontario.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD—RICHMOND COUNTY

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many farms were sold by the Soldier Settlement Board to returned men of the county of Richmond?
2. What price was paid for each of those farms?
3. Who were they bought from?
4. What inspector recommended paying the purchase price?
5. Who were the purchasers?
6. Are any of the said farms now vacant?
7. If so, in what township?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Twenty-two.

2. Price paid by the board: $2,700, $2,500, $2,250, $3,550, $700, $2,250, $1,890, $4,500, $3,600, $3,270, $4,500, $4,050, $4,500, $4,050, $4,725, $3,150, $4,050, $1,520, $3,950, $3,840, $2,675, $4,500.

3. C. M. Rief, E. G. Andre, V. Messier, N. A. Robert, C. E. Frost, G. Hodge, Dame E. Knowles, Irene Roux, R. W. Frank, D. J. Austin, E. H. Stimson, J. H. Ewing, J. B. Miles. E. E. Whitty, E. Melancon, Z. Allaire, L. Girouard, Dame C. Oliver, J. Goddard, Jos. Dubois, E. Roleau, M. H. Sims.

4. E. L. Hall, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, E L. Hall, A. L. Pomeroy, H. D. Snow, C. N. Lyster, H. D. Snow, W. R. Stevens, A. L. Pomeroy, H. D. Snow, H. D. Snow, W. R. Stevens, E. L. Hall, J. Pereas, H. D. Snow, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy.

5. I. Robinson, E. G. Andre, E. Messier, J. O. Blais, C. E. Frost, Thos. Dixon, E. Knowles, I. Roux, W. D. Frank, W. Ford, J. M. Leckie, J. Robertson, M. Husk, N. Zibrowski, J. A. Morrisette, H. J. Hall, Theo. Royle, J. Gilbert, J. Allan, B. P. Readshaw, F. Gendron, G. J. Sims.

6. Yes, one leased and one vacant.

7. Township of Stoke.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD—WOLFE COUNTY

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many farms were sold by the Soldier Settlement Board to returned men of the county of Wolfe?
2. What price was paid for each of those farms?
3. Who were they bought from?
4. What inspector recommended paying the purchase price?
5. Who were the purchasers?
6. Are any of the said farms now vacant?
7. If so, in what township?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Seventeen.

2. Price paid by the board: $1,800, $2,880, $4,400, $2,700, $3,700, $3,400, $4,500, $3,150, $2,430, $4,500, $4,500, $2,340, $1,260, $2,700, $1,600, $2,075, $2,700.

3. J. Longval, E. C. Tanguay, J. A. Moreau, A. Jackson, W. W. Jackson, N. Tessier, B. Boulet, A. & J. Laroche, Jos. Gagne, G. H. Gorham, F. N. Desmarais, E. Goddard, Wm. Dawson, E. Tremblay, R. Lemire, R. Gardner, A. Grimard.

4. A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, E. L. Hall, A. L. Pomeroy, E. L. Hall, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, E. L. Hall, H. D. Snow, E. P. Ball, A. L. Pomeroy, A. L. Pomeroy, H. D. Snow, A. L. Pomeroy, H. D. Snow, E. L. Hall, E. L. Hall.

5. P. Charland, F. Longval, E. Godbout, L. Breton, E. Breton, J. H. Bois, C. Doyon, C. Laroche, A. Gagne, J. A. Currier, Nap. Beauregarde, O. Filliault, W. S. Cooper, Jos. Provencal, R. Lemire, E. Brunelle, R. Devine.

6. Yes, three.

7. Village of Beaulac, township of Weedon. and township of Wotton.

NATIONAL REVENUE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the revenue of Canada in the year 1896-97?
2. What was the revenue of Canada in the year 1911-12?
3. What was the revenue of Canada on January 1st, 1922-23?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $37,829,778.40.
2. $136,108,217.36.
3. $300,174,050.18.

NATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What were the total expenses of Canada in 1896-97?
2. What were the total expenses of Canada in 1911-12?
3. What were the total expenses of Canada in 1921-22?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $42,972,755.89.
2. $137,142,082.20.
3. $365,701,790.85.

NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the total net debt of Canada on January 1st, 1896?
2. What was the total gross debt on the said date?
3. What was the total net debt of Canada on January 1st, 1911?
4. What was the total gross debt on the above date?
5. What was the total net debt on Januiary 1st, 1922?
6. What was the total gross debt on the above date?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $250,738,079.50.
2. $321,898,871.90.
3. $326,885,959.67.
4. $477,578,701.94.
5. $2,366,861,252.29.
6. $2,943,620,629.44.

WAR EXPENDITURE 1914-1922

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the total amount expended by Canada for war purposes from the year 1914 to 1922?
2. What was the increase in the public debt of Canada from the year 1914 to 1922?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $1,688,948,035.78.
2. $2,086,138,951.59.

THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. BENOIT:

Does the government intend, during the present session, looking into the benefits which might be derived from the establishing of the metric system in Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

The matter has been under constant consideration by the government during past years, and the use of the metric system in Canada is already legalized, and has been permitted since 1871.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

NATIONAL RAILWAY MILEAGE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the mileage of railways owned by the Dominion government in 1896?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

2. What was the cost of same to the country at that date?
3. What was the total mileage of railways owned by the Dominion government in 1911?
4. What was the cost of same to the country?
5. What was the total mileage of railways owned by the Dominion government on January 1st, 1922?
6. What was the net cost to the country on January 1st, 1922, of the railways taken over by the government from Mackenzie and Mann?
7. What is the total mileage in Canada of the railways taken over by the government from the Grand Trunk Railway?
8. What is the total mileage in the United States?
9. What was the total cost to Canada of the Grand Trunk Railway both in Canada and the United States, on the 1st of January, 1922?
10. What was the total cost to Canada of all railways owned by the Dominion government on January 1st, 1922?

CUSTOMS OFFICIALS—HALTON COUNTY

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What are the names of the customs officials in the county of Halton and where are they located?
2. What was the amount collected in each office in the said county in (a) 1921, (b) 1922?
3. What was the total expense of each office, including the salary of the official, during the years 1921 and 1922 respectively?
4. Who is the customs official in Streetsville, county of Peel, Ontario?
5. What was the amount collceted in that office during the years 1921 and 1922 respectively?
6. What was the total expense of the office, including salary to the official, during the said years respectively?
7. What part of the receipts from this office was collected on goods entering the county of Halton in the years 1921 and 1922 respectively?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

NORTH OAKVILLE POST OFFICE

Mr. ANDERSON:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, memoranda, reports and other documents relating to the application for the opening of a post office in North Oakville in 1921 and also relating to the order countermanding the opening of said post office.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—EXEMPTIONS

Mr. IRVINE:

For a copy of all recommendations, correspondence and reports passing between the government and the Civil Service Commission referring to the exemptions made under Order in Council 1053, June 29, 1922.

SYDNEY COAL STRIKE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

1. For copies of all communications of whatsoever sort exchanged between the departments of the government or any member of the government with any person or firm respecting the Sydney coal strike of last winter.
2. For copies of all communications made to or received by any department of the government from the railways in connection with the shop trades controversy of last summer, and concerning the Alberta coal strike in the autumn of 1922.
3. For copies of opinions of the Department of Justice given in relation to conduct of either employees or employers affected by any strike or threatened strike of workers in shipping or railway trades; and,

4. Also for copies of all correspondence relating to or requisitions for troops in connection with the Sydney coal strike of last winter.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for West York will intimate that in the last word of this motion he means summer, we will be able to give him the papers. So far as we know, there was no strike last winter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a misprint. My hon. friend is quite right; it should be last summer.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT, 1915

SALES TAX—PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a select committee of this House be appointed with instructions to conduct an inquiry into the operation of the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, having particular reference to the sales tax and its difficulties of administration and collection and alleged inequities, with power to summon witnesses, to call for documents and information from government departments and to report its findings or recommendations, from time to time, to the House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution, it will be noted, introduces the very important question of taxation. I do not know of any problem to-day that is commanding more attention and inciting, perhaps, more concern among the people than taxation. And this is a condition not peculiar to Canada alone, but to all countries in the civilized world.

I may be permitted very briefly to make a reference to the causes of this concern. In the first place, as a result of the enormous war debt of all the belligerent countries, there has been added within a very short space of time a huge sum annually to the national expenditures. This necessarily reduces the amount of revenue available for ordinary purposes by a very substantial amount. In addition, we have the almost generally increased cost of administration, due to higher salaries, and cost of materials. All these things tend to two ends; first, to an increase of taxation; and, secondly, of course, to the reduction of the amount of revenue so raised for ordinary purposes.

It is not my intention for a moment to insinuate that any responsibility for this particular condition rests upon the government; indeed, I think I would be foolish to do so. But I do wish to say that both government and parliament must assume responsibility for dealing with the question which arises out of this condition. The whole problem of taxation is of primary importance and must to-day engage the attention of the government perhaps above almost every other problem. It also merits the closest study and attention of parliament.

We are raising our taxes from a very limited number of sources. We have the customs, the excise, the income tax, the sales tax, and the corporation income tax. I do not intend to make any close analysis of these methods of taxation, or to offer any very severe criticism of any of them other than to illustrate my point and the reason for my resolution in the briefest possible manner.

My resolution particularly asks for a study of the sales tax. The reason is that this tax is to-day perhaps the second largest source of revenue. And it is capable of becoming even a greater source of revenue. It is a method of taxation which is new to this country. A few years ago we had a sales tax which was termed a luxury tax, and while it may have served its purpose for a short time, the irritation caused by it was such that a modification of its conditions became necessary. In a lesser degree, perhaps, but nevertheless to a smaller extent, there are inequities connected with the sales tax; there are injustices and unnecessary costs which could be mitigated, if not wholly overcome, by some slight modification of the act, and it is for that purpose that I suggest that a committee be struck to consider the question. I may say to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that in the proposal for a House committee I am not seeking to reflect upon the minister and his department, under whose particular jurisdiction is placed the problem of raising revenue. I offer the suggestion as an aid to him, and if the Finance department or the government will undertake this task, with some assurance that when the budget is brought down we may have a solution of some of the problems that I shall touch upon briefly in a few moments, that will be satisfactory to me. However, before deciding that matter I suggest that the minister hear what I have to say, as well as the remarks of others who choose to speak on the subject.

I have already intimated that the present system—and I am referring very largely to the sales tax—is in some measure inequitable. Merchants and dealers who are dishonest are able to escape the tax by various methods. Many small dealers claim that they do not keep books; some of these are foreigners who have not a great knowledge of the English or the French language or of business methods common in this country. These people escape a good deal of taxation, whereas the bona fide merchant who keeps an up to date system of books is checked up closely and must pay

to the last farthing. There is no question that in this respect the tax is inequitable and unfair. Then, it is exceedingly complex and costly. The number of officers, clerks and inspectors that are necessary even to get the measure of collection that we are getting now from this tax is very large, but if the law were administered with any degree of exactitude; if the tax were collected from all, the officials would be multiplied many times. It is only by simply ignoring a great many persons that the cost of adminstration is kept as low at it is.

I am not going to attempt this afternoon to demonstrate to the last point the soundness of my contention for a change in the tax. I am asking for an inquiry; I only hope to give the House sufficient information to excite its curiosity, shall I say, to the extent that it will grant this request, or to bring from the government assurances that will answer the purpose.

Let me give two specific cases, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate my point. Take first the case of the leather business. First, the dealer in hides pays 2½ per cent on the sale to the tanner. Then, the tanner, on his sale to the shoe manufacturer, is assessed 2¼ per cent, and the shoe manufacturer on his sale to the wholesaler is assessed 2¼ per cent, as well as the wholesaler on his sale to the retailer, or, in the case where the sale is made direct from the manufacturer to the retailer, there is a 4½ per cent tax, which amounts to the same thing. There the tax ends; the pair of shoes goes out to the public; there is no further imposition. Now then, let us take a very similar case to show how wholly unequal is the application of the tax. Take the case of cocoa. The dealer in cocoa beans, on his sale to the manufacturer, is assessed 2¼ per cent; then on the sale by the manufacturer of cocoa powder to the wholesaler, there is another 2¼ per cent. On the sale by the wholesaler, of chocolate powder to the retailer there is another assessment of 2¼ per cent; or, as in the case of the leather, if the manufacturer sells direct there is a 4½ per cent tax, which is the same thing. Up to this point the application of the tax is the same in connection with these two industries; both are treated alike. But the retail purchaser of cocoa powder may be a manufacturer; in fact, the greater part of the candies, chocolates, and so on that are consumed is manufactured by persons or firms carrying on a retail business as well. The retailer who has paid the tax right down from the sale of cocoa beans to his own purchase becomes a manufacturer and is then assessed a 5 per cent manufacturing tax as well as the 4½ per cent sales tax. In order that it may be clearly shown that I am not overstating the case, I have under my hand three specific instances taken from my own city which can be duplicated by scores of similar cases in every city throughout Canada. I will give these three cases to show the result of the application of this super-tax to the trade in question.

The Mission Confectionery Company, conducting a retail business in Vancouver, with very handsome retail stores, refreshment counters and cafe stalls, and at the same time manufacturing candies, paid in 1922 an amount in super-taxes—the tax I referred to a moment ago as being added to the amount that would be paid, say, by the shoe manufacturer —equal to the profit on the entire business for the year from the cafe bakery, confectionery and soda fountain. The only way they can carry on business is to have these various lines; they have their soda fountain; they serve light refreshments, cold soft drinks in the summer and hot drinks of various kinds in the winter. This service is a convenience to the public and is very widely patronized. A bakery and confectionery is also operated. That is one case. Here is another: Chanticleer Limited paid in this super-tax in 1922 more than the profit on the entire business for the year, cafe included. In the case of R. C. Purdy, another large firm, the super-taxes for 1922 combined were greater than the profit in the entire business, cafe included, for 1921 and 1922 combined. These firms are threatened with annihilation if they must continue to pay this tax under the present system. It is not my purpose this afternoon to argue in detail regarding these particular cases. I merely cite them as illustrations of the inequity of this tax and the unfairness of its application, to show how under the present law one class of business will pay a given rate, while another class is called upon to pay a very much higher rate.

I have another illustration here. It is a letter from a dealer in furs and skins, from North Battleford. This man is just a jobber or broker who goes out into the country and buys furs and skins from the settlers and farmers. Sometimes he would buy, I suppose, lynx skins, wolf skins, or whatever the fur-bearing animals of the district might be—sheep skins, cattle hides and so forth. He is a general dealer in skins. Such an individual serves a good purpose and is doing a useful work for the community. This man collects the skins in his locality, then when the big dealer comes along there is a sale tax upon this man who originally collected the skins. The big dealer certainly will not absorb that tax, and the result is that the small dealer has to absorb it, and naturally

it is an inconvenience and loss to his business, and in my estimation threatens to shut out a class of individual who is exceedingly useful to the community.

There are other phases of this question which I shall touch upon only very briefly; for instance, the application of this tax to such institutions as libraries and hospitals. I have resolutions under my hand which I shall not for a moment refer to other than to bring them to the attention of the committee as another reason for careful examination of the method of applying this tax.

Let me turn to another phase of this question. I want to suggest to the House that in place of the present system of collecting the sales tax from the manufacturer or dealer in raw material, from the manufacturer, the jobber or distributor, and then from the retailer, following this tax down through these various lines of business—and we exempt certain classes of goods, which increases the complexity of the matter—instead of that I would suggest this simplified method of securing what I consider would certainly be quite as large a revenue. Take the present method we have of applying a certain excess duty, if you like to call it that, or sales tax duty of a given figure to be determined by a committee or by the government, as the case may be. Then impose a sales tax upon all manufacturers of manufactured goods which go to the public in a finished form. At the present time the manufactured article of one firm is in many cases the raw material of another, and there is your difficulty under the present system. You are taxing the man who purchases bar steel, for instance, to turn it into cutlery, though that bar steel is the finished product of the steel company. He pays the sales tax to the steel company, which offsets the duty in that case, but he has to reproduce that bar steel in the form of cutlery, and on that he pays a sales tax again. I might give innumerable illustrations of that kind. The present tax in its application is complex, intricate and to my mind wholly unnecessary. Therefore I suggest the imposition of this tax upon such manufacturers as produce an article finished for the ultimate consumer. That, I think, would give a very handsome revenue. You may say that it would be difficult to classify the manufacturers in that way. I do not think it would be. I remember during the war we had a licensing of all manufacturers as well as of other persons doing business, and certainly it would not require anything like the staff in connection with the minister's office and throughout the country to register and license the manufacturers of Canada, who, after all, are the smallest body of classified business men. Of the three classes I have mentioned, manufacturers, wholesalers or jobbers, and retailers, the manufacturing group is the least numerous and necessarily the largest in their production both as to value and quantity. Consequently, the imposition of the tax upon that group would minimize the cost of collection. Let the tax be of sufficient amount to raise the revenue. Then impose the excess duty to which I refer upon imports to offset such an imposition on the manufacturer.

In addition to that, I suggest that on all goods manufactured by such manufacturers, when exported or re-exported, as the case may be, there should be a rebate of such tax. The reason for that is that if our manufacturers are to compete in the world market they must be relieved from excess taxes in their own market. These taxes, we must remember, are imposed for the purpose of raising revenue to run the business of this country, and if our manufacturer is to compete in a foreign country and pay the import charges and taxes which are levied in that foreign country, such a tax as we suggest here, such a tax, in fact, as we are imposing to-day ought to be rebated on such goods as are exported or re-exported.

I do not wish to labour the question, I do not wish to go into detail. I have already intimated that my object is to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we have a very serious problem in connection, not only with this tax but every branch of taxation, but particularly in connection with this. I understand from figures given by those who are supposed to have sound information on the subject that we may expect from this sales tax a revenue to the amount of $90,000,000. This will constitute a very large proportion of our revenue, and therefore inasmuch as this tax is affecting the whole of the business of Canada, it behooves us to give it the most exhaustive study as to whether or not this somewhat new tax is in any way interfering with the normal course of business.

It is claimed by the retailers particularly that it is working a severe hardship to-day. It is claimed by them, as I have already intimated, that the retailer who keeps an up-to-date set of books is penalized as compared with the retailer who does not keep books but just keeps slips of rough memoranda regarding his business transactions. It is exceedingly difficult to draw the line of demarcation between absolute fraud and mere ignorance on

the part of small dealers. I am sure that those who have given any study to the question of accountancy will realize at once the absurdity of expecting a man down in the heart of any of our great cities, particularly the foreigner, who is doing in every other respect a legitimate business, and perhaps supplying a very great need in the community, to keep an accurate set of books when he is doing only a small business, such as many of them are doing to-day. So there is no use trying to kid ourselves, if I might be permitted to use that expression, into believing that it is possible to enforce the present tax to the point of exact equality and justice to all.

There are certain advantages which would accrue from the method of taxation I have suggested, and with a brief statement of them I shall take my seat. In the first place, it will reduce, and reduce enormously in my opinion, the cost of collection. In the second place, it will eliminate this discrimination to which I have made very brief and altogether inadequate reference. In the third place, it will in my estimation bring a very much larger revenue to the exchequer of the country, a most desirable result at this time; and in the next place it will bring about a more equitable distribution of taxation over the country as a whole.

I am aware—and I pause for one moment to anticipate the point—that there are those who will at once apply to my suggestions the argument which has always applied to the imposition of a customs duty viz.—that it is always passed on to the consumer. Unquestionably it is passed on to the consumer. It makes no difference what form of tax is imposed it is ultimately passed on to the consumer. The error, however, that is often made in advancing that argument is that there is an imaginary line of demarcation drawn between consumers and others; that is, those who are sellers of goods—retailers, wholesalers or manufacturers—are often classified as being exempt from the penalties of the consumer. As a matter of fact everybody is a consumer, and there is no use trying to deceive ourselves. Taxes are always passed on to the consumer and will be, I care not what form they may take.

Let me illustrate the point very briefly: You may impose a tax, we will say, on the shoe manufacturer, and you may say with all the dignity and majesty of law that that tax must appear on the invoice, and that the shoe manufacturer must pay that tax. Certainly he will pay that tax, but if it puts him out of business he quits manufacturing. The only way he can continue to manufacture is

to make a profit, over and above that tax, sufficient to induce him to continue in business; but if that tax so invades his profits as to make it unprofitable for him to continue he will quit manufacturing or, if he can, raise his price. So it does not make a whit of difference whether that tax does or does not appear on the invoice; it will be absorbed sooner or later by the ultimate purchaser and consumer.

There is another phase of the question to which I feel tempted to refer, and it is this: It is pretty generally admitted by those who are frank enough to do so, and I claim to be one of them, that the general public prefer to pay a tax that does not appear under their noses specified as a tax.

Mr. BUREAU: That is true.

Mr. STEVENS: I think that is right; I think everyone who has had any experience with it at all will admit that. Now, I know that a great many pseudo economists who are very anxious to stir up discord will tell the consumer that this mysterious imposition of a tax in an intangible and undefined form has some criminal or some immoral taint about it. That, I think, is a fallacy, an utter fallacy. As a matter of fact business is very largely dependent upon the great general laws of supply and demand, and the question of whether a business is or is not a paying one; and the imposition of a tax—whether it is shown, as I said a moment ago, on the face of the invoice or whether it is absorbed in the general cost—in the long run makes no difference, except that it does cause a certain amount of irritation as has been proven beyond all peradventure in the United States and in Canada when we caused everybody who sold neckties, shirts, shoes, and such like articles, to show upon the counter slip the tax that went to the Dominion or to the federal government as the case might be. I do not think there was the slightest good—indeed I am convinced there was a great deal of irritation and harm—done by that. However, I repeat, in case my statement should be misconstrued, —that as far as equitable treatment of the public is concerned it is not affected at all, because as long as business is done on a competitive basis, and that is how it is done to-day, whether the tax appears on the invoice or not the business will continue just as long as it is a profitable one; that is the basis and that is the test.

I will not detain the House further. I present this resolution with a sincere desire to have a discussion here, if possible, and a definite and serious consideration of this problem with the hope that we may find some

solution of the inequalities and the injustices which are now being imposed, unconsciously and unintentionally perhaps, because of the sales tax.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I have listened with much interest, and with a measure of sympathy, to the remarks of my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre, (Mr. Stevens) and I am quite sure he is moved entirely by a desire to meet some of the criticisms that we are familiar with from day to day on the sales tax—indeed as to other methods of taxation. It is a misfortune that the tremendous obligations of the war have obliged the government of the day, no matter what party may be in power, to discover new means of raising revenue; and it is quite possible that some of these new means are almost experimental in their character and that, in the light of experience, they may be modified or, in some cases possibly, abandoned altogether.

I am afraid that neither my hon. friend nor I can indulge in the hope of devising any means of taxation that will be popular. Taxation is not popular. New taxation is particularly objectionable. If your taxation has been in force for a number of years, even though it may seem to be inequitable, the people get accustomed to it and gradually cease to complain of it, but new taxes always bring forth a new cry against them, and that is the situation regarding the sales tax. The machinery of the sales tax is substantially the same as it was from the beginning. It has been changed somewhat in detail, and the amount has been increased; but it is a difficult thing to adjust. The cases to which my hon. friend has referred, as between the various branches of industry, certainly seem to make out a fair claim to consideration. The imposition of taxes, however, in the end must be the obligation and the responsibility of the government. There is no escape from that, and such being the case I can give my hon. friend assurance at once that what he has said, and other representations that we may receive on the subject, will be considered with the utmost desire to meet criticisms as far as possible.

I must not hold out the hope that we can reduce taxation to any considerable extent. It is a misfortune that we have to pay high taxes—but every country in the world has to pay them too—and there is naturally a desire for exemption. My hon. friend mentioned one case which seems to be very worthy and he thinks that should be exempt. Other cases could be cited which would seem perhaps to be equally open to one's consideration. However, I realize that in our efforts, and in the efforts of our predecessors, to raise money it is quite possible some errors have been made. It is quite possible that there may be some room for criticism. I can assure my hon. friend that we appreciate what he has said, and if there are any other members who wish to join in the debate we shall be glad to welcome the attention and consideration that they may give to the subject. Our only desire, as I am sure he himself will realize, is to try and raise money and raise it in a manner that will be as little objectionable as possible to the public at large.

I do not think, I would respectfully submit to my hon. friend, that anything can be gained by having a committee because, as I I have said, the government must take the responsibility of raising taxes. I hope my hon. friend will on reflection see that he may accept the assurance that I give him that what he has said to-day, and what others have said—and indeed what others may yet say on the subject—will be received in the same spirit in which I know the criticism will be offered, and with every desire to meet objections as far as is reasonably possible.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I desire to sympathize with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) in his difficulty. I know the nature of the difficulties my hon. friend has to face, but let me tell him that he has added to them.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is, of course, the tax which can be absorbed and the tax which cannot be absorbed. I do not entirely agree with my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that all taxes are passed on. Some taxes that are light are absorbed. For example, I do not think our tax of 2 cents on a cheque was ever passed on. I am quite free to admit that when the tax on a cheque to-day aggregates in amount $2 it is passed on. While under the old tax no attention whatever was paid to that small impost of 2 cents on a cheque, to-day in a great many cases that tax is passed on. It is likewise passed on in connection with the sales tax. In our sales tax operations we wanted money and wanted it badly. We tried to get to the point where, at least in the majority of cases, it worked out that we would have such an impost that, while the resultant revenues would be large, yet in the particular instance of each case the amount would be so comparatively small that it would not be passed on. My hon. friends had to add to the difficulties I have mentioned. They increased the sales tax to a point where, I am afraid, it is largely being

passed on to-day. One particular matter I would like to draw to my hon. friend's attention is that when we have these sales taxes—and have them we must—they do not work out very fairly in connection with special imposts on luxuries. In referring to the so-called luxury tax, the position was just exactly as I said when we introduced this tax into the House. The idea was that in some way we would stop the tremendous amount of luxurious buying in Canada, and that we would in that way intercept, to some extent, the inevitable deflation that of necessity would come. Hon. members talk about deflation and blame the government for it. It is not a matter of government policy. Business deflates, and certainly in a place like Canada, next door to the great United States, when they de-
4 p.m. liberately embarked on that policy of deflation we had to follow. We buy our raw materials in the same markets. The prices are common, the purchases are common, the methods by which business is done are common and when they deflate we have to deflate. We wanted in some way or other to put the brakes on business to avoid to some extent the disastrous effects of deflation. Deflation is disastrous and it is a question which is the worse, undue deflation or great inflation. I am sure the effects of deflation are more disastrous than the effects of inflation. But knowing it was coming, we wanted to do something which would ease the shock, and these luxury taxes did ease the shock.

The manager of a large departmental shop met me in Ottawa about six months after the luxury tax had been imposed and when we were experiencing deflation and marked deflation. He said he called me all kinds of bad names, everything he could think of, when that tax was put on. He thought that I was everything I ought not to have been. Then he said "Do you know, when I stopped to think I wondered if you really were trying to make yourself the most unpopular man in the country, or trying to do a real service to Canada, and I came to the conclusion you were trying to do that real service, and having come to that conclusion, I knew the only thing you could be driving at was that you wanted to warn everybody not to buy. I stopped buying, and to-day my shelves are practically bare. If I had had the ordinary amount of stock, which in the ordinary methods of business I would have had on my shelves, I would have suffered very, very materially from this deflation; as it is to-day it is not hurting me." That was the reason that tax was put on. Immediately that deflation had shown itself the tax was taken off, because it is really a tax that is not a fair one, a tax which singles out one particular activity as against all other activities. It is not a fair thing. I just want to give the House the one illustration that the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has made plain. He spoke about the confectionery business and gave the names of some concerns engaged in that business. We had a luxury tax on candy. Candies were dear and they were being sold in great quantities.

That tax we took off, with all the rest of the luxury taxes but it was one of the last taxes we took off. We needed the money but the real underlying reason, apart from the unfairness of having two taxes upon one commodity, was that it is a tax which cannot be properly administered, for the simple reason that the foreigners,—and I am not using that word in the slightest degree offensively, because they make first class candies—are generally more or less uneducated people, and are more and more going into the candy business. In some of our smaller towns the candy merchants are Greeks and Italians. They go not only into the candy business but into the fruit business as well, and they are doing the business. They keep no books and I found it quite impossible to fairly and equitably enforce that double tax.

As I said in opening, I sympathize very, very deeply with my hon. friend. We must have the money; and must get it, but I hope he will see to it that this idea of double taxation, this special tax upon this activity or that activity, on top of the sales tax, is stopped, and I am inclined to think, from the representations which I know he must be receiving, that he has already come to the conclusion that it is an undesirable form of taxation.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker I am rather glad that this question has come up, although I would have liked to have had some notice that the discussion was going to take place this afternoon, so that I would have had some data upon which tc speak. However, I suppose we shall have another opportunity on the debate on the budget to discuss the subject, but it might be as well that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should have some idea as to what proposals or what criticisms are likely to be presented at that time. I think the members of the House are all pretty well aware of the fact that the members in this part of the House are what may be called low-tariff men. We also recognize the fact that taxation must

be high, and that we have to have those taxes, and as the Minister of Finance has said, he has got to have the money and the great question we have before us, besides the question of economy is where can those taxes be best raised, without hurting too much? Naturally the answer would come "Those who pay the taxes should be those who are best able to pay them." Consequently I believe that taxes should be as low as possible on all the common necessities of life, and I would say to the Minister of Finance that I would like to see that list of exemptions from the sales tax extended to everything that is in use by the common masses of the people. I mean the common articles that the poorer classes of the people must have in their daily lives.

In regard to the pyramiding of taxation, I believe the principle is wrong, and if that could be possibly avoided, I do not know that I would not agree to some extent with the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I do not feel at all sorry that the taxes should be rather high on articles of luxury. I do not care. Suppose the price of chocolates is rather high, people will have them, they buy them and they must pay for them, but they are a luxury and are not necessary to human life and the poorer classes of the population cannot very well afford them.

Now as to taxes being unpopular because we know we are paying those taxes. I do not know that taxes are ever very popular; they are something we do not like to pay. Nevertheless, when I pay a bill I always want to know what I am paying it for, how much I am paying, and what services or value I have received for the money I am giving. If indirect taxation takes from me two dollars when I should pay only one, I do not feel like paying two dollars about the particulars of which I am not at all certain. I do not find any fault with a tax because it is direct, for under such a tax we know either that we are getting value or that we are not, and if we are not we are able to direct our criticism intelligently. Under municipal taxation you know what your taxes are, and how the money has been expended, and you can intelligently criticise that expenditure. But under a system of indirect taxation there may be extravagance and waste and you may be unable to put your finger just exactly on the spot. I am therefore not opposed to direct taxation.

Now, I do not desire to take up the time of the House to-day, because I expect to have an opportunity of criticising the budget when it comes down. Still I think it is as well that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should be given some idea of just the direction criticism is likely to take. First of all, there must be a demand for economy in the conduct of public business, while recognizing the fact that a certain amount of money must be raised and must be collected from those who are best able to pay. As regards the taxes consumers pay, I think everyone recognizes that the consumers have to contribute to taxation. But I claim that in this country the heavy burden of taxation falls upon our primary industries, because other businesses can so conduct their affairs as to pass along the taxes until they rest upon the people engaged in these primary industries. I think that probably I have said enough at the present time to indicate the lines along which our criticism may probably be directed.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I hardly agree with the remark of the leader of the Progressive party that candy is a luxury. In a sense, of course, it is; but when we speak of candy we must think of the children. Candy is the children's delight, and the majority of people would be inclined to agree that the appeal which the hon. gentleman made might have had some regard to the children. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has well covered the subject and has shown the many objections that are inherent in the present system of sales tax. It is my intention, however, to refer to one or two points not dealt with. The matter of keeping books and the ability of the government inspectors and tax collectors to collect the taxes from the confectioners are questions that arise, as the hon. member for Vancouver Centre pointed out, largely because certain foreigners engaged in business in this country have not that system of book-keeping that makes it possible to collect these taxes. The up-to-date and reliable business man conducts his business in the proper way. And what is the result? Three of the largest confectionery and bakery firms in Vancouver have made no profits during the last year or two. The member for Vancouver Centre explained what happened. In the case of one, R. C. Purdy, the sales taxes for the year 1922 were greater than the profits of the entire business for the year 1921-22 combined.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do they claim that they paid the taxes out of their profits? Or did they add the tax to the prices of the goods they sold?

Mr. LADNER: The claim is that the amount of the sales tax exceeds the profits

which they would have made if they had paid the taxes which they could not pay. Those who have been in Vancouver know that these three establishments, the Mission Confectionery Company, the Chanticleer, and R. C. Purdy, are the three leading confectioners and bakery firms there, and they are actually losing money; while on the contrary we find from the records of the city license inspector of Vancouver that the orientals now have two thousand licenses in Vancouver alone in the retail and wholesale business, showing an increase of five hundred per cent in four years. What is the explanation of that increase? It is simply because the oriental keeps no books. Whatever records he has are in Chinese and Japanese, and the tax collectors do their best to understand that language and get at them, but in the end the wily Chinese is able to outdo the government and the tax collector, while the men who endeavour to face their just obligations in the way of taxation lose money. These orientals have been able to increase their business to the extent that they now have two thousand licenses in Vancouver, and that is very significant. It is one of the most cogent reasons why other means should be devised of collecting the taxes. The Minister of Finance properly told us that in view of the obligations of the war new taxes had to be imposed and that you could not devise a new means of taxation which would be popular. But there is a method of co-operation with the retail and wholesale merchants and the manufacturers of this country by which some practical basis could be arrived at. The retail and wholesale merchants and the manufacturers have in their associations considered the question of the sales tax, and in a memorandum which I hold and which is published under the caption "Taxation" they state in a letter to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that they represent and have the authority of the Retail Merchants Association of Canada, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Jewellers Association, the Canadian Wholesale Grocers Association, the Canadian Wholesale Hardware Association, the Canadian Automotive Equipment Association and the wholesale dry goods trade. All these organizations have joined together on a common plan that would eliminate the injustice of the present system of collecting the tax and would replace it with a system which would be more equitable and in the net results would bring the same amount of revenue to the exchequer of the country. They say in one of the concluding paragraphs:

[Mr. Leader.]

If expenditures are reduced, the government will not need to raise so much revenue through taxation; but, if after exercising every possible economy, the government finds that the granting of our requests would prevent the securing of the necessary amount of revenue, it is recommended that a slight increase be made in the sales tax.

These business men are telling the government that they know their business and know what kind of taxation would be fair; each scrutinizing the other, they all agree on a plan and ask for a fair system of taxation, and if the government has not enough money as a result, then they recommend that an increase be made in the rate. But they want to have the injustice of the present system removed. Under the heading "Sales Tax" they set out certain schemes which they think will be practicable and which all these merchants have agreed upon. One of these I will read:

(g) (1) All retail merchants who do business exclusively by retail and who pay a sales tax to manufacturers of 4½ per cent., or to wholesalers of 2¼ per cent., shall be required to keep books or records in either English or French, and to take out a retail merchant's sales tax license, and shall be exempt from all other sales taxes except those above mentioned.

This covers the point to which I referred a moment ago—where books are not properly kept. The memorandum contains other practical suggestions which should be of the greatest assistance to the government.

My purpose in rising this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is to urge upon the government the necessity, expediency and justice of correcting evils which are so apparent that all those interested in these trades and businesses are seriously hampered. These evils are driving the leading men out of the confectionery business in the city of Vancouver, and their fine large stores are being replaced by the little hole-in-the-wall stores run by Chinese, Greeks and other foreigners who make their profits by keeping their taxes at the lowest possible minimum. Such a condition of affairs is neither good for the city nor for the Dominion, and I trust the government will entertain the recommendations that our retail merchants are urging upon them.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): I am pleased indeed that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has brought this matter up for discussion. I did not know he intended doing so to-day or I might have made a little preparation, because I have received some complaints in regard to the sales tax. Retailers advise me that the law as administered causes them a great deal of irritation by way of what they term "pin pricks." They do not wish to evade the tax, but their chief complaint is that it is adminis-

tered in a way to cause them the maximum annoyance and inconvenience.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has referred to the fact that in all cases taxes are paid by the consumer. Another hon. member pointed out that this was not always so. I should like to draw attention to one case in point; I think I mentioned it in the House on a former occasion. The members of the grain exchange in remitting payment for carloads of grain place the proper amount of stamp taxes on the cheques and then add this tax to the account and pass it on to the farmers. It may not be a strong argument to refute the statement made by the hon. member, but it is one instance at least.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has told us that we must levy taxes because the money must be had to meet our national expenses. If the people felt the government were doing their very utmost to cut expenses to the core, I think there would be greater readiness to pay the taxes imposed. I do not say that this government has not done as much as governments in the past to economize, but the need at the present time for drastic retrenchment is greater than it has ever been before. Economic distress is rampant throughout the country, and for this very reason I did hope that the government would succeed in cutting down their estimates to a greater extent than they have. We are called upon sometimes to vote for the reduction of a particular item, as happened, for instance, yesterday; but I feel that when such a vote is called most of us are not in a position to say whether the particular cut is advisable, for it is conceivable that we may reduce an item that can least stand any reduction.

I believe the people who are called upon to pay these taxes, and who are ill able to pay them, are not encouraged very much when they see large expenditures in the estimates this year on such public works as the Welland canal. I hope to have an opportunity to speak to that later on, but I mention it in passing. Such heavy expenditures do not tend to encourage those who are burdened by taxation and find it most difficult to make both ends meet.

I have thought that much good could be done by taxing luxuries. The hon. member for Vancouver has objected to what my leader has said about candies being a luxury. For the most part, I think, candies are certainly a luxury. An instance came under my notice a year ago where a boy paid eight dollars for a box of chocolates.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame!

Mr. MILLAR: If that was not a luxury, then what is?

Mr. STEVENS: It was the measure of his love.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether it brought results?

Mr. MILLAR: Unfortunately, I am not able to give that information to my hon. friend.

I believe that as far as possible taxes should be levied on the wealthy, but I admit one difficulty. I believe it has been the experience that when governments have taxed the wealthy, the tendency is for the class affected to take the money required for payment of the taxes from their business rather than from their personal expenditure. I am sorry this is so, but I am afraid there is only too much truth in the assertion. We expect to cause them to cut down their personal expenses, but if applied to some of the wealthy people of the city of Ottawa in the expectation that it would influence them to ride in $4,000 motor cars instead of $8,000 vehicles, I am afraid it would work out the other way in many cases, and that the extra money required to meet the taxation would be withdrawn from the industries in which these people are interested, with the result that in some cases perhaps fewer men would find employment. Notwithstanding this difficulty, however, I know of no better method than to levy heavy taxes on those who are best able to pay them, and to make the taxes correspondingly light on those who are poor and least able to meet this obligation. For this reason I have felt very strongly against this sales tax, because undoubtedly it is passed on, and unfortunately the class to which I belong, the agriculturists, cannot pass on their taxes to some one else. We are dealing with Nature, and she will have nothing to do with the sales tax, with the tariff tax or with any other tax. We cannot say to her, "We must have a better crop because our taxes have been increased." I am not sure that the appointment of a committee would be the proper way to deal with this question, for the reason that we have a great many committees appointed already, but I am very glad the question has been brought forward for discussion and that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will give due consideration to these complaints.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): Mr. Speaker, reading the resolution of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) I see that he alludes to the "difficulties of administration and collection and alleged inequities."

There are two issues in this question. Of course, I have sympathy for my hon. friend,

the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he has to impose taxes, but God help the man who has to collect them.

Mr. FORKE: What about the man who pays them?

Mr. BUREAU: The man who pays them has a grouch against the man who collects them, and says nasty things to him. New taxes are always disagreeable—Taxes generally —and this is admitted by everyone, even by my hon. friend the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke)—are not very appetizing. Taxes are repulsive to most people. The difficulty is that you cannot see what you are getting for your money. You pay for your roads—they are not really your roads; they belong to the municipality, but you can walk on them and ride on them and see you are getting value for your money. But when it comes to a federal tax for the purpose of carrying on the business of the country, for the paying interest on the country's debt, and so on, you cannot visualize the thing. You know there is a debt—but where is it and what is it? If you subscribe ten dollars for charitable or other like purposes, you do not have the same satisfaction that you get from buying even a luxury—even candy which you may look at; you can see it and you know what it is you have paid for. It is admitted then that taxes are not agreeable to anybody.

Mr. McMASTER: But one only buys candies to give them away.

Mr. BUREAU: Then there are two pleasures, that of seeing and that of giving. Now, the collection of the sales tax presented certain difficulties at the start, but those difficulties have gradually disappeared. The cases mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) have been called to my attention and the matter is being investigated. I understand the trouble is that certain Greeks, or Hindus, or foreigners—to use the same word that is used in the representations made—who are running confectionery stores, do not keep books, and the auditors who are sent by the government to see what sales tax they should pay cannot ascertain the amount and have to guess at it. I do not think, however, that the sales tax generally has worked very great hardship.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has made a suggestion with regard to means for applying the sales tax, and I must apologize to him for I did not exactly catch his idea. I understood him to say he wanted the tax to be imposed upon the manufactured product as it went out to the general public for consumption. Well, let us take the case of leather. I do not know much about the leather business, but we will suppose that a man goes around to gather up hides and then pickle them; that would not be manufacturing. The skins are sent down to the factory to be dressed into leather; that would not be manufacturing. Then it would be made into sole leather, for instance; would that be manufacturing? Suppose the hide as pickled is sold to the manufacturer of sole leather; would that be a case where the tax should be collected? Or would my hon. friend wait until the leather goes to the shoe manufacturer before levying the tax.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not quite in order for me to answer, but my idea was this: the hide is first treated, and then it is tanned and manufactured into leather; then it is sold, say, to the boot and shoe manufacturer; then it is manufactured into boots and shoes. That is the point where the tax should be imposed —at the point where it is manufactured into boots and shoes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then we would have two sources of revenue, one at the custom house, when the importer pays the sales tax, and one when the product is manufactured.

Mr. STEVENS: As I said a moment ago, if you put a sufficient tax on to bring the revenue up to the desired point, you will not have to impose an additional sales tax on the retail shoe merchant, the dealer, in harness, or on the retail sales to the customer.

Mr. McMASTER: It would be pyramided by two profits on it.

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot exactly see where we would better ourselves so far as the ultimate consumer is concerned. It is admitted by everyone that we have to get the money, and it appears to be the unanimous desire of the House to take the line of least resistance in applying taxation; to follow the course which will result in the least friction. It is admitted that the sales tax is a good tax. I know that in certain cases it is working injustices, but we are trying to remedy those. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) seemed to think that the retail merchants had been badly used in connection with this tax. I am free to say that the matter has been a good deal exaggerated, and that considerable propaganda has been carried on by some officer of the retail merchants; and if I were to use my own judgment—I do not want to impute motives—I would say it was with the object of embarrassing the Department of Customs. Every man who took out

a license sent in a uniform printed protest, on which he made the statement, "I take my license, but I consider myself a retailer and not a manufacturer," etc. I admit that there are difficult cases. I will tell my hon. friend of one difficulty that I have experienced in connection with the definition of "retailer". A retailer is a man who produces upon the special order of each individual. Now, take the case of the florist; I do not know when my friends are going to get married or when they are going to die, and it is hard for me to know when I am going to need flowers and to order them in advance. There is a difficulty therefore, in connection with the status of a florist in that respect. Another difficult case is that of the manufacturer of chocolates. I cannot tell in advance when I shall want a box of candy for a child. I cannot telephone two days in advance and say that I want a box of a certain kind of chocolates. It is necessary, therefore, for them to keep these goods on their shelf, ready for sale, and those who do that sell them, not only over the counter, but in many cases, also to other small dealers. So that it is difficult to give a definition in cases of this kind that will satisfy the producer.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that if the committee asked by my hon. friend were granted, a great deal of trouble and embarrassment would result, not to the government, not so far as the policy of the administration is concerned, but in connection with the carrying on of the business of the department. It is the same with this matter as it is with the tariff; you would not like a committee to go into that question and advise the House what changes to make in the tariff. If we did that, speculation would be rampant throughout the country. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has had sufficient experience in departmental administration to know how difficult it is to carry on the work of a department without having observations offered freely by the public or interested bodies. The question of changes which may be necessary in connection with sales or other taxes may be dealt with when the budget is brought down. I am glad my hon. friend has brought the subject up; hon. members will ponder over it, and when the budget is before us we may have some helpful suggestions. And I would invite suggestions not only as to the way the tax ought to be imposed, but also as to the way it should be collected.

I do not think the expense has been so great. We have not added very much to the staff. Of course, we have had to get additional auditors to go around the various wholesale houses and among the jobbers to examine their books and see that those who ought to pay the tax are doing so, but the expense has not increased at all in comparison with the increase in revenue. The difficulties have been gradually disappearing, and they have been disappearing more especially—and I say this for the benefit of my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre—since that propaganda on behalf of the retailers has ceased. I think a lot of men have been submitting to the Department of Customs and Excise imaginary grievances because we find when we write back to them and ask for concrete instances of how they are affected and are suffering, they are willing to admit that after all it was not so bad as it was first represented to them.

As I said before, I invite any suggestions that may be made, but under the circumstances, seeing how much it would disturb the work of the department if we were to send for the employees and have them receive suggestions from every one and then go to the minister and say, "You should run the department this way, or that way," I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion on the assurance that consideration will be given to any suggestion that he or anyone else may make on this subject when the budget comes down. I can assure him that no one has more at heart the good administration of the department, and has more at heart especially the collection of the taxes with the least possible friction and the least possible inconvenience to the public generally than I have.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I am sorry the minister cannot see his way to accede to the request of my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) for a committee of this House to investigate this important matter, because it seems to me it is eminently one for investigation. The object of the mover was not in any way, I think, to embarrass the government. In fact, he made it perfectly clear that he did not intend to impute to this government responsibility for the present unsatisfactory condition in respect to the sales tax and its collection, but rather, he said, it was a condition which has been brought about by unusual circumstances and one which calls for special consideration.

I am inclined to think also that the minister's remarks in reference to the retail merchants were hardly called for, because I believe that this propaganda of which he

speaks was not directed as an attack against his department at all. There was no intention on the part of the Retail Merchants' Association as such to enter into a political discussion or to gain a political advantage for any of the political parties in Canada. The association is entirely a non-political body. I have had the honour of meeting several of its committees at the coast, and as a matter of fact I know that some of the leading officials of the organization are very strong Liberals. Their object in issuing this propaganda, if I may call it such, was to my mind an attempt on their part to show to the government that there are grievances which should receive consideration and adjustment.

Mr. BUREAU: If my hon. friend will allow me, I do not want to impute to any members of the association or to the association as a whole the idea that they were trying to make political capital out of the action that was taken by them. The propaganda I think—and I am going to be frank and open about it—was due more to the fact that a certain official wanted to keep his job in that association, than to the body as a whole.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I must accept the minister's statement, but in regard to his second proposition I think I shall have to take exception to that also, because I am convinced that the officials of this organization are imbued with proper motives in carrying out the duties which fall upon them in connection with this matter. It is only right and proper that there should be an organization of the retail merchants, just as other businesses have their organizations.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not deny that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Then if it is right for them to have an organization there is no reason in the world why they should not have officers, and if they have officers there is no reason in the world why those officers should not be paid.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not object to that at all, but I do not want to be made the goat for them to keep their jobs.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The minister goes so far as to say that these men are issuing this propaganda merely for the purpose of holding their jobs.

Mr. BUREAU: That is my impression.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think that is going very far, and if the minister is basing his action on this resolution on that attitude, I think he is really taking the wrong stand. I have met many officers of the Retail Merchants' Association, and I must say that they are very responsible citizens. I believe they are doing their work in a conscientious manner and that they are men who are entitled to every consideration. They certainly are not men who should be criticised in this unjust manner. The Retail Merchants' Association is composed of a very large number of members from one end of Canada to the other. In every city and town they have their representatives and their organization is a large and powerful one. I am convinced that the officers of this association who have issued the manifestoes to the government have done so, not with the object of holding their jobs at all, but for the purpose of trying to right what seems to them a very unsatisfactory condition.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not misquote me. I am not talking of manifestoes. I am talking of the protests sent to the officers of the Department of Customs and Excise at the instance of this officer.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think it is quite clear from what has been said that the retail merchants are not objecting to paying the tax. I have seen one of the memoranda which they forwarded to the Prime Minister. I have it here.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the date of this memorandum?

Mr. McQUARRIE: The date is January 25, 1923.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, there has been a change lately.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In this memorandum they say they have no objection to the sales tax being increased, if necessary. It is not the tax they are complaining of. They admit that the money has to be raised and that the sales tax is a means which can properly be made use of. It is simply a question of whether the tax is being collected in a fair and equitable manner, and it seems to me they have grounds for complaint as to the manner in which this tax is applied if one class of merchant has to pay a greater tax proportionately than another class of merchant, and that would seem to be the case in view of the illustrations which have been given by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. I quite appreciate the fact that the retailers, of course, would be inclined to get some other class to pay the tax instead of themselves. I have no doubt the same might be said of the manufacturers and of the wholesalers; there is always that difference of opin-

ion as to whom the taxes should be collected from. It seems to me that the suggestion made by the hon. member (Mr. Stevens) is a reasonable one, and that if you get taxation at the source you will not only derive a larger revenue but its collection will be less expensive.

There are differences of opinion, I admit, among the various classes that have to pay taxes, and all these different organizations have their own ideas as to the remedies which ought to be applied. If a committee of the House were appointed to consider this matter, which would not necessarily involve a great deal of expense, that committee might hear representatives of the various classes interested and might be prepared to make recommendations to the minister and to the government which would be deserving of consideration. We have had many committees appointed by the House in the last few years in the endeavour to adjust troublesome questions, and I think it will be admitted on all sides that all these committees have filled a useful purpose, and that some good, at least, has been derived from their deliberations. If, as the Minister of Customs says, this whole thing is propaganda on the part of certain officers of the Retail Merchants Association who desire to hold their jobs it would, of course, be unnecessary to have a committee; but if there are a number of problems involved—and the minister must know that there are a great many, not only in connection with the application of taxation and the specification of the sources from which the tax should be collected but also as to the manner in which that collection is made—it would seem only reasonable to agree to what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre proposes. I have heard that the machinery which is provided at the present time for the work of the department is not very complete. I do not know whether that statement is true or not, but possibly that machinery may be improved. That is another matter which might be considered by the proposed committee. I do not wish to take up time unnecessarily, but I would impress upon the minister the advisability of reconsidering his attitude in this matter. Let us have a committee and let that committee see if it can assist the minister, and the government also, in satisfactorily adjusting the difficulties which have presented themselves in connection with the application of this particular tax.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): If there is any hon. member who desires to speak he should do so now before the mover of the resolution closes the debate.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): In view of the statement made by the Minister of Customs that the government would welcome suggestions as to any changes in the sales tax I am encouraged to direct their attention to—

Mr. BUREAU: If my hon. friend will pardon, my special duty is the collection of the tax. I said I would welcome any suggestion made that would tend to improve the collection of the sales tax. That is the hard part.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Well, in view of the statement of the Minister of Finance a year ago in dealing with the sales tax, after the budget was introduced, may I direct his attention and the attention of his colleagues to one item, and one item only, which I think has a very important bearing on the prosperity of the country, having to do with the reclamation of waste lands. It has been stated that means to pay the debt of this country must eventually come out of the soil. If that is the case, the greater the improvements made in the land of Canada the greater the returns must be. The item to which I would like to direct the attention of the minister is that of field tile for drainage purposes. I know of cases during the past year where contracts have been let, and the tile purchased and delivered on the land, but no labour was available, and in consequence great loss has been sustained. In addition to that there is the further handicap in the shape of the sales tax which is imposed on this field tile, a tile which is used for reclaiming what are practically waste lands. I am drawing the attention of the minister to this matter so that before the budget comes down he will be in a position to deal with it. I am encouraged to do so by reason of the fact that a year ago he made some alterations with respect to a matter that I brought to his attention, and I am quite sure they had a very good effect. I think splendid results came from the change which he then made, and I am satisfied that the use of field tile for reclamation purposes should also be encouraged rather than hampered by the sales tax.

Mr. L. H. JELLIFF (Lethbridge): There are one or two matters to which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre drew attention which have also been impressed upon me by different organizations in my district. The hon. member referred to the matter of the sales tax on books for public libraries. I have received from the librarian of the public library

of the city of Calgary, and also from the librarian of the city of Lethbridge, communications relating especially to this subject, in which the writers complained quite bitterly of the sales tax on the books which they purchased for these public libraries. The libraries in question are supported by public taxation, and the imposition of a sales tax on the books published doubles the burden which these libraries have to meet. The librarians referred to, therefore, urge very strongly that the sales tax be removed, to the end that the usefulness of these libraries may be extended, and the public given the full benefit to be derived from them. I hope that the Minister of Finance, to whom I am going to send these communications, will take this matter under advisement and see if he cannot arrange to relieve these public libraries from the burden of this extra taxation. When the budget was up last year and we were discussing this sales tax I presented a resolution or two from the labour organizations of the Lethbridge district resisting the increase in the tax that was made at that time. They are protesting particularly against the sales tax on the coarser lines of clothing and on boots and shoes. I hope the Finance Minister will carefully consider this matter also when he brings down his budget this year. I do not care to enter into details, but there are many matters in connection with the sales tax that should be adjusted. I believe these taxes are placing burdens upon the people of this country, and especially the class of people who can least afford to bear them, and I hope that every effort will be made this year to see that these articles of necessity are taken off the list to which the sales tax applies.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): In view of the very courteous, and I think very frank, request of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), the two members of the government particularly charged with the respective duties of imposing and collecting taxes, I am willing to have the resolution withdrawn. But before asking you, Mr. Speaker, to make the request to the House that this resolution be withdrawn, may I make myself clear on one point in regard to my suggestion? I admit that within the confines of a brief few moments' speech it is impossible to properly treat so important a subject, but I will just reiterate what I said a short time ago. I believe that the somewhat complex nature of the existing taxes could be very very much simplified if, instead of imposing a sales tax upon the various branches of trade—the dealer in the raw material, the manufacturer, the wholesaler and the retailer—the taxes were imposed upon one branch, namely the manufacturer of the goods in their finished condition as issued to the consumer, and at the same time retaining the other features of this tax, namely, the sales tax imposed upon imports of an amount corresponding generally with the other tax. In addition to that I suggest that such a tax should be increased to an amount that would ensure the maintenance of the amount received. I know that the Minister of Finance understands what I have very imperfectly stated, and I would ask that, when he is giving consideration to this problem, he would take that suggestion under advisement. I would like to tender another suggestion, that, perhaps between now and the time when the budget is considered by the Cabinet for presentation to the House, officers of the two departments might be detailed to give this matter special study and attention, and to hear the representatives of the manufacturers, the wholesalers and the retailers. In making this request I am quite aware that several delegations have waited upon the government and have submitted memoranda of various kinds, but I think if the two ministers would appoint from their departments one or two thoroughly expert individuals—and I know there are many such in the departments—to give immediate and definite study to the problem, with authority to hear these representatives and instructions to seek finality in the matter, that would certainly be better than even a parliamentary committee such as could make a report this session. These suggestions are given with a very sincere desire to solve a very difficult problem, and not with a desire to embarrass the government. With the consent of the government, I request that the resolution be withdrawn.

5 p.m.

Motion withdrawn.

MARKING OF WOOLLEN GOODS

Mr. J. D. DRUMMOND (West Middlesex) moved:

Whereas the sheep-raising industry of this Dominion is suffering severely from restricted markets and inadequate returns received by the wool-growers engaged in the industry;

And whereas the present markets are further restricted by misrepresentation as to woollen products;

Therefore, be it resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, it is highly desirable that the government should bring down legislation that will adequately protect both producer and consumer by compelling manufacturers of goods sold as woollen goods to mark or label such goods in accordance with the composition thereof; showing plainly the percentage of virgin wool, shoddy, cotton or silk or other materials contained therein, and that importations of such goods be certified in similar or equally adequate manner.

He said: I hope that this resolution requires very little explanation. It is in reality something that has been before the people of the United States for two or three years known there as the "Truth in Fabric Act." The intention of the resolution is not to prevent the use of shoddy, because we realize that if that were done there would not be enough woollen goods in the Dominion of Canada for the purpose for which they are needed, but, as the resolution itself states, to place the public in a position to know what they are buying. Permit me for a moment or two to take up the resolution as it pertains to the producers of wool. It is, of course, a fact that is well known to every agricultural man in the House, that the sheep industry in the Dominion of Canada is on the decline. The reasons for that may be several, but we believe it to be mainly the fact that the wool has not been sold at a price that would return an adequate profit to the wool grower. We believe that the producer of virgin wool should not be placed in the position where he is a competitor with the rag man or the producer of shoddy. To this end we ask that what is contained in the resolution be put into legislation: that is, that manufacturers be compelled to mark or label such goods as they manufacture in accordance with the composition thereof, showing plainly what is contained in those goods, whether it be a percentage of shoddy, or whether it be a percentage of silk, cotton or any other material. This is something that has been asked for by many sheep breeders' associations both in the Dominion of Canada and in the United States. It is something that has been asked for also in a number of newspaper editorials. I have a list of newspapers which since 1919 have taken up this matter and, so far as their influence can go, have ranged themselves behind it. It is not necessary for me to read them; suffice it to say that I have 32 press editorials from Canada and the United States in favour of legislation of this kind. I have also, from wool growers and live stock associations, the National Consumers' Association, etc., in the United States and Canada, some 60 resolutions that have been passed to the same end. I intend to be brief and for that reason I shall not read many of these resolutions, but I might read the following resolution passed by the Ontario Sheep Breeders' Association in Toronto on February 26 of this year.

That we, the members of the Ontario Sheep Breeders' Association, urge the Canadian government to enact fair and equitable legislation that will ensure "truth" in fabric; and in such an effort we pledge them our undivided support.

In view of the fact that the sheep industry is on the decline in Canada, I think I am only voicing the sentiments of most of those who are engaged in agriculture in this country when I say that this is deplorable from the farmers' standpoint, not only in the production of wool but in other ways as well. Those of us who have been engaged in agriculture all our lives, and who have for the greater part of that time had something to do with raising sheep, know that there is no means by which the eradication of weeds can be so successfully accomplished as by the pasturing of sheep. This is one reason why sheep raising should be encouraged in the Dominion.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more from the point of view of the producers, but for a few moments I might consider the matter as it affects the consumers, because this is one of the things that do not affect any particular class. It affects, in fact, two classes, the consumers and the producers, who comprise the population of Canada. It is a fact that is well known to those who have given any study to the question that shoddy as used in the manufacture of cloth is sometimes worked over up to eight and ten times. In every process it is carbonized and the dress material and other undesirable elements are eliminated, leaving only the wool. I want to emphasize the distinction between virgin wool and shoddy, because one might go to buy a piece of cloth and be told that it was all wool, whereas it might be shoddy and the merchant might nevertheless be telling the truth. We do not want to eliminate the use of shoddy in the production of fabric, because there is not enough wool produced in Canada to provide more than one-third of the cloth necessary for the use of the people. It is therefore actually necessary that shoddy should be used in the manufacture of cloth. What we do ask, however, is that when it is used the percentage that is contained in the fabric shall be made known to those who buy it. When the United States government and, as well, if I am rightly informed, the government of Canada, were clothing their troops for overseas service, they made it obligatory on the part of those who provided cloth for the soldiers' clothes that they should state what percentage of virgin wool and what percentage of shoddy such cloth contained. If that was necessary in connection with the cloth provided for the soldiers' clothing, surely it is also necessary as regards the clothing that our people in general wear.

This is a principle that has been applied and carried out in the Pure Foods Act. For instance, the manufacture of oleomargarine is not prohibited, but it is definitely laid down in our legislation that the people must know whether they are buying oleomargarine or butter. In the manufacture of maple syrup no one will for a moment say that the addition of cane sugar or any other ingredient is deleterious, but it is the function of the Pure Foods Act to safeguard the public by providing that they shall know whether what they are buying is pure or is an adulterated article. The same thing applies to milk. Nobody will say that the addition of water to milk makes it unfit for human consumption. But the Pure Foods Act clearly and distinctly lays it down that milk of a certain quality must be sold or the buyer must know what he is getting. I do not think it is necessary for me to go much further. I have a considerable amount of material which it would take me an hour or two to consider, but I have no desire to do so. I might refer before concluding to a bill that has been before the Senate of the United States for two years and which has been thrown out on both occasions. That bill is coming back this year with every prospect of being passed. Now, we do not ask this parliament to pass a bill of that character, but it indicates what we are seeking. It provides:

> That every manufacturer of woven fabrics that contain wool, and of garments or articles of apparel made therefrom, shall. . . . cause the said woven fabric to be marked, and all garments and articles of apparel made therefrom shall be tagged in the manner hereinafter provided.

Now, I do not propose to lay down any lines on which this might be carried into effect, but it is something to which I hope the government will give their attention. I trust that something will be provided that will not only help those who are engaged in the important industry of sheep raising in Canada but will afford some protection to the consuming public.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The hon. member (Mr. Drummond) who has presented the resolution has introduced in the language of the resolution, a tariff issue that is familiar to many of the people of this country. He suggests that we provide for adequate protection. I should like to submit to my hon. friend that while we all share his views as regards the wisdom of providing the people of this cold country with woollen goods that are really woollen, and while the government are in sympathy with anything that will help to encourage the sheep industry throughout the country, I am not sure how far the gentlemen who sit around him are prepared to follow him in this resolution. It seems to me that this is adequate protection to the limit. For while we are prepared at once to admit that parliament might enact legislation compelling our own manufacturers to visibly brand the products of their mills, I would ask my hon. friend what control have we over foreign manufacturers? If we adopt this resolution, it simply means that we are handing over the whole business in question to the manufacturers of Canada and are keeping out the competition which we believe is in the best interests of our domestic trade.

There are many ways besides a customs tariff of protecting national industries. We have learned that truth ourselves. For many years our cattle were kept out of the British market because it was represented by the British cattle men that our stock was diseased. This was purely a pretence to protect the British cattle industry. We know to-day that certain of our industries are deprived of business in other countries because of restrictions by way of specifications governing contracts. I have in mind complaints that are now before my department. Canadian industries desired to tender for locomotives to be shipped to an overseas dominion, but the specifications framed by those who were able to control that business were such that our Canadian industries were shut out. Only last week we had brought to our attention the case of a manufacturer not far from Ottawa who had secured an order for 30,000 doors to be shipped to the United Kingdom. But he could not ship them because the carpenters there said, "You have not provided certain information as to what you pay for labour." No person is foolish enough to believe that this is done for any other object than to protect the particular industry affected.

If this resolution goes through in its present form, and it becomes an order to the government to bring in the legislation my hon. friend is asking for, it is in the last analysis the highest degree of protection. My hon. friend has debated the question. The government are desirous so far as possible of seeing that all goods sold throughout this country are what they are represented to be to the public, but I submit to him that in the interests of our people generally the government cannot accept this resolution because it is purely a measure of protection, worse even than any he would find in the customs house.

Mr. DRUMMOND: What has the government done along this line to protect the public?

Mr. ROBB: The greatest protection the public can have is competition. This resolution would destroy competition.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) absolutely and entirely mistakes the motives prompting the hon. member who has moved this resolution.

Mr. ROBB: I am not attributing any motives to the hon. member; I am pointing out the possible results of the resolution if it goes through.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He may not know it, but nothing is being done, so far as I am aware, to help that primary activity which ought to be great in this country—the production of Canadian wools. The subject has been discussed before. We had it up before the tariff commission time and again, when farmers showed what could be done, the kinds of wool that could be grown, and the like. We had it up in connection with our Marking Act. Of course, the present government threw it out.

Mr. ROBB: What, the Marking Act?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was something which was a little troublesome, something which made difficulties. Why, there is a firm in Scotland which turns out the best grades of tweed in the world, and it stamps every yard of its product with its name and a guarantee, as I recollect it, that it is composed entirely of pure wool. The thing can be done. Of course, it will be a little troublesome, of course the trade will come down and make trouble, of course the importers will come down and make trouble, and of course it takes time to convince people in the business of handling shoddy that this thing is right. But why attempt to dispose of the proposal by raising the bugaboo of protection?

Mr. BUREAU: That is what it is.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend argue that the only shoddy sold in this country is the product of Canadian mills?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is indeed short of argument when he advances a question of that kind. Shoddy? Look at what you are getting through your customs to-day if you want to find shoddy. Let my hon. friend examine the imported article that he is so solicitous for if he wants to find shoddy. I can assure him he will find any quantity of it. The hon. minister says he wants to do everything for this industry that he possibly can—he wants to help the farmer, he wants to help the wool industry, he wants to see that when our people buy goods they may know what they are buying; and yet he will not do the one thing which would render it possible for them to know what they are buying.

This proposal is not anything new. The Marking Act of the United States covers it. That act is enforced when it is convenient; sometimes it is not convenient. But such an act can be enforced. My hon. friend says that the purpose of this resolution is absolute protection. I do not know why. I do not know why it is any harder for the foreign manufacturer to do what my hon. friend would say it is perfectly all right to make the domestic manufacturer do if it did not result in protection—to honestly state what is in his goods. He says, "We have got control over the domestic manufacturer; we can see that he is honest, we can see that in so far as his materials are concerned the Canadian purchaser will know what he is buying." "But", he asks, "what control have we over these foreign manufacturers?" Equally great—greater control because it can be more easily enforced by my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau). Why, all these imported articles have to come through his watchful department, and it is perfectly easy for him to see whether they are pure articles or not—that is, if it is required.

Mr. BUREAU: What would you do if they are not marked?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I can tell the House what my hon. friend does when goods are not marked. He knows what to do with goods that his government want to have marked in connection with interests that they wish to protect. Why, they feel that it is necessary to mark pencils—one of the smallest and most insignificant businesses in this country.

Mr. BUREAU: Everybody uses them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An industry employing probably less men by many units than any other we could seriously discuss. But there is a pencil factory in Newmarket the owner of which was the chairman of the election committee of the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear. More power to his arm.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows what to do when pencils try to get in that are not marked; they simply do not get in, that is all.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, they do. We mark them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, you hold them up and mark them at the shipper's expense.

Mr. BUREAU: How about printing and lithography?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The same thing about that as well. We thought all these things should be marked.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not on the basis of this man's politics or that man's politics, or with reference to the question whether he was chairman of the Prime Minister's election committee, but simply on the basis of what was right.

Mr. BUREAU: And that is why you suspended the Marking Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We wanted the Canadian public to know what they were getting. We wanted it not only on pencils but on cutlery, and everything. But no cutlery was being manufactured in that particular place; there was no knife factory there. The knife factory was in Kingston.

Mr. McMASTER: These are cutting remarks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They happen, Mr. Speaker, to be true remarks.

Mr. BUREAU: Partly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says, "partly". Will he tell me wherein they are incorrect?

Mr. BUREAU: They are incorrect in this respect: My hon. friend stated that we did away with the Marking Act. His government suspended the act; it never was in force.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, let us try to get down to facts.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Finance Minister threw away the Marking Act with a wave of his hand in his last budget. But it was found convenient later to hang on to something in order that these privileges might be given. It was convenient to do it, and it was done.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says "hear, hear". It was also convenient to give this protection, not to the wool producer, not to the maker of cutlery, but to this pencil manufacturer, and also to the lithographer.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. BUREAU: And printers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And printers. It is right that lithography and printing, a first-rate business in this country, should be looked after, but other industries should also be looked after. My hon. friend has no difficulty whatever in looking after the lithographer, the printer, and the manufacturer of pencils.

Mr. BUREAU: Because they made a good case, and the others did not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, here is a case being made for others.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not yet passed on it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I hope my hon. friend will give to the wool industry and the farmers producing wool in this country the same measure of protection that he gives to the manufacturer of pencils.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the matter of the pencils hurt my hon. friend more than anything else?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, but I would like to see them all treated alike. My hon. friend cannot say that it is more important to have pencils made in Canada, even at Newmarket, than it is to grow wool on a thousand farms. He cannot say that the wool industry and the farming industry are not more indigenous to Canada than the making of pencils. If my hon. friend is going to see that the farmers get just as square a deal as the manufacturers of lead pencils in Newmarket, I am quite content to say nothing more upon the subject.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a matter of tariff, and I leave it to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that the matter of protection was introduced into the discussion of this resolution. I did not understand that the motion was made primarily with the intention of asking for protection for the wool growers. There is another class who need some protection—not tariff protection, but protection from the efforts of those who are selling an adulterated product for the pure article—and that class is the great unorganized mass of the people of Canada. They are the victims more than the wool growers. Everybody has to buy clothing. We go into a store and a dealer will say, "This is an all-wool article." But very few articles of clothing are one hundred per cent wool as they are sold for. The shoddy manufacturer will have in stock goods that are eighty per cent shoddy, and the adulterated article is sold as a pure wool

article. In this case, who is defrauded most, the buyer of the cloth or the wool grower? Why, the person who buys the cloth. And the beneficiary of the system is the shoddy manufacturer. Should this system be allowed to continue just for the benefit of a few shoddy manufacturers? I do not think so. The wool growing industry of this country is a very small one, but it could be one of our first industries if conditions were as they should be. Very few farmers raise sheep to-day; they have no encouragement to do so. If sheep were raised in greater numbers the result would be far-reaching in many ways. There would be more grain grown and sold; and surely we need larger production to take care of the overhead liabilities that confront us. Every basic industry should be given a square deal. We are not asking for protection, but we are asking for fair treatment. The Canadian Co-operative Wool Growers last year sold most of their wool in the United States, paying 15 cents a pound to get it there, and an equal amount of woollen goods was subsequently shipped back to Canada, the Canadian consumer paying the duty. What is the matter with our having the wool manufactured in our own country? There is something wrong, and I would like somebody who is wise on the subject to explain.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), referring to the cattle embargo, pointed out that the contention that disease prevailed among our cattle was merely a pretence; that it was protection our friends on the other side wanted. Well there have been a good many pretences by politicians to try to get by with something. In this case we are not asking that the wool grower should be protected at the expense of the consumer; in fact, if such protection was afforded it would be only the due of every consumer. The great unorganized masses have a claim on the government that all these goods should be marked. We have to sell our wheat, our oats, our flax, our hogs on this basis; they are all graded; why should not clothing be graded? Why should not the manufacturer have to mark on the goods what percentage of wool and what percentage of cotton or shoddy is in it? That would give the buyer a square deal, because the people cannot be good judges themselves. As far as the imported article is concerned, I think the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is right, that it is easier to check up the importer than it is the home manufacturer, because you could very easily put a mark on the imported article. I very much hope that this resolution will receive the support of the House and become law.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I should like to express my sympathy with the motion before the House. I have watched the woollen industry in this country for thirty years or more now, and my father before me. He made it an outstanding item in his programme that the first thing Canada wanted was a woollen industry, so that our farmers might produce wool, and in the next place that our factories might make that wool into goods that could be used for clothing.

The only objection I have heard against the proposal made here to-day is that it is one instance more of a system of double-barrelled protection being introduced into this House. The mover proposes that there shall be protection to the wool grower and at the same time protection to the consumer who uses the wool. While it may be protection, and protection in the double sense, I am convinced from my experience in the past, and I have also been impressed by what the mover has said that the wool growing industry in this country is declining. I would like to see the growing of wool become one of the staple industries of this country, and I want to see our farmers encouraged by some kind of protection if protection is being applied to other industries in this country. It may be said that our friends here to my left are inconsistent. Perhaps they are and perhaps they are not, but whether they are or not, inasmuch as the principle of protection has been recognized and applied to many industries in this country, the farmers are entitled to their share of protection.

I also agree with the mover that this question is coming up in the United States, where the farmers' demands are growing, and are being recognized more and more. The outstanding thing in recent legislation at Washington was the putting through of a bill to provide a way for the farmers getting additional credit outside of the banks. I have not any doubt that the next Congress will pass a similar bill to that being urged here to-day, and that under their broad system of protection they will include the farmers as well as the manufacturers. I hope the government that we have in this House to-day, if they are not going to carry out their free trade principles but afford more or less protection, will apply the principle of protection to the wool growers as they are applying it to some of the other industries, as was mentioned here to-day.

Again I say, I shall have much pleasure in voting for the motion and supporting it on this occasion, and later on if it comes up in

this House. The agitation will go on, and especially will the farmers continue an agitation for the recognition of the wool growing industry in this country. It is more a basic industry than almost any other I know. Wheat growing may be a basic industry, as they say, but certainly wool growing is. Wool is grown in the West and in a large section of the province of Ontario, but it is a declining industry. I maintain that if there is any country competent to engage in the wool growing industry it is Canada, and if that industry is failing there must be something wrong. It may be within the compass of this parliament to apply a remedy to that grievance, and that grievance does exist. The question is now before parliament and now is the time to give some relief to the wool growers of Canada.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): As I understand the resolution before the House, it is not asking protection for the farmers, but we would like to see encouragement given to the wool growers. We know that the sheep industry is dropping away in this country and that many of the farmers raising sheep consider that the wool, the product of their sheep, is scarcely worth taking off. We have known cases of farmers allowing the wool clip to lie over for one season, considering it scarcely worth while to draw it to market. So if this resolution is going to do anything to encourage the use of woollen goods in this country, it is going to help the farmers to that extent. I cannot understand how it is going to affect the manufacturer of shoddy goods. In no way will he be affected, nor will it affect any man or woman who wants to buy shoddy goods, nor the manufacturer who produces a mixture of cotton and wool or of some other materials, because the people will still be able to buy that class of goods if it is manufactured, and I presume that the manufacturers will still continue to manufacture it. But if this resolution becomes law the consuming public will be protected against buying an article that is not what it is supposed by them to be. It will put the consumer in a position where he will know what he is getting. If he buys woollen goods it will be marked woollen goods, and if he buys a mixture or shoddy he will know it as such. So I think this is a very important thing, not only to the wool growers of this country but also to the consumers who buy and use the goods. For these two reasons I am in sympathy with the spirit of the resolution, and hope that legislation will be introduced bringing it into effect so that the people of this country will know exactly what they are buying, and can get just exactly what they pay for.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I only intend to take a minute or two. I was rather surprised at the jocular manner in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) treated this resolution. It also surprises me to see how joyfully hon. members point to some member in this corner of the House and say that he is advocating protection.

Mr. BUREAU: You enjoy it.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, because it is getting to be a joke. I can assure hon. gentlemen that it does not act like a red rag to a bull for us to hear the word "protection" mentioned. Perhaps there is a place for it. However, I do not see any signs of protection in this resolution. Perhaps the Minister of Trade and Commerce wants to adequately protect the people of this country from the cold weather by seeing that they get proper underclothing. I notice that there may be a little difficulty in connection with the working out of this resolution should it become law, but I think the principle is sound upon the whole, and that the difficulty referred to might be overcome. I feel greatly encouraged to see the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) taking up the wool industry and helping out the farmers who are engaged in the very laudable calling of raising sheep. I happen to be the proprietor of a fairly large flock of sheep and I am very much interested in the price of wool, but I do not know how this proposition might act. If you could convince me I was going to get a bigger price for my wool—well we will not say any more; but let us not even mention the word "protection" in regard to the selling and the buying of wool. I remember a little incident which occurred—I am rather afraid I mentioned this last year but I am going to repeat it because it is so good it is worth repeating. I happened to be selling wool and was unable to get enough for it to pay for the cost of shearing the sheep and carrying the wool to market. At that very time I went into a store to buy a small woollen cap. The clerk asked me $3.50 for a small cap. I looked rather suspiciously at him and asked him if he was not ashamed to ask such a price for a cap of that description, and he almost whispered to me "isn't it all wool?" You know it is rather trying on a man who is trying to raise sheep and sell wool to have to buy tweed caps. However, I survived the experience, and I am happy to say that the price of wool has greatly improved during the last year.

While I have this opportunity I want to say to the farmers—I think the observation is applicable, perhaps to farmers throughout

the Dominion—that there is no better class of live stock to have on the farm at the present time than a few sheep; it is the best paying proposition we have in live stock to-day. With these few remarks I wish to state that I am going to support this resolution. I recognize there is a little "catch" in it, but that can be overcome and the principle itself is sound.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): I was rather surprised at the manner in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce received the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Drummond). I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the mover of the resolution did not make the fact of the protection it will afford the wool-grower the main reason for his argument—that was more or less incidental to the argument which he presented. His main argument was that the people of this country were entitled to know the quality of the goods which they were buying.

Mr. ROBB: I fear there has been a misunderstanding, I did not refer to it as protection to the wool grower. What I wished to make clear was that it was protection to the Canadian manufacturer, because he would have all the business.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I fail to see the force of the minister's argument, because he would not be placing the Canadian manufacturer under a less handicap than the manufacturer abroad who is sending his goods into this country; and I cannot believe but that the manufacturer in Great Britain, as well as the manufacturer across the line, would be willing to comply with the regulations in order to get his goods into this market. The increased demand for wool would largely come about in this way. The people, realizing the value of getting first class goods, would buy more of them; there would be a greater demand and a greater consumption of the best quality of woollen goods, which would result in a greatly increased demand for wool in this country. Why, our manufacturers now import large quantities of their wool from outside. I think, possibly, the greater quantity—yes much the greater quantity—comes from outside of Canada, so that there is absolutely no protection for the wool grower; and although there might be, perhaps, some little advantage to the Canadian manufacturer, I would suggest to the minister that it would be quite easy to overcome that by reducing the customs duty on manufactured woollens. There is no trouble in getting over a little difficulty of that kind and therefore I would heartily support the resolution.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Every grower of wool is familiar with the fact that the industry has got into low water since the war. Although there has been an improvement in the price of wool, nevertheless the industry is not yet by any means in a too flourishing condition. I have been, in common with my staff, casting about to see in what direction we could move to encourage this industry but I must confess that it never occurred to me that a means of rescue could be found in this way. There is no reason in the world why the home manufacturers of woollen goods cannot comply with the conditions laid down and I think there are many reasons why they should. But I do not think that the imposition of these conditions on imported goods of this nature is practicable. I am not familiar with the importation conditions in regard to woollen goods, but I do know that in the case of certain importations with which I am conversant we are obliged by an understanding with the United States to accept their goods in the containers in which they are presented and they accept ours in return. I do not know whether these conditions apply to woollen goods or not but it would be manifestly unfair to impose conditions in the case of home manufactured goods and exempt from those conditions goods that are imported. This should be a matter for the customs and the finance departments to work out together. I think every member of the House must sympathize with the object of the resolution. We should be able to get at a solution of the difficulty somehow. But I understood from the Finance Minister that the thing would be impracticable, it could not be carried into effect, and therefore, I ask, why pass this resolution? The Finance Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Customs know infinitely more about this matter than I do. I know something of the requirements of the sheep industry and of the condition it is in, but I am not familiar enough with this phase of the matter to speak as to the conditions to be imposed on the importation of woollen goods. If we impose these conditions on these goods of home manufacture and cannot impose them on imported goods of a like nature, look at the difficulty you are in. Let somebody who is familiar with the business try to solve this riddle and then we are more likely to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. However, there is no sense in advancing a resolution of this nature unless it can be complied with, and

my understanding is that it cannot be complied with, as affects the imported article.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): I do not look upon this as a question of protection although really that is involved. The marking of goods is not, in itself, a measure of protection but practically it works out that way. So much for that. Let me say that I am thoroughly in sympathy with the desire to help the sheep industry in this country. As the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) has rightly said, it is one of our industries that should be helped if that can be done. Now what is the purport of this resolution? It is set forth therein that our markets are restricted and that if we desire to help the sheep industry we must enlarge those markets. The resolution declares:

Whereas the sheep raising industry of this Dominion is suffering severely from restricted markets and inadequate returns received by the wool growers engaged in the industry:

And whereas the present markets are further restricted by misrepresentation as to woollen products.

That is the point we have to solve. How are we going to enlarge our markets? The second part of the resolution states that:

It is highly desirable that the government should bring down legislation that will adequately protect both producer and consumer.

If I understand the resolution correctly, the markets are restricted on account of the fact that misrepresentations are made. In other words, you have to deal with unscrupulous merchants or unscrupulous men who either manufacture or retail the wool that is produced by the farmers. That is the only thing that restricts our market. The suggestion is that the men who deal with the product he raises on his farm, when it is converted into cloth or otherwise, are not honest in their representations. As the hon. leader of the Progressive party said, when they sell you a tweed cap they have to whisper in your ear, "It is all wool," because they are afraid to say it out loud. Does my hon. friend think that the marking of the goods is the remedy, and that it is an adequate remedy, instead of using the words "adequate protection" which we have heard so often in this House? That is a debatable question. Another matter which I am most interested in is the question, how will it be possible to do it in a commercial way, or in a way which will not impede trade or prevent the free exchange of merchandise of this particular class? My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton)—and when I say my hon. friend I emphasize the word "friend"—

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Not the other word too?

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, yes, he is a Sir. The word honourable sinks down to that.

In regard to the Marking Act my hon. friend wants to reproach me—and I think for once in his life he is unfair,—with putting lead pencils and printed and lithographed matter on the marking list.

An hon. MEMBER: Six o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 48, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada —Mr. McMurray.

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

Thursday, March 8, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 49, respecting a patent of Robert A. Campbell.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate the Protestant Federation of Patriotic Women of Canada.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 51, respecting a certain patent of James M. Richardson.—Mr. Chew.

REPORT

First report of the select standing committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I would move:

That the special committee to inquire into the operation of chapter 12, 8-9 George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, pursuant to the resolution adopted by the House on the 22nd February last, consist of the following members, namely: Messrs. Brown, Carmichael, Chevrier, Copp, Drummond, Hughes, Garland (Carleton), McBride, McKillop, McMurray, Malcolm, Martell, Parent, Rinfret, Simpson, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its proceedings and the evidence taken for the use of the committee, and to report from time to time; and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SHAW: Might I ask the Prime Minister if either of the two Labour members is on that committee? I did not hear all the names.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think not.

Mr. SHAW: Well, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment it is highly desirable that one or other of the Labour members should be on the committee. Some 10,000 of the employees in the Civil Service owe, I think, direct allegiance to labour organizations, and there can be no doubt that other branches of the Civil Service are organized and have affiliation with labour unions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will tell me which one of the two members he would like to have on the committee I shall be very pleased to add his name.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the House that according to rule 11 no special committee may, without leave of the House, consist of more than fifteen members. Of course, if the House agrees to more than fifteen the rule is suspended, and the name may be added.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the rule to be suspended by the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. If the House is agreeable, and if the name suggested is accepted, the motion may be amended.

Mr. SHAW: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the matter stand until to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might pass the motion now and add the name later.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the understanding that the name will be added to-morrow, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the motion should pass on any understanding whatever. I have no objection to the motion, but I think when a suggestion is made that a name be added, and the government is willing to agree to the addition, the name should be added at once.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion can only pass by unanimous consent, anyway.

Motion stands.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved:

That the report of the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 15, an act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, which report was presented to this House on Tuesday, 6th March, be concurred in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not recall any report save one, a report asking leave to report from time to time and to sit during the sittings of the House. If that is the report, I am quite willing that it be concurred in.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is the one.

Motion agreed to.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF ROOT VEGETABLES

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 52, to amend the Act to Regulate the Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables.

He said: This amendment is not designed to change the act in any way; it is simply to add to it the following clause as section 14A:

An inspection certificate signed by an official inspector, appointed under this act, shall be prima facia evidence of the grade and condition of the root vegetables or packages to which the said certificate may refer.

In the bill that was passed last year—and it was on the whole a very good bill—this clause did not appear, that is, a provision making an inspector's certificate evidence of the grade. I have conferred with the minister and the officials who have charge of the enforcement of the act, and they agree that this provision should be made.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

SUBSIDIZED STEAMSHIP LINES

Mr. EVANS:

What steamship lines are subsidized by the Canadian government operating between Canada and European ports, and between Canada and the British West Indies?

Hon. Mr. COPP: The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company is paid a subsidy for a steam service between Canada and the West Indies.

ASSIGNMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. COOTE:

How many persons, firms or corporations made assignments under The Bankruptcy Act, in Canada, during the years 1916 to 1922 inclusive?

Hon. Mr. COPP: The following are the bankruptcy records for 1916-22 inclusive, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Dun's, and Bradstreet's:

	Dominion Bureau of Statistics	Dun's	Bradstreet's
1916..	No. information	1,677	1,772
1917..	" "	1,088	1,109
1918..	" "	873	814
1919..	" "	751	625
1920..	" "	1,034	966
1921..	2,364	2,379	2,358
1922..	3,922	3,630	3,185

BUREAU OF STATISTICS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many temporary employees are there at present in the Bureau of Statistics, and how many were there at this time last year?

2. Are these officials selected entirely or nearly from the Ottawa district?

3. If so, why are none drawn from other parts of Canada?

4. Of the male temporaries, what percentage are returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. There are at present in the Bureau of Statistics 312 temporary employees. At this time last year there were 416.

2. So far as the Bureau is aware, 210 members of the temporary staff have homes in Ottawa; 61 in Ontario, other than Ottawa; 39 in Quebec; 1 in New Brunswick; 1 in Alberta.

3. All employees of the Bureau except census commissioners and enumerators are appointed through the Civil Service Commission.

4. Fifty-one per cent.

SALES TAX COLLECTIONS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

What are the amounts collected on each of the different commodities as classified by the Department of Customs for customs records and reports up to the end of last accounting period under the sales taxes enacted by the legislation of last session?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: The sales tax returns are not compiled for customs records according to the different commodities, and it would be very difficult to give the information asked for. If, however, having regard to the way our books are kept, I can give the hon. gentleman information respecting any particular item, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

BACON IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

1. What is the amount of fresh American bacon sides, shipped into Canada, in bond, for curing in Canadian plants, and shipped out as Canadian cured American, during the years 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?

2. What percentage of this amount was exported to the British markets during these years?

[Mr. Copp.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—HOTELS

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many hotels are owned by the Canadian National Railways?

2. What was the cost of construction of each of these hotels?

3. What is the present value of equipment of each hotel?

4. How much fire insurance is carried on each hotel and equipment, and in what companies?

5. Are all these hotels being operated by the railways?

6. What was the revenue of each of these hotels in each of the last three fiscal years?

7. What was the expenditure in connection with each of these hotels in each of the last three fiscal years?

8. In regard to each of these hotels operated by the railways, in each of the last three fiscal years, what was the net profit or loss in connection with the operation, including all charges such as insurance, interest on investment, and allowance for depreciation on building and equipment?

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers; for the administration of the proposed Act by a Minister of the Crown to be named by the Governor in Council; for the appointment of a registrar to receive, register and deal with applications for such investigations, and for the appointment of commissioners from time to time by the Governor in Council to hold investigations; for the payment of the registrar, commissioners and witnesses and to establish such offices, with assistants, as may be required; for power to remit or reduce duties where combines are proved to exist; for the revocation of patent rights in certain cases; for prosecution by the Attorney General of any province, or upon his failure to act, by the Solictior General; and for the imposition of penalties for violation of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution and has been pleased to recommend the same to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

"QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS"

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): On many occasions this session questions appearing on the order paper have been asked to stand as orders for returns. I would like to ask the government whether the answers to these questions, when brought down, appear anywhere on the records of the House, or are they simply handed to the member asking for the return?

Mr. GRAHAM: They appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. CALDWELL: A great many of these questions are matters of public interest, and the replies should be available to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: In cases where questions stand as orders for returns, when the information is made available a few days or sometimes a few weeks later, it is tabled, and any hon. member who is interested in the return can get a copy of it from the proper officials.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to corroborate the view apparently held by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). What I understood him to press was this: when questions are made to stand as orders for returns there is no record of the returns in Hansard or in the Votes and Proceedings, and the result of having it so stand is to prevent that publicity being given to the answers which is desirable in many cases. I know it is the right of the government under the rules to have a question stand as an order for return; it is a right that has been very generally exercised—I think too loosely exercised this session. It should be confined only to cases where the record is very long and there is no great importance as to publicity; it should not be done simply as a means of ridding the order paper of the question.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It was not done under the late government, I suppose?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very rarely.

Mr. BOIVIN: The remarks of the right hon. gentleman are correct in every respect except one, and that is that every return tabled in the House is immediately registered in the Votes and Proceedings and can be there found. Then those returns are submitted to the Printing Committee, and the Printing Committee decides which returns shall be printed and which shall not be printed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite true that a note is made in the Votes and Proceedings when a return is tabled, but the return itself does not appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. BUREAU: But you get it from the clerk in charge of it.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we might have a useful thought in the matter in this way. Many of the questions that are asked this session are too long, too elaborate, and call for information which I do not think is of practical value. The right of a member to ask a question we do not dispute, but I would suggest to hon. members who put questions on the order paper that they ought to observe the rule with regard to brevity in a larger measure than they do.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I am not out of order, perhaps I may be permitted to intrude on delicate ground and say that in the case of some questions that have been asked of one of my departments, I have discovered that the member in whose name they stood had not put them on the order paper and had no information concerning them. I think members should not allow outsiders particularly, to put questions on the order paper until after full consultation with them, and until they know what those questions really mean. In the case of some of these questions, one or two of them at least, it would take quite a staff working at least a month to prepare the answer. That is easier, of course, for some outside person, than paying a legal man to get the information and work up the case.

As to questions being changed to orders for returns, questions may look innocent, but when they are taken to the departments it is found that they mean pages and pages of information, and I submit that Hansard never was intended to be the medium through which all the records of departments are published. It was intended to be the medium through which the expressions of the members should be recorded, and to give certain other information at moderate length, but not infomation that would cover pages of Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not at all take exception to the general principle the minister lays down, namely, that questions on the order paper should not be used as a means of getting private information merely for citizens. They should only be used as a means of getting information in the general public interest, and, further some regard should be had to the time and expense entailed in procuring that information. I never was so impressed in my life with the need of that as three years ago, when one hon. member moved that the government procure from Great Britain a list of all the shareholders and debenture holders in the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which return no doubt cost this country many thousands of dollars, which return came over in a large box, and which box I am informed never was opened.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are still in a box.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I inquire if any steps will be taken to have this condition

remedied; that is where questions appearing on the order paper are passed as orders for returns, will the answers be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings or in Hansard?—I do not care which so long as we get the information.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the hon. gentleman that no paper is tabled in the House without reference being made to it in the Votes and Proceedings of the next day. For instance, any reports or any returns that were tabled yesterday are mentioned in to-day's Votes and Proceedings. As to the inclusion of these bulky returns in Hansard, I think it would certainly entail too large an expense and that it is really uncalled for. As the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) said quite clearly a moment ago, the remedy is in the hands of any member who has an interest in any particular return. He can go before the Printing Committee and there move for the printing of the return. I have done it quite often myself when I was on the floor of the House, and it is done, very often in relation to important matters. Surely hon, members will not ask that Hansard be overloaded with bulky returns.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Somebody will have to assume the authority for deciding which returns are to appear in Hansard and which are not. This must not be left to the Hansard staff because it would not be fair to place upon them the responsibility. Either the Speaker of the House, or the Clerk, or Clerk Assistant, or the government, will have to decide which of these returns are to appear in Hansard. These returns sometimes appear as answers to questions. Very often a minister with a lengthy answer will say, "I will not read this but will hand it to Hansard," and then Hansard prints it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: A return was laid on the Table yesterday in reference to some question placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Carleton relating to a matter of general interest to the people of this country and a matter which has been discussed in the House this session. I tried to get a look at the return brought down, but I was informed that the hon. member for Carleton had it and consequently I have not been able to see it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Every member is entitled to get a copy of a return. If he will only apply to the proper clerk here in the department, as many copies can be had as are desired. We have a staff of nearly eighty typists and stenographers who are there for that purpose.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) stated a moment ago that three years ago an order of the House was passed for a list of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk and that it cost the country a lot of money to get this list, that the names were contained in a box, and that that box was never opened. I may say to the leader of the Opposition that he is badly informed. The box was opened, and we found out that the government had not complied with the order of the House, that the list of shareholders contained in the box was not the list as of the date asked for. It was a useless list. So the leader of the Opposition is wrong again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The box was not opened for some time after it was returned here. I made inquiries and found out. I called the matter then to the attention of the hon. member who moved for the return. Perhaps he has opened the box since, and it is quite evident that the object he had in seeking the information was not shown to be served by the contents when he opened the box.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The box was opened ten days after it came in.

Mr. BUREAU: Another case of misinformation.

INQUIRY AS TO QUESTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Yesterday I had a question on the order paper that was called by Your Honour, and I think the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) gave an answer to it, but I see no reference at all either to the question or answer in yesterday's Hansard. It was about civil service pensions and superannuation.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I have not read Hansard. I observe, however, that the reply appeared in the morning paper.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would rather have the information appear in the official report as the Minister of Finance gave it in the House.

[The question and answer referred to are as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the government, during the present session, to bring down legislation with regard to the superannuation and pension of civil servants?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to renew the Calder Act which expires on July 1, 1923, with regard to the superannuation and pension of certain old employees?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: The matter is under consideration.]

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS—HARBOURS AND RIVERS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The vote is No. 154, to be found at page 36 of the Estimates:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding $293,100 be granted to His Majesty for harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to take each item separately as it appears in the resolution?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Public Works—Annapolis Royal—wharf repairs, $1,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is apparently a new item. There should be some explanation given by the minister.

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Public Works): The item is for general repairs, consisting of the renewal of fenders and bearing piles.

Item agreed to.

Mr. HANSON: The resolution calls for the expenditure of a large sum of money, $293,100 as compared with $441,420 last year. Some of the items in it must relate to new work and I think we ought to have an explanation from the minister respecting them.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was resolved that each item should be considered separately. If an explanation is called for I shall be glad to give it in each case.

Black Point—breakwater repairs, $1,150.

Mr. STEVENS: Apparently that is a new item and the minister ought to give us an explanation.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is for repairs to the projecting portion of the breakwater consisting of 120 feet by 241. A section of the seaward side, 20 feet long by 15 feet wide, requires to be constructed from low water up. The seaward face at the outward end needs to be resheathed and ballast placed in various ways.

Item agreed to.

Canso—wharf, $7,700.

Mr. EVANS: Why was this work not done last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A vote was granted last year for this work, but we had to acquire a site, and by the time the necessary negotiations were completed it was too late to undertake the construction. Therefore we are asking for a revote.

Mr. HANSON: What amount was paid for the site?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was $2,500.

Mr. STEVENS: Are tenders to be called for the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract was let in October, after tenders had been called for.

Item agreed to.

Cape St. Marys—breakwater repairs and renewals, $3,000.

Mr. STEVENS: This is also a new item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to renew the sheathing on the seaward face of the breakwater, and to cover the stringers on the shore end of the breakwater to a length of 200 feet.

Item agreed to.

Chapel Cove (West L'Ardoise)—breakwater extension, $7,500.

Mr. STEVENS: Is that work under way?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, it is under way.

Item agreed to.

Chimney Corner—completion of wharf, $13,400.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Chimney Corner?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Inverness county, Nova Scotia.

Mr. HANSON: Have tenders been called for the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, tenders have been called for and the contract let.

Mr. HANSON: Who is the contractor?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): W. E. Landry, Antigonish.

Mr. HANSON: This is a large sum for a wharf in what must be, I am afraid, a very small community. I must confess that I never heard of Chimney Corner before. How many people live there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a farming, fishing and mining centre. There were upwards of 2,000 tons of coal shipped from the mines there last year. Some fifteen odd schooners are engaged in the fishing industry and they export fish to the value of $9,400 a year.

Mr. HANSON: What mining company operates in that vicinity?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Chimney Corner Coal Mining Company, I believe.

Mr. STEVENS: It must be a pretty small mining company to be shipping that quantity of coal a year. I would like to invite the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie), who represents a Cape Breton constituency, to the fact. This company does not seem to be operating one of the large mines he was talking about the other day. This seems to be a large expenditure for a district shipping such a small quantity of coal, even if there are fifteen schooners plying in and out, it is a fairly generous expenditure for the amount of business indicated by the answer of the minister. Perhaps there is another explanation that could be given for such a large outlay.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. member appeals to me for information about the matter—

Mr. STEVENS: I know it will be accurate.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, it will be accurate. I know the place very well and the necessity exists for this work. It is not in my own riding, it is in the fair county of Inverness which is part of Cape Breton Island. My hon. friend will easily find out, as far as coal is concerned, that the northern coast of the county of Inverness from Port Hood to Cheticamp, about fifty miles, is one solid mass of coal, as yet undeveloped, and we have no railway there—for which I am sure my hon. friend will be sorry—except for a distance of thirty-five miles from Canso down to the town of Inverness. The rest of the coast, covering about twenty-five miles, has no railway at all. The mine in question, although not large, is shipping considerable coal to Prince Edward Island, the distance from Chimney Corner to that market being comparatively short—some thirty miles. The development that is now going on at Chimney Corner is small because there is no harbour. This breakwater is to serve the purpose of a harbour. When the breakwater is extended there will be shelter for vessels coming in there, and I can assure my hon. friend that, for the protection of the fishermen and the people generally who have to do business at that place, fishing and mining, the extension of this breakwater is most important.

Mr. STEVENS: The only difficulty with the answer of the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) is that the breakwater happens to be a wharf.

Mr. McKENZIE: It answers both purposes. There is nothing to laugh at, I can assure my hon. friend. I see my western friend, who is strong on wheat boards and the expenditure of money in the West laughs vociferously, at the idea of a few dollars being spent on the coast of the Atlantic to protect our fisheries. I stand up here proudly to say that there is the strongest possible necessity for these developments, and all I have to say is that not enough of this kind of work is being done.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to ask the minister a question. I thought I was going to get an accurate answer from my hon. friend from Cape Breton. We are left in a dilemma as to whether this is a breakwater or a wharf. Which is it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It serves both purposes.

Mr. BAXTER: Will my hon. friend tell us whether it is coal or fish that require development?

Mr. DUFF: Both.

Item agreed to.

Digby—general repairs and renewals to pier, $3,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is that the large public wharf where the boats come in?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: The estimates indicate that last year there was a vote of $5,000 which was all expended. This is an additional $3,000. Is that under contract? Was there a contract, and if there was a contract were tenders called for, and what were the amounts?

Mr. KING (Kootenay). It was for day labour last year, and a further amount of $2,000 was required for renewal of floors, fenders and freight sheds, rendered necessary by the wear and tear of the wharf.

Mr. HANSON: This is a very important item.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $60,000.

Mr. STEVENS: This is one of the general votes for repairs in the different provinces, and always a very interesting vote. It shows that the vote of $60,000 last year was fully expended. This vote is used generally perhaps for unforeseen and miscellaneous expenditures, and I think the House and the committee are entitled to a very careful explanation of what was done with the $60,000 last year, and what is anticipated to be done with the $60,000 this year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is really a contingent vote—a vote that is used to meet unforeseen conditions that may arise from time

to time. We spent out of the vote last year $46,121, all in small expenditures. There are a great many items, filling two or three pages. I do not know whether my hon. friend would like to go into the whole of them.

Mr. STEVENS: Give us some of them.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some of the items are:

Amherst Point	$295
Babins Cove	499
Bass river	211
Baie St. Lawrence	241
Breen's Pond	410
Burlington Centre	49 95
Cariboo Island— repairs to breakwater	124
French river	26 90
Cariboo Island	77 14
Goose Bay	197
Hall's Harbour	99 23

That is the character of the expenditures made under that vote. The items are all small, none of them exceeding more than $1,000. That is the largest expenditure I see here. Then we have Arichat, $2,095.55. That is the largest expenditure.

Item agreed to.

Haulover—repairs to channel protection walls, $4,000.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Haulover. What channel?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in the county of Queen's and Shelburne. The walls which are to be repaired are to protect a channel which connects Negro bay with Fort La Tour harbour, saving a distance of ten miles for motor boats, employed chiefly for fishing. There are over 120 in both harbours.

Item agreed to.

Joggins—breakwater repairs, $3,000.

Mr. HANSON: That is not on the Atlantic coast; it is away up at the head of the Bay of Fundy, on Cumberland basin, if my recollection serves me right. Is it necesary to have a breakwater there? Have they always had one?

Mr. DUFF: High tide.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to repair a section of the wharf 220 feet long, 20 feet wide, by filling in with ballast for its whole length to an average depth of 6 feet and replanking about one-half of its length.

Mr. HANSON: What is the traffic? Is it coal from the Joggins coal mine?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Breakwater and wharf used for the protection of the coal shipping piers at that point. Coal mining is the principal industry of the town, the output being about seven hundred to nine hundred tons a day, showing that there is a very considerable industry going on there.

Item agreed to.

Judique—Baxter's—wharf repairs, $2,700.

Mr. LEADER: I see the name "Baxter". Is that a private wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, it is a public wharf.

Item agreed to.

Leitches Creek—wharf repairs, $2,200.

Mr. STEVENS: That is a new item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The top tier of logs, stringers, guard-railing and twelve fenders are now badly decayed. It is really repairs of an old structure.

Mr. HANSON: What county?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Cape Breton North.

Item agreed to.

Lockeport—wharf, $5,800.

Mr. HANSON: Is that a new wharf? It is a revote I believe.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is reconstruction work. There has been a wharf there.

Item agreed to.

Ostrea lake wharf repairs, $2,700.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not like to be too inquisitive; but surely the minister could give a brief explanation of these new items as we come to them. Over one-half of these are entirely new work calling for votes of considerable amounts—$8,000, $6,000, $5,000, and so on.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This work is for renewing piles along the face of the wharf, also new caps and stringers; repairs; planks and stringers for the new portion, and new guards all around this work, together with fenders.

Mr. HANSON: Is this work supposed to be done by day labour under the supervision of some appointee of the government, or are tenders to be called?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is often very difficult to get tenders or to let contracts for repair work, and unless the job is a large one, this class of work is often done by day labour.

Item agreed to.

Port Greville breakwater repairs, $6,000.

Mr. HANSON: This is an important job and the minister has an engineer in charge in this locality. Does the engineer not make a report on the character of the work to be performed, upon which report this appropriation is based? And does he or does he not report as to the way in which the work should be done? I know pretty well how these things are done. As a rule they are farmed out among friends of the administration, and very often value is not received for the money spent. This practice is probably growing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to rebuild this breakwater to a length of 150 feet, a height of 5 feet and a width of 20 feet, at an estimated cost of $6,000. This breakwater protects the harbour which, without this protection, would soon not be navigable. A very considerable tonnage in lumber goes over this wharf, a total of $175,000
4 p.m. a year being the value. I am advised that this work is on our list with a recommendation from the engineer that the work be done by day labour. His recommendations come to the department calling either for contract or for day labour, whichever in his judgment is best.

Mr. HANSON: This is to be done by day labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is his recommendation.

Item agreed to.

Yarmouth harbour—dredging, $85,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is it proposed to do this work with the government's own dredges, or to call for tenders?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A contract has been let.

Mr. HANSON: Who is the contractor?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Halifax Dredging Company.

Mr. HANSON: What is the contract price per yard?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is $1.45 per yard.

Mr. HANSON: How deep is it proposed to dredge there?—$1.45 is a very high price.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend should have regard to the nature of the material. This is not considered a high price in the department, because this is largely rock that is being removed from the channel, and it is expensive work. Twenty-two feet is the depth, to conform with the other portion of the channel.

Mr. HANSON: That is 22 feet at low water?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. BAXTER: Is that rock in boulders, or in ledges?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Boulders, largely.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When was the work authorised?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was let in August of last year by order in council after tenders had been called for and received.

Mr. STEVENS: There was no vote for this last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We were doing the work under our general vote and we could probably have proceeded in that way, but it was thought better to vote a separate sum this year for the work.

Mr. STEVENS: How much money has already been spent on it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1922-23, a total of 16,981 yards was removed, at an expenditure of $24,622.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the minister expect this appropriation of $85,000, in addition to the money already spent, will complete the contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is proposed to remove 56,500 yards this year, at a cost of $81,925.

Mr. STEVENS: That scarcely answers my question. Will that complete the work, or will further contracts be required later on?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That completes the work, I think.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister know who compose the Halifax Dredging Company?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no knowledge of that. The information may be in the department.

Mr. HANSON: The contract should show who the officials are.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Hon. Mr. Beasley is president of the company, I think.

Mr. HANSON: Were tenders called for the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, public tenders.

Mr. HANSON: How many tenders were received and what were the amounts?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Tenders were received from the Halifax Dredging Company, their price being $1.45 per yard; and from the Canadian Dredging Company, their price being $1.70 per yard.

Mr. STEVENS: Just two tenders received.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Just the two.

Item agreed to.

Prince Edward Island—harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $14,000.

Mr. HANSON: How much was spent under this item last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To January 31 we have expended $2,660.

Item agreed to.

New Brunswisk—Campbellton—Deep Water Wharf—Repairs, $1,200.

Mr. HANSON: I was under the impression that the Campbellton wharf was part and parcel of the railway. Does the Public Works department control the wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: What is the location of the wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is at the end of Ramsay street on the west bank of Bruce river.

Item agreed to.

Cumming's Cove—wharf repairs, $2,000.

Mr. GRIMMER: May I ask the minister if this wharf is in Charlotte County?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GRIMMER: Is Leonardville wharf also in the county of Charlotte?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GRIMMER: Last session I inquired of the minister if any representations had been made on behalf of the people of Grand Manan and the neighbouring islands urging upon the government the necessity for the construction of breakwaters in all or any of these islands. I was informed by him later that representations had been made, and he gave me the names of the places where works were to be constructed. I am disappointed now to find nothing in the estimates in connection with what I consider were representations made by the patronage committee of my county. As I stated last session, prior to the general election assurances were given the people of the islands that if the present administration were returned to power breakwaters and other necessary structures would be built to help the fishing industry in which the people there are engaged. Does the government intend to adopt any of the representations made? If so, what work will be undertaken this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are many works we would like to undertake in the county of Charlotte, but unfortunately the money available is not sufficient. It may be somewhat disappointing to my hon. friend that more items do not appear in the estimates for his county, but we can only carry on such work as in the judgment of the department is urgent. Supplementary estimates will be brought down later, but in their preparation I am not sure what consideration is being given to further expenditures in the county of Charlotte.

Mr. GRIMMER: Can the minister assure me that something will be included in the supplementary estimates to carry on a portion of the work covered by the representations to which I referred?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very sorry I cannot meet my hon. friend's proposal. The matter will be considered carefully by the government when the supplementary estimates are being made up.

Mr. HANSON: What representations have been made to the government with respect to the island of Grand Manan? Its population are wholly dependent upon the fishing industry, and I submit that they are entitled to quite as much consideration as the people in the county of Inverness, where thousands and thousands of dollars are being spent in every little cove; also the county of Cape Breton North and Victoria seems to have swallowed up a very large portion of the vote for Nova Scotia. Here is a population producing, I am satisfied, more fish, than the whole island of Cape Breton, but not a dollar appears in the estimates for their protection.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The files of the department would disclose the representations that have been made. Those files are available to my hon. friend if he cares to look into them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the meaning of the term, "patronage committee"?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not anything here on the patronage committee and am not able to answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. HANSON: If the minister cannot tell my hon. friend, I can show him a patronage committee in active operation in the county of Charlotte.

Mr. DUFF: You are not getting very good results.

Mr. HANSON: Its efficiency is demonstrated by the fact that the new governor, who was defeated six times in that county, has now gone to his reward as a direct result of the patronage committee's work in his behalf. They have a real live patronage committee in that county.

Mr. HOCKEN: What seems to me to be more important is whether there is a patronage list in the department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I know of none.

An hon. MEMBER: The old one is there yet.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $40,000.

Mr. BAXTER: Would this item cover some protection work at Salmon river, the necessity for which has been represented to the minister's department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the expenditure would be too large to be included in this vote.

Mr. BAXTER: Will the hon. minister in making up his supplementary estimates give consideration to the protection work that is needed at Salmon river?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Representations have been made regarding this work, and we are obtaining a report upon it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What amount was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $11,107.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why is it necessary to have an appropriation of $40,000 when the expenditure of that amount is not contemplated?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditures last year were in the nature of repairs at Back bay, Bathurst, Bayside, Black river, Burton, Campbelton, etc.—quite a number of small expenditures. Several items are noted for expenditure this year, but only some six or eight as yet.

Mr. HANSON: I noticed that the premier of New Brunswick was here the other day and I was very credibly informed that one of his missions was to unload on the Dominion the provincial government wharves in tidal waters, especially those on the St. John river. I may say that not a cent has been spent on the repair of these wharves since before the war. They are in an extremely dilapidated condition, and if the government takes them over they will be a liability rather than an asset. I will point out further that in many cases there are duplications of provincial and Dominion wharves, especially on the St. John river, and that is something the minister ought to look into before he agrees to have this legacy unloaded upon him. I understand that negotiations are under way between the two governments, and I would like to know what their present status is and what are their prospects.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand from my hon. friend that he is opposed to the Dominion government becoming involved in the provincial wharves in New Brunswick.

Mr. HANSON: I did not say that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter has been before the government for some time. A survey of these wharves was made in 1918 or 1919 and the late government apparently did have it in mind at one time to take them over. There was a similar proposal from British Columbia, and that province was more successful; we did get a transfer of the provincial wharves to the federal government. The government has given the matter consideration but has not yet definitely made up its mind whether or not these wharves shall be taken over. The matter will be under further consideration in the course of the next few days.

Mr. HANSON: The minister must not misconstrue any remarks I made. I did not either affirm or deny the proposition. I have a very definite opinion upon the subject myself.

Mr. DUFF: What is it?

Mr. HANSON: I think the minister should take over those wharves that are not duplicates of other wharves, but where there is duplication I do not think the federal government should take them all over and maintain two where only one is necessary I think that is a sound position to take, and one that public opinion will support. The premier of New Brunswick went back to the province the other day and said that all he was waiting for was an order in council to put this matter through. Is that correct?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): An order in council would bring the wharves under the supervision of the Dominion government, but

money would have to be voted for repairs and renewals. I assure my hon. friend that a very careful survey of the situation will be made before action is taken; in fact, I think it has already been made by the department.

Mr. HANSON: Has that order in council been passed, or is it contemplated?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): An order in council has not been passed.

Mr. BAXTER: At the time when the Hon. Mr. Carvell was Minister of Public Works, this matter was gone into exhaustively. A list of the wharves was prepared, their values were ascertained by the department, and an order in council was drafted. This will all be on the departmental files. The people of New Brunswick—it does not matter what administration was in power there—were led to believe that the wharves would be taken over by the federal government. There may be criticism on the ground that the provincial government has not in the meantime made any expenditure on the wharves, but the fact is that as a result of the abstinence in that respect of both the federal and provincial authorities, the wharves are, as the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) says, in a pitiable condition. It seems to me that the matter of these wharves is a federal matter just as much as a railway would be, and I would like to see it dealt with on a business basis. It ought to be possible for the two governments to get together. I do not want to suggest anything in the House that will help any sort of political claptrap down in New Brunswick, such as the premier stating that he is only waiting for an order in council. I want to get away from all that political bombast and give consideration to the interests of the people who need the facilities of these wharves, which constitute an important part of the highway of commerce. I would like to see something definite done, and done quickly. I do not think the minister will be subjected to any criticism from those sitting on this side representing New Brunswick if he does act, and we will not find any fault if there should be a little bit of generosity in the action.

Mr. STEVENS: Last year $60,000 was voted for Nova Scotia under the head of harbours and rivers generally, repairs and improvements, and the amount is the same this year. The figures for other provinces are as follows: Prince Edward Island, $14,000 last year and the same amount this year; New Brunswick, $65,000 last year, $40,000 this year; Quebec, $75,000 each year; Ontario, $65,000 each year; Manitoba $15,000 each year; British Columbia $95,000 last year and $75,000 this year. If it is reasonable to take $25,000 from New Brunswick and $20,000 from British Columbia this year, why would it not be possible to make a similar reduction in the votes for the other provinces, especially in view of the minister's intimation that in each case a less amount was required during the year than had actually been voted? I am not seeking to deprive any province of what is its just due or requirement, but there appears to be discrimination against New Brunswick and British Columbia in this respect. If a similar reduction is made in the other cases, very substantial saving will result. I would also point out that, deducting the revote, we have new work this year to the extent of $1,289,000, covering all the provinces—a very considerable sum indeed. So I suggest that the minister might make a saving in the other provinces similar to that in the two I have mentioned.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote for New Brunswick last year was larger than was considered necessary for a contingency vote. There was a question at that time of taking over these wharves in New Brunswick. That not having been done, in making up our estimates this year we deducted the sum of $25,000 from last year's vote. In regard to British Columbia, the deduction is arrived at in this way. The Dominion government took over the wharves in 1918, I think, and since that time we have been putting the former provincial wharves in a state of good repair. That having been done, it was found that this year we could get along with a smaller vote for British Columbia.

Mr. HANSON: The minister told us that only $11,000 had been spent out of this vote for New Brunswick. I think that is altogether too small for the province, because I myself know of wharves owned by this government which are quite out of repair and need attention. What is the modus operandi in arranging for these repairs? Does the engineer make regular trips of inspection? I know the engineer on the St. John river very well, and he is a very good man. Does he make inspection trips, and of his own motion make recommendations, or does he wait until somebody draws the attention of the government to some particular wharf, and then act under instruction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The district engineer is charged with the responsibility of taking care of these works, and it is upon his recommendation that the expenditure is made.

If my hon. friend has in mind any works that are in a bad state of repair, he might very well bring them to the attention of the department, and we will have inquiry made.

Mr. HANSON: I have in mind the wharves at Gagetown and at Oromocto. I ask the question to find out if the minister would take reccommendations from me, for instance, if I called his attention to the matter, or does the engineer himself go round and see what is required?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He is supposed to make his inspection trips from time to time.

Mr. MacLAREN: As the minister has reduced this vote by $25,000 this year, that seems to me to indicate that he is very doubtful about taking over these tidal wharves. The amount was larger last year when this subject was under consideration, but now there is a reduction of $25,000. We have heard with interest that British Columbia has had her tidal wharves transferred: I think it was in the year 1919. I hope the minister will keep this matter in view, but it does not look to me as if the transfer of these wharves was seriously contemplated when we see this reduction of $25,000. I hope I am mistaken in that view.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps the minister would reply to the question of my colleague. I hope the government has not determined not to take these wharves over, but if that is the fact, and if this reduction in the estimate points to that, let us have the blow, however bad it may be. I trust, however, that the government has not come to that conclusion, because there are at least two subjects in the province of New Brunswick that I trust some day will be effectively dealt with. One is the taking over of these wharves, and the other I shall not discuss at present; I refer to the taking over of the St. John Valley Railway. I regard these two things as more important than any other matter of public construction in New Brunswick to be taken over. It would be relieving the province of a burden and doing a real good to the people. I am not quite so narrow in my political views that I would want to withhold credit from any administration that would grapple with these questions in a businesslike way. If these things were done, I would unhesitatingly say it was a good thing to do them, and that the administration which had done them was entitled to credit for doing them.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As I have already said, this amount is considered sufficient for any unforeseen conditions that may arise. It does not, however, take into account the transfer of these wharves. That is a matter of government policy, and must first receive the consideration of the government. After consideration has been given, if it is decided to take them over, an item could very properly be included in the Supplementaries.

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the minister this? Is it his intention to have the matter disposed of before the Supplementaries are down? It seems to me a question of that, or else of putting a blanket vote here that would be large enough to cover the cost. I would be glad to have the minister's assurance that the matter will be settled before the Supplementaries come down.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter has been held in abeyance for three or four years now. I hope that it will receive consideration from the government shortly, but as to the outcome I am not in a position to speak at the present time.

Mr. HANSON: What is the minister's own attitude?

Mr. COOTE: Is there any generally recognized basis for the granting of money for harbours, wharves and breakwaters? The reason I ask is this: I understand that at some of the ports in New Brunswick, St. John, for instance, there is a harbour commission.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not at St. John.

Mr. COOTE: We have harbour commissions controlling a good many of the harbours in Canada, and as I understand it, they do not get any grant from this parliament; they are supposed to be self-supporting. Is it right that we should grant hundreds of thousands of dollars to certain harbours while other harbours have to be self-supporting?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have harbour commissioners in various parts of the country, more particularly at the larger ports. Some of the ports are self-sustaining, such as Montreal and Vancouver. With others, it is merely a matter of control. Some of the commissioners are paid officials, and some are not. There is no fixed principle applied throughout. Some of the harbours are self-supporting and provide moneys for improvements and repairs out of the tolls collected. Others again, are dependent on the grants received from this parliament.

Mr. COOTE: Are there any tolls collected from the vessels using these harbours for which we are making grants to-day?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure. There are wharfingers at some of these wharves.

I imagine. These wharves have been turned over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and they would have knowledge of the tolls collected.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any toll on coal shipped over the Joggin's wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have no information in our department regarding that. That would be in the Marine department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What strikes me, in looking over the estimates for harbour and river improvements, is that the minister is asking for more money than he will require. The committee must bear in mind that this expenditure is spread very generally over Canada. Three of the western provinces get very little of it, I refer particularly to the item which is included for each of the provinces.

The CHAIRMAN: Harbours and rivers.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under "Harbours and rivers generally" the amount for Manitoba is only $15,000, and for the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta only $20,000, or $10,000 each. Large amounts are granted for the other provinces. Last year the sum of $60,000 was granted under this vote for Nova Scotia, and the minister says $46,000 was spent. For Prince Edward Island last year $14,000 was granted under this item, and two thousand odd was spent. For New Brunswick $65,000 was voted last year and some $11,000 was spent; and I assume that probably the same proportion will be maintained for the other provinces. There remains in the case of each province a large amount of this money unexpended, which is all to the good and to the credit of the Dominion and the minister, but the point is this: If the minister does not require more than one-half or say one-quarter of this amount why vote it, why put it in the estimates? It will only be a few days, or a few weeks at most, before the Minister of Finance comes to parliament with his budget. He will then tell the House "The Estimates amount to so much, I must raise a certain amount of money, and I must do it by taxation." In the meantime we are voting money—without very much inquiry, I grant—voting money that according to the record of last year was not spent—not nearly all spent. Now, would not the minister think it wise, under these circumstances, to revise these figures for harbours and rivers generally? If the amount is not required there is no use passing it now. If we pass it now the plea will be, "There is the amount required and the taxes to meet it must be imposed." I should think it would be in the interest not only of the minister and his department but of the country generally if we would cut these votes for harbours and rivers in each of the provinces by one-third, or even one-half. If an emergency arose, if some storm came up suddenly and washed away a wharf, or something of that kind, during the year the government could always get money, they did it last year; they could get it under Governor General's warrant. But if we vote money, as we propose to vote it now, it has to be made up when the budget comes down and has to be made up out of taxes. I think the minister would do well to reduce this amount.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In reply to my hon. friend I cannot quite follow his reasoning when he complains that we are not building more wharves and more piers in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. If my hon. friend has travelled across western Canada he will know that the requirements in those provinces for piers and wharves are not very great.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I made no complaint of that kind. I said those provinces get very little out of this large amount of money.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is very true. Naturally they do not require a large expenditure.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As for the vote, as has been stated before, it is a contingency vote to be used for unforeseen expenditures. As I have already shown the committee the items that make up the total expenditure under this vote are very small in amount, and the suggestion that the minister, or the department should go to the Governor in Council for an order in council for five or six hundred dollars each time an expenditure on a wharf were required would not, I think, meet the approval of the committee. This is the usual vote and it is very necessary to the department to have it. The money is expended with care. As shown by the reports this year when expenditures have not been required they have not been made. I am satisfied, therefore, the committee will be well advised in leaving the estimate as it is. I can assure hon. members that there will be no extravagance in the expenditures, but the money will be there for the use of the department if it is required in the public interest.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister has entirely missed the point of what I said, or intended to say. I did not suggest that there was extravagance in the expenditure, nor did I

suggest that some vote was not necessary. What I did suggest was, that in view of last year's experience too much money was asked for, I said, lop off one-third or lop off one-half. I cannot see what justification the minister has for asking these large amounts when, according to his own showing, much smaller amounts were necessary last year. I made no suggestion that he is running to the Governor in Council for orders in council to authorize small expenditures—nothing of the kind. I said there was no danger in passing an estimate for a smaller amount because, if storms should arise and cause damage or difficulty occur it was always within his power to provide for such emergencies by a Governor General's warrant. I made no suggestion that he run with an order in council every time he wanted a few hundred dollars; but in regard to the order in council question there is this to be said—that with respect to an item of $85,000 that we have just passed he did proceed, without the authority of this parliament, on the strength of an order in council notwithstanding that he and his colleagues when in opposition so roundly denounced that particular course.

Item agreed to.

Portage River—repairs to breakwaters, $600.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Portage river?

Mr. KING: (Kootenay): In Kent county.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec. Bryant's Landing—wharf repairs and reconstruction, $2,700.

Mr. STEVENS: This is a new item, we ought to have an explanation of it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work to be done is the tearing down of the present crib-work at low water level and building a concrete wall all round, building a concrete floor on the top of the wharf, and repairing the road leading to the wharf. The estimated total expenditure is $2,700.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it to be done by day work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I believe so.

Item agreed to.

Cap de la Madeleine—wharf repairs, $3,325.

Mr. STEVENS: We ought to have an explanation of this item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This expenditure is to renew the flooring of the wharf and approach, and to repair the concrete on the lower platform and on the west side of the approach.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Chicoutimi—wharf repairs and rebuilding shed, $29,500.

Mr. STEVENS: Explanation.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is at the request of the district engineer to repair the damage done by fire September 7, 1922. It consists of rebuilding the large shed, "L" shaped, 100 feet each way by 40 feet wide, 19 feet high, replacing crib work and so forth, and moving the temporary shed constructed after the fire.

Item agreed to.

Contrecœur—reconstruction of wharf headblock, $5,500.

Mr. STEVENS: I have asked the minister two or three times if he would spare us the necessity of asking questions. There is no explanation as to what this item is for. I think we should have an explanation of the new items. Was there a tender called for the $5,500? Is it to be done by day work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It consists in removing all the decayed timber of the crib down to extreme low water level, building reinforced concrete wall 4 feet 6 inches at the base, 20 inches at the top, all around the headblock, and laying a 1-foot layer of concrete on the ice-breaker, and a 6-inch concrete flooring on the whole surface of the wharf. The total cost will be $5,000. It will probably be done by day work.

Mr. STEVENS: I understand the general policy of the government is that all work over $5,000 must, under the statute, be done by contract, but that does not necessarily mean that all work under $5,000 shall not be done by contract. Most of the items amounting to $3,000 or $3,500 could be done by contract to the advantage of the government.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I explained to the committee a little while ago that in the case of these repairs it is often difficult to let a contract. The work could be done more satisfactorily under a good foreman by day labour. If it is a renewal of work running over $5,000, the department in all cases, I think, try to have it done by contract, but in the case of repairs it is found they can be carried on better by day labour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister pleads violation of the statute in such a simple form as that? The statute is there. To be told: why it is better to do it the other way, is only to be told that it is better to violate the statute. Why is it better? What is the difficulty in getting tenders for repair work on a wharf when the repair work runs to that sum? I do not see any difference be-

tween the difficulty of the tender system as applied to repairs and as applied to renewals. To merely say that it is better is not any explanation to a fairly intelligent man.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the leader of the Opposition is familiar with the construction of a wharf.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not very.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If he were, he would understand that when you undertake to tear down and remove, or to repair, a wharf, you never know what you are going to find. You may think it is only a small job, and when you get into the interior of the wharf you find the decay has gone further than you expected, and that is the reason why it is better to do the repairs under a competent foreman by day labour. It is hard to estimate what the work will cost until you start to take down the structure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do you intend to recommend an amendment to the statute, or just to violate it and let it go?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised we have a right to do it under the statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are certain conditions that have to be lived up to. Does the minister intend to try to live up to them?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We will try to live up to them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister know what the conditions are?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If it is shown the work can be done more efficiently and more economically by the department, we have, I understand, the right to carry it on in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is subject to certain conditions. I am asking what those conditions are.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think those are the conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. Does the minister want to tell us that when we have a statute saying that in all cases where the expenditure is over $5,000 the work shall be done by tender, it is all right for the minister to do it in some other way if he thinks fit? If that is the statute, I think he should introduce an amendment. But that is not the statute. There are some conditions. The minister should know them. I do not know them as I was never in that department, but I remember a discussion and a statement to the effect that there is some provision whereby the reasons must be set out and must in some way be made known to parliament. I am asking that those conditions should be lived up to.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think that is the condition. I think I have shown, in regard to this repair work, that it is very difficult to estimate and to know the cost and to let contracts, and in the discretion of the minister we have the right to carry on this expenditure by day labour, if we think it can be done more efficiently and more economically than by tender and contract.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give the committee again what is intended by this vote. If he will do so, it will show, I think, very distinctly that his argument does not apply at all. It will show, if I recall it, the construction of a concrete wall and certain other specific works, and the item as it stands is not a repair; it is the reconstruction of a wharf headblock, an absolute work in itself, and certainly should be done by tender and contract. Will the minister be good enough to give the committee, in the light of his rather involved explanation of the statute, the explanation of this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The engineer advised the department that in his opinion this work could be done more economically by day labour. We have not made up our minds in regard to asking for an estimate for the work. I am not in a position to say that tenders will be asked for, but the recommendation of the district engineer is that this work can be done more efficiently and economically by day labour than by contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We should know the reason the engineer gave. On the face of it this is reconstruction and not repair. This is the reconstruction of a wharf, taking the old one down and putting up another. The reason the minister gives in the case of repairs would not apply at all. Just to be told that the engineer says so is not helping the committee. We might as well go home and allow the engineer to run the department with out the review of parliament.

Mr. STEVENS: Could the minister give us the engineer's report. He will have it under his hand.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think I have that recommendation here, but I am told that that is his recommendation.

Mr. STEVENS: Could the minister give us the engineer's recommendation—his reason?

Give us his whole report, so that we can understand it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not any reasons, as far as that is concerned. The engineer reported to me that that was one of the works he suggested could be done more economically by day work than by tender.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the item should stand till we find out what policy the department has followed. Surely the department reviews the reasons of the engineer, and surely this committee should review these reasons in a case where the committee feels that, on the face of it, there appears no reason in the world for departing from the statutory system. All we have been told, after a long series of inquiries, is that the engineer says we had better not follow the statute and had better do the work by day labour. Each question brings the same answer—"This is one of the cases where the engineer says so." What is the committee for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I might ask: What is the engineer for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is there to give his reasons to the minister, and the minister is here to give them to the committee.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The duty of the engineer is to advise the department as to these expenditures, and it is supposed that he is qualified. If not, he should be. On a matter of this kind the department and the minister would naturally accept his advice, unless it was found at times that the engineer was in error or was not carrying on the work properly. As regards the suggestion that the department had adopted a new policy, that is not true. This House has been voting similar supply for many years, and the same manner of departmental treatment has been going on. I do not think we are outside of the statute; I am advised that we are not and that, under the statute, we have power to make expenditures of that character. There is no objection, so far as I can see, to calling for tenders on these items, if the committee should so wish.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister will assure us of that, that will be satisfactory. The minister asks: "What is the engineer for?" The engineer is there to give his recommendations and his reasons therefor. It is the duty of the minister and his deputy to review them and the duty of the minister to give them in the House when they are asked for. If we are here only to hear that the engineer advises this or that, we are superfluous. We cannot deal with every case; but surely this is a case which calls for some explanation, and the minister can give the reasons set forth by the engineer. The recommendation of the engineer in this case might be all right, but we have a right to know what is back of the engineer's recommendation.

Mr. McBRIDE: I have had a good deal to do in connection with building and repairing wharves, and if I did not think the engineer or the man who was put in charge of that work was capable of carrying it out, I do not know that I would have him there at all. If a man gets an architect to draw plans for a house, is the architect not capable of drawing the plans and seeing that the work is properly done? He should be. If he is not, he is not fit to draw the plans. Last spring, we got some repairs done to the Salmon Arm wharf, and as this is in my constituency, I was there a number of times while the work was being done. If tenders had been called for that work, the man who was carrying it on would have put in a bill for accidents; whereas, as the matter was, the engineer put a foreman in charge of the work; the foreman employed his men, and the work was carried out absolutely satisfactorily.

5 p.m.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: This work is very important. I have in my hand the engineer's report, which states that, "this wharf is in a dilapidated condition and must be rebuilt from low water level." This wharf is quite important, because it is the only place around that district where the boat calls for merchandise. The steamer Terrebonne calls at Contrecoeur about six times a week. There is a very heavy traffic from Contrecoeur to Montreal. There are, in the district, two shoe factories doing business to a value of about $350,000 a year, and the raw material received for that manufacture and the finished goods sent out comprise the trade of practically the whole district. There are quite a number of general stores, and the farmers, who also send their products to Montreal, use that wharf. The wharf is in a very dilapidated condition, and, as I can assure my right hon. friend, requires repair.

Mr. STEVENS: We are not questioning the need for repairs. What we are asking for is information. Would the minister now borrow from his colleague the report of the engineer and be good enough to give to the committee the engineer's report which, the minister says, he has not under his hand? I am sure his colleague, two or three desks away, would be glad to lend it to him.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have the engineer's recommendation as to how the work

should be carried on. I have not his report as to how it is being carried on. The engineer recommends that in certain instances the work can be done better by contract and, in others, that it can be done better by day labour. That does not necessarily mean that the work will be done by day labour. That question would be left still, I would think, in the judgment of the chief engineer, who would review those recommendations. For the committee to say that an expenditure of this amount should be by contract and not by day labour would be going a long way, and it might mean that the expenditures of the department would be increased rather than decreased, because it is well known that certain of these works, especially these repair jobs, can be carried on more effectively by day labour than by contract.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister bring down the report of the engineer this evening?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think I have given the report that is in the office now. It is just a list indicating his opinion that this work can be done better by day labour or that work can be done better by contract.

Mr. STEVENS: There is surely no objection to the committee seeing that report.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no objection.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What does my hon. friend wish to know?

Mr. STEVENS: We want to know what is in the report.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The engineer states:

> The following works can be undertaken to better advantage and more economically by day labour than by contract.

And he gives a list in which, I think, is this one, Contrecoeur.

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot understand why there is any objection to giving us the report.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have just given the committee the report.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister read the report to the committee and the reasons of the engineer, and this will probably save a discussion on other items of a similar character.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The committee has been given a number of them, but I have no objection to reading the report. The report states:

> With reference to your memorandum of the 3rd instant concerning the amounts in the Main Estimates, and with particular reference to the amounts provided for the province of Quebec, I beg to report as follows:
>
> 1. Work now under contract.
> 2. Works for which tenders have been received but contracts not yet awarded.
> 3. Works advertised, or yet to be advertised, and for which plans and specifications are ready.
> 4. Works which should be done by contract.

He gives a list of those which should be done by contract. Then he states:

> The following works can be undertaken to better advantage and more economically by day labour.

And he gives a long list of those.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does this one appear in that list?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The recommendation does not comply with the statutes at all. The Public Works Act, section 36, has three subsections. The first part of the section provides that all contracts shall be let by tender. Then there are certain exceptions:

> (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.

It is hardlly suggested that this is one of those cases. I presume the minister claims to come in under (b):

> (b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Does he mean to say that he is going to do this by the officers and servants of the department?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member suggest that that permits day labour and the hiring of men to get the work done?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think a reading of the next subsection will make it clear that the section does not so permit. Subsection (c):

> —where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

There the minister is enabled to get the work done by day labour. But if the cost is over five thousand dollars he can only do the work by the officers and servants of the department That is certainly the intention of section 36. This work runs over five thousand dollars, and if the minister is not in a position to do it by the officers and servants of the department he must do it by tender. Undoubtedly this means the regular officers and servants. If you say it means every one you

want to employ for this special work, then under that interpretation the whole section is gone. It means work in Ottawa where they have officers and servants already in the service of the department; then they can do it even if it is over five thousand dollars. If it is under five thousand dollars he has wider discretion, but when over that amount he is not allowed to go out and simply hire anybody he wants to get that work performed.

Mr. CARROLL: Exception number two does not mean that the officials of this department can go down to the province of Quebec or of Nova Scotia or anywhere else and hire men themselves. They get the work done under foremen. For instance, they have a public works office in the city of Halifax, and I presume they have one or two in each province, and the work is done directly under the supervision of the department's engineers who visit various places where public works are in course of construction. In Nova Scotia there are probably ten engineers whose duty it is to supervise every bit of construction which is let without tender and contract, and in that way I think the minister may come in under subsection 2 of clause 2 of the exceptions, when the work will be done under the supervision of the department's officers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member's interpretation simply repeals the section.

Mr CARROLL: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like to know what is left of the section if the minister can simply say to an engineer, "Hire all the men you like and go to work and do that by day labour." If he can still do that, there is no section left. That is not the meaning of the section at all. The section permits the minister, when the work is under five thousand dollars, to do the work by the officers and servants of the department provided the minister takes the responsibility because owing to the nature of the work he thinks it advisable to do it in that way; but if the cost of the work is over five thousand dollars it must be done by tender, unless it can be done, not under, but by, the "officers and servants of the department." The meaning must be the regular officers and servants of the department, not those employed for the special purpose of doing the work. If they are so employed, and that interpretation is accepted, the section is nothing more or less than a farce.

Mr. CARROLL: Surely the right hon. gentleman does not take the ground that subsection 2 only provides for such work being done actually by the officers and servants of the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Or by tender.

Mr. CARROLL: How would he get the work done?

Mr MEIGHEN: By tender and contract.

Mr. CARROLL: Who would be the tenderer if the work is to be done by the servants of the department? Are the servants of the department allowed to tender for the construction of public works?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member will read the section he will not so argue. Certainly, if by tender, the tenderer can hire anyone; but the minister cannot, and his officers cannot. If the work is over five thousand dollars, then the only way he can avoid doing it by tender is by having the work done by the officers and servants of his department under the conditions named in subsection (b). Once the tender system is adopted, the tenderer will employ whom he likes; that is a different thing altogether. But the option of the minister to employ whom he likes to get the work done is confined to works under five thousand dollars.

Mr. CARROLL: If the minister appoints one of his engineers in the province of Quebec, say, to do this work, the right hon. gentlemen then will agree, I suppose, that the minister comes within the exception of section 2 of the act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he cannot come within section 2 and have it done by an engineer who goes out and employs extra help. Subsection (b) covers a case where the work can be done by the ordinary officers and servants of the department. Subsection (c) allows him to go further, but only in cases under five thousand dollars.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the right hon. gentleman give an example of some work which could be constructed under subsection (b)?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The Privy Council chamber, for example, a few years ago was repaired by the officers and servants of the department under subsection (b). It was not a case of telling an engineer to go out and hire people to do the work; it was done by workmen in the regular employment of the department. The greenhouse is another example. If the act is to be interpreted in the way the hon. member contends for, then the whole section is utterly valueless.

Mr. MARTELL: Cannot the right hon. gentleman point to instances in the department

when sums over five thousand dollars were spent without tender and contract under the administration of the right hon. leader of the Opposition?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Privy Council chamber which my right hon. friend referred to was repaired under the supervision of the architect of the department, who prepared the plans and brought the workmen from Toronto.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He had no right to do so under that section.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister send across the floor the engineer's report that we may have a look at it?

Item stands.

Cross Point—wharf repairs, $3,030.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the particulars?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote is to renew planking of landing slip at outer end of wharf in 4-inch planks; to renew 300 L.F. of cap pieces; to remove ballast from wharf which is lying at foot of slip; to reinforce easterly side of westerly outer wing with pile sheathing and replace ballast which has been swept out through break in sheathing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): None of these matters have been settled as yet.

Item agreed to.

Descente des Femmes—wharf repairs, $2,700.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister give us particulars of these repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to renew six mooring posts, 8,000 feet B.M. of cross ties, 4,000 feet longitudinals, 12,000 feet of stringers, 10,000 feet 3-inch flooring and 2,000 feet of coping.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The name of the place is not very significant geographically. Where is Descente des Femmes?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in Chicoutimi-Saguenay county.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the recommendation as to tender system here?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My right hon. friend has the recommendation across the way now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the deputy will remember.

Item agreed to.

East Templeton, Wharf repairs, $1,420.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before we go any further I may point out that the name of the engineer does not appear in this report. Who is he? It is unsigned but is marked "For Chief Engineer."

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Mr. Cameron.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the official who actually takes the responsibility?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He will take the responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe that he has a decided leaning against the tender system. Some of these amounts run as high as $29,500, $23,500, $20,000, and so on—all to be done by a foreman, I suppose, who employs whom he likes, when he likes and how he likes. There are only four as against about sixty that he recommends to be done by contract.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It would be his opinion that the work can be done more economically that way. These are repairs to structures that are in decay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister intend to recommend the repeal of the statute bearing upon this subject? It might as well not exist, under the interpretation the minister is giving to it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been no change of policy; the statute is being lived up to as heretofore. The same recommendations were made this year as were made last year and the year before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a matter of recommendations. It is all very well to make these general statements, but there appears to be a distinct loosening of the tender system going on. The minister says no; but it is pretty well loosened, that is certain—it is pretty nearly abolished. Here we have all but four cases recommended to be done by day labour. Now, the minister says we do not know, but this is the time the committee must know, or not at all; what is the good of our being told next year that it was done this way or that way? It is too late then; we ought to know when we are voting the money how it is intended to do the work. It is a principle that is at stake; if the department is simply getting rid of the statutory provision, either by slow degrees or fast—and I am inclined to think it is the latter—we ought to know it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have a list submitted by the chief engineer suggesting that these works be done a certain way, and

that list is available to the committee. I will not say the course suggested will be followed; when the matter is finally dealt with it may be considered that many of these works would be better carried out by tender. These are simply the recommendations of the engineer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In order that the minister may be on his guard I would like to point out that, whether intentionally or not I do not know, the recommendation of the engineer does not comply with the statute. The object of the law, which has been on our statute book for a long time, is as far as possible to enforce the system of tender and contract, the method of public competition, in connection with these works. A clause was inserted providing that in the case of all works in connection with which the cost exceeded $5,000, the system of tender and contract should be followed.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): With certain exceptions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Except in the case of the exceptions noted, and the engineer in this case is evidently trying to come within the language of the second of these exceptions. He has reported to the minister, on an unsigned report made by Mr. Cameron, I understand, that the work can be more advantageously done by day labour. Well, that is not what the statute asks him to certify. The statute says that the work shall be done by contract except in cases, in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department. There is nothing in it about day labour.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is all right.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister says it is all right, but I may tell him that when the statute prescribes a certain line of action which must be followed unless certain things happen, those things which happen must come within the language of the statute. The engineer must certify that the work can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department, and I point out to the minister that his engineer has not so certified.

Mr. FORKE: I am not acquainted with the circumstances, but anyone who has had experience in connection with the making of repairs knows that it is pretty difficult to have a contract on repair work. I have no doubt that for many years past this thing has been done exactly the same way—at any rate, I am making a guess; and I would say that if the procedure is contrary to the statute, then some change should be made in the statute. I honestly believe it is impossible in a great many cases—I do not care what line of business it is—to have a contract on repair work.

Mr. STEVENS: I think it would be well for hon. members to know just what that recommendation is, and if the minister will let me have it again I will read it to the committee. In that list we have practically the whole of this vote, about forty items, including several amounts running up to $20,000, $25,000, $29,000. Surely if we are going to open up the way for the carrying out of public works by day labour without tender, without contract and without regard to the statute, it is time we knew it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my hon. friend would like the report read, I will read it for him.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a long list which I think it would be well for the committee to have before it. I refer to the works that it is proposed to carry out by day labour.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Batiscan, wharf improvements, $925. That is repair job, and improvements. Beloeil Village, wharf repairs, $700; Bryant's Landing, wharf repairs and construction, $2,700; Cap Chat, wharf repairs, $1,100; Carleton, wharf repairs, $1,950; Cap de la Madeleine, wharf repairs, $3,325; Cap St. Ignace, wharf repairs, $2,500; Caughnawaga, shelter and wharf repairs, $875; Chicoutimi, wharf repairs and rebuilding shed, $29,500. That vote we passed a little while ago. Fire had destroyed a portion of the wharf and the shed, and this is for reconstruction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister tell the committee why that could not be done by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would be of the opinion that the shed should be built by tender. But there are wharf repairs, too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were repairs necessary after a fire.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Possibly some repairs necessary as a result of fire, others resulting from decay. The engineer sets out here that in his judgment this work can be better done by day labour.

Mr. STEVENS: And that is authority for the minister's so doing!

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Cross Point, wharf repairs, $3,030; Desjardins, wharf repairs, $765;

East Templeton, wharf repairs, $1,420; Fabre, wharf repairs, $600; Father Point, wharf improvements, $5,500; Fassett, wharf repairs, $2,000; Fort William, wharf repairs, $950; Fox river, wharf repairs, $1,900; Grindstone, wharf repairs, shed repairs and breastwork extension, $2,050; Grand Mechins, wharf repairs, $1,350; Grosse Isle, wharf, repairs, $1,250; Iberville, wharf repairs, $850; Lanoraie, wharf reconstruction, $5,500; Lavaltrie, reconstruction of wharf and approach, $2,300; L'Islet, wharf repairs, $23,500.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the minister consider it reasonable to do that by day work simply because the engineer recommends it in his report? The amount is $23,500.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It would be a matter for the departmental heads to consider in consultation with the chief.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When will the committee be advised what the department is going to do?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the ordinary course that would be next session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: After it is done. It would be valuable then.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend would like to have it appear that we have changed the policy of the department in this matter. That is not true. There is no change of policy.

Mr. STEVENS: You have just enlarged it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is the policy that has been followed, and it would seem to be a reasonable policy. Surely these men that we employ must have some knowledge and should be able to advise us whether it is better to do this work by day labour or by contract. Does my hon. friend require me to continue with this list?

Mr. STEVENS: Take those above $5,000. We do not object to those under $5,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Pointe-a-Elie, wharf repairs, $5,850; Riviere Ouelle, wharf repairs, $5,600; Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi, repairs to wharf, $8,500. I think that is all.

Mr. STEVENS: There is $20,000 for wharf reconstruction at Rimouski. Does the minister consider it reasonable to do that by day work?

Mr. KING: It would depend on the information we have.

Mr. JACOBS: I am not advocating the violation of the law which declares that where the work will exceed $5,000 tenders should be called for, but if we are doing this we are simply following the lines of the opposition when they were in the government, when Mr. Ballantyne was permitted to build his government merchant marine or a large number of those vessels, running into millions of dollars, without any tenders at all being called for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows better than that. They were not under the Public Works Act to begin with. They were built in strict conformity with the item which parliament passed authorizing them to be built, and furthermore, were built in the only way they could be built. Anybody knows you could not possibly submit to tender the building of vessels like that, owing to the difference in the facilities of the various docks in this country, and besides, in no country in the world are vessels of that character or vessels of any character built by tender, neither in the United States nor in Great Britain; and that by means of the method adopted there and the conditions that were imposed the vessels were built on an equality as to price with even those built in Great Britain, built in Scotland on the Clyde, and built at $20 per ton less than vessels of inferior quality were built for at the same time in the United States. The point is this: They could not have been built in any other way. The conditions did not permit it; the act did not call for it. The authority of parliament was strictly complied with in every regard. But in this case we claim that the authority of parliament is not complied with.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How much money was saved to the country by building those ships under that system?

Mr. MEIGHEN: About $20 per ton on sixty-three vessels; the hon. member can compute it for himself. It would amount to many millions, and what is more, they were well built. We are not in the position of the United States to-day of having them up for repair on account of poor construction. The reports show that every one of them was well constructed, and at an average of $20 per ton less than theirs which were poorly constructed. There has not been a better piece of work done by this country in so far as cheapness of construction is concerned.

Mr. JACOBS: They all went to pieces on the first opportunity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not one of them has gone to pieces. I defy the hon. member and his ministers to produce a report to this House of the faulty construction of one of these vessels.

Mr. JACOBS: Practically half a dozen of them are now at the bottom of the sea, due, it is claimed, to faulty construction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are lots of good vessels at the bottom of the sea—the Lusitania, and others as well. That is not the fault of the vessel. The vessels were well constructed, as everybody in this country knows, and what is more, the time will come when hon. gentlemen opposite who derided and decried them will be standing up in this House and claiming to be the fathers of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine. We have had experiences like that before.

On this item, when the minister makes his very general statement, I think it would be well for him to bring instances in support of it. Of course, I know that items under $5,000 were done this way under previous governments, and that items over $5,000 were done this way, but there was never brought to my attention a case over $5,000 where it was not brought strictly within the meaning of subsection (b). If there was, I would like the minister to bring it forward, and not take refuge behind a very general assertion. As long as he does that, I take no exception at all. It is not, of course, an argument to say when you are violating the law, that it has been violated before. If the minister thinks that, he should have the law amended. We do not object to ordinary repairs being done that way. Ordinary repairs come under $5,000 almost always.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Pretty nearly always. There may be cases where they go over, I admit that; but there is no great difficulty in getting that work done by tender and contract. When you get away from tender and contract the door is open to abuses of all kinds, and that is why the act was passed, and it is the duty of this House and of the opposition to see that the act is complied with or to get complete reasons from the minister why any exceptions are made and to see that they come within the exceptions as provided in the statute. That is the duty of parliament. That is all we are trying to do. We are not trying to harass the minister, but if we are going to say any time the minister tells us "The engineer told us to do it this way, that is enough for the committee," all well and good. But it is not enough for the committee. We want to know, and it is our duty to know, whether these cases come within the three exceptions the act provides for, and that is all we are trying to do.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. HATFIED: I think I can supply the leader of the Opposition with a case where there was an item in the estimates of $10,000 for the extension of a breakwater, all new work that was done by day labour under the old administration, and wisely and properly so, I think. That was at Bluff Head breakwater in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what year?

Mr. HATFIELD: I think it was in 1919-1920.

Item agreed to.

Grand River—Wharf extension, $29,000.

Mr. STEVENS: We ought to have a statement from the minister in regard to this work.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This revote of $29,000 is required to continue the construction of a cribwork extension along the front, a distance of 65 ft. by a width of 24 ft. and a heighth of 26½ ft., and down the south side for a distance of 99 ft. by a width of 20 ft., the extension, when completed, to have a landing face along the front of 65 ft. and along the south side of 123 ft., the portion of construction under water to be built with creosoted timber; and to raise the height of the present wharf by an average of 6 ft. on a length of 261 ft.

Mr. STEVENS: Is the work being done by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will be under contract.

Mr. STEVENS: An item of $3,000 has been already spent. This is a revote. Has the contract been let? If so when, to whom, and at what figure?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, the contract has not been let as yet.

Mr. STEVENS: How much work has been done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been an expenditure of $2,814. I have not the details of that expenditure; I will advise my hon. friend later if he wishes to get that information.

Mr. STEVENS: It is rather a peculiar circumstance. Here is work to be done by contract and approximately $3,000 has been already spent. The work has been commenced, and is under way, but there is no contract. My hon. friend was trying to make a case a moment ago in support of the rather extraordinary stand he took respecting entering into contracts and the difficulty of making them, but certainly he is raising an almost

insuperable obstacle by starting to work spending a portion of the money by day labour, and then saying that at some time when the work is in progress he will ask for tenders and award a contract. That is a most extraordinary course to pursue. It is a large item. The sum of $32,000 was voted last year and $29,000 is a revote. This is certainly work which should be done by contract after calling for tenders.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have my notes on this matter now and I see that a small expenditure was made last year with a view to holding the structure together and permitting it to be carried over for another year.

Mr. STEVENS: Will tenders be called for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is on the list of works for which tenders will be called.

Item agreed to.

Grondines—Wharf, $50,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give us an explanation of this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is required to carry to completion the contract awarded the Doran Construction Co., Ltd. of Ottawa for the construction of a wharf 300 ft. long by 22 ft. wide, consisting of two concrete walls filled with rock, tied together with 1½ inch tie rods and surfaced with bituminous macadam, the whole resting on a solid rock foundation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will this amount complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No it will not complete it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much more will be needed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will take about $130,000 to complete the structure.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When was the work started?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract was let October 7.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I understand the matter aright the House last year appropriated $12,000 for this work. Now, apparently, a contract has been let running into how much money?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract has been let for the work that was undertaken last year. There will be a further contract for the amount this year. The contract was let by tender, and there were some nine tenders, the lowest tender being $15,586.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The whole work when completed will run into what amount of money?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): About $130,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was the House informed last session that any such work was in contemplation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I imagine so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My recollection is otherwise.

Mr. STEVENS: Have tenders been called for the second contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One hundred and thirty thousand dollars is a very large item, especially on a vote of $12,000 for the commencement. I think the minister should give us some explanation as to the grounds upon which this immense expenditure appealed to the department as a necessary expenditure, what the country is going to get for all this outlay, how much is to be spent each year, and when the work is to be completed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This matter has been under the consideration of the department, I think, for some time. The district engineer reports on the subject as follows:

> There is no deep water wharf between Batiscan and Quebec; all the wharves in this section are tidal wharves. Therefore it is absolutely important, if not imperative, to have a deep water wharf at this place, for the accommodation of the public, and to facilitate the importation of this important district.
>
> At the present the steamer Etoile, plying between Montreal and Quebec, and the steamer St. Croix, plying between Quebec and St. Jean Deschaillons, land at Grondines when the water is sufficiently high, but do not stop when the water is too low. By this fact, the exporters are never sure whether the boat will stop or not, and very often, this is a cause of serious losses for them when their shipments consist in perishable merchandise such as cheese, butter, meat, etc.
>
> The parishes interested in the general traffic of the proposed wharf are, St. Ubald, St. Marc, St. Alban, St. Thuribe, St. Casimir and Grondines, representing a total population of about 8,500 inhabitants. The welfare of the trade and commerce, and the general production to the above mentioned places depend on the shipping facilities and accommodation by water.
>
> The exports consist of farm and dairy products, meat, vegetables and general merchandise, etc., which may average when a deep water wharf is built, from 3,500 to 4,000 tons per season.
>
> The imports consist of the necessities of life for the above-mentioned population, and average 20 tons per week, but will increase considerably when the deep water wharf is built.
>
> The proposed deep water wharf is a public necessity, and if not built, it would be most detrimental to the general production of this community.

That is the report we have from our district engineer on the advisability and the necessity for this wharf.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year parliament was asked to appropriate for this wharf $12,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This year parliament is asked to appropriate $50,000, and of that $12,000 is a revote, so that up to the present time, if I understand it aright, nothing has been spent on the vote.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A contract has been let for $15,000 odd.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When the vote was before parliament last session, did the minister give any information at all to the House or the committee as to the extent of the work on which he was starting, or which he had in contemplation, when the vote of $12,000 was passed? The minister will understand that an item of $12,000 might go through with very little discussion or consideration on the mere statement, but when we know that the contemplated work will run to $130,000 or $150,000, a much more serious condition arises. Did the minister, when the $12,000 was voted last year, inform the committee or the House of the expenditure which he had in contemplation? My recollection is that no information was given.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my information is correct, this matter was in the supplementary estimates last year, and I do not know that we were asked for an explanation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister surely would not need to be asked to let the House know the significance of a vote when the consequence was so vital as that. The House naturally assumes that what is asked for is all that is wanted, unless the House is informed differently.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But the point is this: Does the hon. minister think it proper practice, or is it treating the House or committee with proper respect, to allow an item to appear without giving us information? A very small sum might be placed in the estimates, say $1,000, for what might appear a very ordinary work. The results would be that it would not be very much questioned. No question at all might be asked, but the government or the minister might have in contemplation a work involving millions of dollars. In the interval, contracts could be let in respect to the money voted, not confined to the item voted. Last year we voted $12,000 for this item, but in the interval the minister has let a contract for $15,000, exceeding the amount voted, which I complain of, and which I think the House has a right to complain of. We were evidently entering into a work of some significance, involving a very large expenditure of public money, at a time when we were all assured in this House and in the newspapers that this economic government was not launching on any large or any new expenditures for public works. This is the way in which this matter was launched by an innocent, insignificant $12,000 with no information, and consequently little discussion and no inquiry. I protest, Mr. Chairman, that that is not treating the House or the committee with proper respect. I appeal to the minister to know whether in his own opinion we should not have had the fullest information, if he had at that time in contemplation a work of this magnitude.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I might say I had the information last year, just as I have now, when the vote was before the House. I do not think any explanation was asked for or offered. There was no desire to mislead the House. The work is important and necessary for the district which is a large farming district. It is required in the public interest. It is true we are not voting the total sum. We would like to do that if we could, but we vote this year an additional sum, and hope to come to parliament next year for a sum to complete it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says he has no intention of deceiving the House, but the House is inevitably misled through the omission of the minister. When a $12,000 item appears in the estimates, the presumption is that that is what is required for the work. Now, we are told it is going to cost from $130,000 to $150,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I said $130,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is one of the figures I mentioned. I fancy $150,000 will likely be next year's figures, but taking $130,000, that is ten times the amount, that was voted last year. Why should we have to ask for something that the minister obviously should tell the House? If he does not tell the House, the House is misled. The House had no reason in the world to assume that that was the commencement of an undertaking that would cost $130,000.

Mr. DUFF: It might be quite possible that the minister did not give to the House last year all the information in regard to this work, but I do not think it lies in the mouth of the leader of the Opposition to criticize either the minister or the govern-

ment for doing it that way. I remember distinctly the matter referred to a moment ago, the vote for the construction of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The first vote was $25,000,000, although the government wasted $80,000,000 in the construction work, but when the first money was asked for very little information was given to the House. We were not told that 63 ships were to be built, and we were only asked for $25,000,000. The next year Mr. Ballantyne was minister and instead of asking for $80,000,000, he only asked for $30,000,000. The following year he asked for another vote, if I remember correctly, of $20,000,000, and the following year a vote of $8,000,000, which was put through by closure, when the right hon. gentleman was the leader of the government.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not know just why hon. members opposite will inject into the discussion to-day a debate which occupied the attention of this House time and again, and which I think, all fair-minded people will agree was settled without any discredit whatever to the then government. As a matter of fact, this discussion took place in the House on two or three occasions. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), the hon. Speaker of the House (Mr. Lemieux) then, a very prominent member of the opposition, my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), I think, and two or three other very prominent members on the other side of the House, commended the government. The former leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) was a member of the government when the contract was entered into. The war was proceeding at the time. The only possible reflection, or excuse for a reflection, upon that contract was that the war collapsed, and because the war collapsed sooner than people expected the ships were not then as much needed as when the government undertook their construction.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that the contracts for those ships were let after the war?

Mr. STEVENS: Every one of those contracts was let before the conclusion of the war.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member is absolutely wrong.

Mr. STEVENS: It is true the construction of all the boats was not commenced until after the conclusion of the war; of that there is no doubt, but that has nothing to do with the question before the House at the present time. If we are going to have a debate on that whole question, let us have the debate with all the facts before us. Let us discuss the important question if it is necessary to do so, but to raise a remnant, in a distorted fashion, of a debate held two or three or four sessions ago, in order to protect the minister on the item we are discussing to-day, and discussing, I think, in a fair manner without any intentional recrimination of any kind, I think is very poor tactics indeed. Now in regard to this item we have before us, the House was asked for a vote of $12,000. No explanation, as far as we can learn, was given to the House at the time. The minister replies "Well, I do not remember any explanation being asked for." Three or four times this afternoon I have had to suggest to the minister, in the most courteous possible way, that he should give to the House as we go along a general outline of what these new items are for. The minister did not give an explanation unless we persisted in asking for it. We were quite willing to facilitate the passing of the estimates; but now we are confronted with what certainly appears, I think, like a lack of courtesy to the committee. That is what occurred last year, and we do not know but what in these items which we have been passing, similar incidents will occur or will be discovered next year. The minister should certainly give the committee a more complete explanation of this appropriation than he has already done. There is a contract for $15,000. Will the minister explain what the contract is and what portion of the work is included in that contract?

Mr. DUFF: I think I was quite justified in making a comparison between the way in which this government was letting those contracts or doing the work and that of the old government. The leader of the Opposition brought the matter up. We on this side of the House did not bring it up.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member's hon. friend across the floor brought it up.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) made the remark that all the contracts for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine were made when the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne brought down his first estimates.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not say that at all.

Mr. DUFF: What did the hon. member say? That is exactly what he said.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I did not.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member said that all the money was voted and the contracts let and brought down when the first vote was asked for.

Mr. STEVENS: I made no such statement.

Mr. DUFF: The truth is that the last contract was made in 1920 and the first vote was asked for in 1918. It seems to me that there is absolutely no difference except that on that occasion the total amount was $80,000,000, and the total cost of this work is $130,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like, when I am chasing a bear, to be diverted by a rabbit trail—

Mr. DUFF: My right hon. friend would run from a bear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But in this case the distinction is important to the House.

Mr. DUFF: He would scare the bear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want any member of the House to feel that I am saying that in bringing down every estimate, you should bring down the whole amount required to complete the work for which that estimate provides. I am not saying that at all. The invariable practice of parliament has been to bring down the amount required for the year, but to state to parliament the total commitment the government is entering upon, toward which this is a contribution. In the case of the mercantile marine the government came down in 1918 with a programme for a certain construction and not for the whole amount of money required for that construction. The government got the amount of money required, told parliament exactly the number of vessels, the tonnage and the estimated cost. Then in 1919, the government deciding on an extension of that, got the unanimous approval of parliament, without a single criticism, for a further programme and secured the vote required for expenditure that year. In 1920, there was some little objection; but the great row was raised in 1921, when the vessels were nearly completed, no further contracts being asked for, and no further programme, but merely a completion of what parliament had unanimously agreed to. What I am emphasizing is this: In every case the government told parliament the whole commitment into which parliament was entering when asking for the amount that would be required for that year. I am complaining that the minister did not do that last year. It is impossible now to remedy that default; but I would impress this on the minister, that he should never come to parliament and let the House assume that that is all the commitment of the country that we are entering into in relation to that estimate, merely taking refuge under the fact that no question was asked. It is his duty to let parliament know the significance of an estimate. I ask the minister if that is not reasonable. I am prepared to let this go if the minister will agree to that. He should let parliament know the significance of an estimate whether questioned or not.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I quite agree with my hon. friend. That is true. The expenditure, last year, of $12,000, with the $15,000 tenders received, will construct the first section of this wharf. The additional sum asked is to carry on and continue another section. This is a large structure. We did not go beyond our authority in the vote given us last year. I quite agree with my right hon. friend that it would have been better—and I would have done so if the matter had occurred to me—to have informed the committee as to the commitment.

Mr. STEVENS: Let me read to the committee what occurred last year when these estimates were up:

> Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—$236,785.
>
> Sir Henry Drayton: Just one question. I take it from what my right hon. friend has said that these are for essential repairs. You are not going on with new works?
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: There may be one or two very small exceptions, but the votes would be for work that has been long standing and should really have been undertaken before this.
>
> Sir Henry Drayton: There are some extensions here—$32,000.
>
> Mr. King (Kootenay): Not extensions, but necessary additions. It is not new work.
>
> Item agreed to.

The opening was there for the explanation; the request for information was all there, and yet that was the answer—that no new work was being undertaken, no extensions, but just ordinary repairs.

Mr. JACOBS: Is that the $12,000 item?

Mr. STEVENS: That is the item included in the supplementary estimates.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering the item on page 37 of the Estimates, Grondines wharf, $50,000. Shall the item carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) had the floor at six o'clock. I think he intended to make some severe strictures on the government in connection with this item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I suggest we let the item stand for the present.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I find the minister was right in stating that last year the item of $12,000 for this wharf did not come up in the supplementary estimates. Unfortunately the supplementary estimates for harbours and rivers, Quebec, amounting to $236,785 went through with very, very little discussion, but what discussion did take place would certainly lead one to believe that no new works of any importance were contemplated by the government. The discussion will be found at page 3545 of the Hansard of last session. The item was called in the lump sum, and the discussion was as follows:

Sir Henry Drayton: Just one question. I take it from what my right hon. friend has said that these are for essential repairs. You are not going on with new works?

Mr. Mackenzie King: There may be one or two very small exceptions, but the votes would be for work that has been long standing and should really have been undertaken before this.

Sir Henry Drayton: There are some extensions here—$32,000.

Mr. King (Kootenay): Not extensions, but necessary additions. It is not new work.

Item agreed to.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): What item were we referring to then?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The whole item in the supplementary estimates for harbours and rivers, Quebec, involving a total of $236,785, the particulars of which are to be found at page 9 of the supplementary estimates of last session. In that list is the item of $12,000 for this particular wharf. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when that item came before the House last session with the practical assurance of the Prime Minister, who happened to be in the chamber at the time, that no new works of any importance would be undertaken, any one then present would naturally conclude that this was one of the small works in his contemplation when he replied to my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton), or that it was merely a repair or extension of some old work. There was nothing in the information given to the committee by the Minister of Public Works, there was nothing afforded by the discussion, to lead us to believe that we were launching on a work of considerable magnitude. I am not in a position to judge whether this work is or is not a proper work for the locality. I heard the statement from the minister this afternoon that it would serve a scattered population of about 8,500.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I made the statement that it would serve an agricultural population of 8,500.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, if it is an agricultural population I may assume it must be a more or less scattered population. It is not a population contained in a town or city.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To serve that community of 8,500 a proposal such as we had last session to expend $12,000 would certainly not be inappropriate. I am inclined to think that when the minister brought down his estimate last session he himself felt that $12,000 would be about the right amount for a wharf for that community. After having obtained the authority of parliament to expend that money, in the interval he has let a contract for $15,000 for this work, which is not very far wide of the mark; but he comes to parliament this session with the first information we get on the subject, namely, that the work is or soon will be under construction and will cost in the neighborhood of $130,000. That is a large expenditure for a government that announced that it was not going to spend large sums on new works. It may be a proper expenditure; I am not in a position to judge that, but the manner in which the vote was passed last year could hardly be called a proper one. Hon. members are entitled to be given the facts in regard to these matters; surely the committee is entitled to know what is in the minister's mind when he launches a proposal of this kind. If, as I believe, the minister contemplated last session an expenditure of only $12,000 on this work, his course to-day should be to say so rather than to put in $50,000 for this year and then say that the ultimate cost is to be about $130,000. We know that these estimates are generally overrun; in all probability even that proposed expenditure will be increased by another 25 per cent for additions, extras, and the like, before the work is completed. I want to register my protest in respect to the manner in which this matter was brought before the House and dealt with last session, without a single particle of information to enable us to judge whether we were voting correctly or incorrectly or whether we were spending money wisely or unwisely. I have no desire in any away to reflect on the minister in this matter, but I do not want to see such a system gain ground in this House, and in order to make my protest as strong as I can I propose to move that this item be reduced to the sum of $15,000, which is the amount for which I understand, a contract has been let.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I quite agree, as I did this afternoon, with the statement of the right hon. leader of the Opposition that an explanation should have been given to parliament last year, but in the rush that took place the statement was not made. Not one dollar of the $12,000 that was voted last year has been spent. A contract has been let. It is in the province of the government to cancel it and pay damages to the contractor. But we are in a position to-day to give the explanation that should have been given last year; in fact, I did give it this afternoon. This work is important to the community it will serve, and the government believes it is justified in asking parliament now for another $50,000 with which to proceed with it. Nothing having been so far expended, the whole matter is open for discussion and review, but from the reports we have in the department I submit that this is a necessary public work and that it should receive the support of parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute that the work may be of use, but is there no relationship between use and cost? At first sight, passing by entirely the question of the way the vote was obtained last year and accepting the minister's statement that it was not obtained in the proper way, that is to say—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I did not state that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not mean improper in the moral sense, but that it was not obtained in the right way; an explanation should have been given and the facts made known to the House. I accept the minister's statement in that regard and pass it over. But on the surface it does not look justifiable to have a $130,000 wharf when, according to the minister's own statement, there are only 8,500 people in the community it will serve, and they not engaged in anything that particularly requires ocean transport. I do not say that the community does not require a wharf; no doubt it does. But the amount suggested is about $13 or $15 per head for the wharf alone. If the minister goes on that principle, how much is it going to cost to string the whole province with wharves? Will the minister make it clear just what facilities these people have now? What have they been doing all along to get their produce to market? What is going to be the saving to them per annum on account of the wharf being built, taking into account, of course, the fact that they will still be at some expense? Will the minister tell the circumstances as they exist without the wharf and then state the advantages that are expected to accrue to that small number of people from the building of it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think I gave the information to the committee this afternoon. My hon. friend speaks of 8,500 people. It is true that it is an agricultural community, the shipments from it being largely the products of the farm. They are a great distance from their markets, Quebec and Montreal. They have been using a wharf which serves at certain heights of water, and it is proposed to build a wharf that will afford them communication with these large centres during the summer season. We have investigated the matter very carefully since last session and we are satisfied that the proposed expenditure is a proper one.

Mr. CANNON (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on the motion of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I wish, as a member for one of the ridings of the Quebec district, to express my great astonishment at the sense of economy displayed by the ex-Minister of Militia just at a time when it is proposed to carry out public works in the province of Quebec. I should have liked, and I think the majority of the members of this committee are also of the same opinion, that this sense of economy, no doubt inspired by the public interest, should have rather existed in the hon. member at the time of the general elections in 1921. Indeed, very large contracts suddenly became necessary in the riding of the hon. member at the last general election, and, if I am not mistaken, a sum of almost $50,000 was spent during the campaign so as to enable the hon. member to further represent his electors. I might suggest to the hon. member not to try and economize always at the expense of the same people, but to allow the government to make the expenditures which are actually needed. Grondines is one of the most flourishing parishes of the beautiful county of Portneuf, and if the hon. member for Wellington were to visit that place I have no doubt that he would be the first to withdraw his objections. Those places are highly populated and prosperous, they are parishes where the wharves are of the greatest usefulness and all expenditure made there at present is in the interest of the public. Certainly, like the hon. member, I favour a sound economy, but economy in the public interest is part of a reasonable and sound policy, and it would be useless for the government to try and practise economy

by not spending a few thousand dollars where it is necessary to keep in repairs wharves for which large sums have been spent. I think the hon. member could, during the present session, practise his sense of economy to a greater advantage if he proposed, for instance, to decrease the expenditures which are made in the harbour of Toronto, where there will never exist a satisfactory harbour, rather than oppose expenditures on public works in the province of Quebec, for the parishes bordering the St. Lawrence river, where the wharves, as I mentioned a few moments ago, are necessary and useful and where this expenditure will evidently be for the public welfare.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. member persuaded the minister to give us the information we asked for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I hope my right hon. friend is now convinced that this public work is a necessity.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am sorry that I could not follow my hon. friend for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) in the remarks which he has just made, but this I was able to gather, that he is in some way or other under the impression that my objection to this particular item was that it pertained to the province of Quebec, and I think he said it would be better if I directed my attention to Ontario.

The only criticism I have offered on these estimates so far has been in respect of the harbour improvements generally in the Maritime provinces. I am not objecting to the item as an item, nor do I regard the fact as important whether it applies to Quebec or any other province. What I am objecting to is the principle. I am afraid that a system may grow up or is growing up whereby a minister or a government can pass an insignificant vote through parliament and start some considerable work, and then come back to parliament the following year and ask for more money to carry on the work, whereas had parliament had full knowledge of the situation when the first vote was asked it might never have been authorized. The same thing applies to half-a-dozen items we have passed this afternoon for public works. They are evidently new works. Nothing was voted for them last year. We have passed them in the belief that the two or three or four or five thousand dollars which is presented in the estimates was the final amount required. Now it may be that some of these items are only the entering wedge, the beginning of a heavy expenditure.

What I wish to point out particularly is this, that if the minister at the time he brings in his estimates has in contemplation the expenditure of a large sum of money on any public work, he should first make the facts known to the House when he asks for the initial amount required. In this case that was not done. I am satisfied that in this case the House voted $12,000 last session believing that they were voting that sum for a wharf for this particular locality, and I believe it is news to every hon. member on this side of the House that the $12,000 was only the beginning of the matter and that it is going to cost at least $130,000 before this wharf is in place. It matters not whether it is in Ontario or Quebec or any other part of Canada; the place is a matter of no consequence.

Mr. CANNON: Is not the item under consideration Item No. 157?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. It is Grondines wharf, $50,000.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item on page 38, resolution No. 157.

Mr. CANNON: And that resolution covers the province of Quebec.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am only objecting to the first item at the top of page 38 of the Estimates. I am not criticising the other items. I am directing myself entirely to this one, and to a practice which has sprung up, and which I trust will not go any further. As I said in my opening remarks, it is to protest against that practice that I move that this vote be reduced.

Mr. POWER: If the hon. member objects to the principle involved in the vote of this money, and not to the particular item, why does he not move that this whole resolution for harbours and rivers be struck out? Then he would not be in the position of having the criticism made that he has selected a particular place in the province of Quebec and made that his target.

Mr. MARTELL: He does not like Quebec or Nova Scotia.

Mr. POWER: Why does he not move to cut out the whole resolution?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Because I do not think the whole of it is objectionable. I have agreed to pass item after item.

Mr. POWER: But it is a question of principle.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think any one either in the government or outside can con-

scientiously support this practice. The minister has to excuse it himself. He says the vote last year was rushed through in the last days of the session.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Did you not agree to it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did through ignorance because the information was not given me at the time. That is what I complain of. I say that the principle is a bad one. We have passed item after item to-day and the same thing may occur next year with regard to them. The minister may come back next year to say that parliament authorized these expenditures of two or three or four thousand dollars this year and that that was only the beginning. I know it is the practice of the department and has been for twenty-five years, whether the practice be good or bad, that when a vote for a public work passes this House the department goes ahead and lets contracts irrespective of the amount voted by parliament, the assumption being that the House has committed itself to the principle of the work, and if we vote ten or twenty or twenty-five thousand to-day the department will go ahead and let contracts for $100,000 or $150,000. That has been the practice for the last twenty-five years to my knowledge.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That has not been done in this case. If there is any objection to this particular item, the matter is in the power of this House. We have only let a contract for $15,000 on a vote of $12,000 passed last year. We have not abused our privileges. We have inquired into the matter and satisfied ourselves that this is a proper vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister will see this, that if on a vote of $12,000 you can let a contract for $15,000, surely the same reason applies and you could let a contract for $50,000 on the same vote.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): But it was not done.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know, but during the last twenty-five years it has been done time and time again on the assumption that when parliament votes the money it approves the work. Then the department goes ahead and carries out the work. If that is a good practice, and it always has been the practice in my time at least, then on each of these items for two or three or four thousand dollars, contracts might be let and new works undertaken and the House in the meantime have no knowledge of what the ultimate expenditure is going to be. What I complain of is that what we did, we did in the dark. We should have had the information. The minister should have come down to the House with a new proposal and candidly said: This is a new proposal to complete a work which will ultimately cost $130,000.

Mr. CANNON: In answer to my hon. friend, who claims that this is a matter of principle and that his criticism is not applied to any particular province, I would draw his attention to this fact: Resolution No. 154 "Harbours and rivers" applies to Nova Scotia. This was passed without any objection, I understand, from my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh, no; it was not, I criticised it.

Mr. CANNON: Resolution No. 155 "Harbours and rivers" applies to Prince Edward Island; resolution No. 156 "Harbours and rivers" applies to New Brunswick; resolution No. 157 "Harbours and rivers" applies to Quebec and is now under consideration. The most peculiar feature of the case, however, is this: My hon. friend professes a desire to protect a principle in the public interest, but his objection to the conduct of the Public Works department is only awakened or aroused when we reach this particular item No. 157 which covers public works in the province of Quebec. If my hon. friend really wishes to fight for a principle why does he not, as suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Power), move an amendment which would apply to all the items generally, so that a reduction of expenditure would be required in all cases and not simply in the case of the province of Quebec? If my hon. friend does that he will have a better chance of making good his claim that he is fighting for a principle, and not merely trying to reduce public expenditure in the province of Quebec notwithstanding the smallness of the amount involved.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Dorchester is an intelligent man.

Mr. CANNON: Thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think he could have been in the House for any very considerable length of time prior to six o'clock or he would not have made this address. I do not think it is worthy of him, endeavouring to make out of this instance a case of prejudice on the part of members of this House against his province.

Mr. CANNON: If my right hon. friend will allow me, I am not trying to make a case, I am trying to help my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) to modify his position so as not to lend himself to misinterpretation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to assure the hon. member that when his ingenuity is applied to the creation of that misinterpretation, it would take a very skilful man indeed to find a method of avoiding it. He argues that because we apply our objection to this resolution 157 we are consequently animated by prejudice against his province. The objection raised, and the point has been conceded by the minister, was against the practice which developed only in this single instance applied not to resolution 157 but only one item in it namely: the Grondines wharf. In relation to that the minister admitted that he obtained last year a vote of $12,000 without giving to parliament, or to the committee of parliament, the vital fact that the $12,000 was only for a commencement, and that the whole work would cost $130,000. The protest of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is against that fact. It has not been revealed that that practice was adopted—it may have been but it has not been revealed that it was —except in regard to this Grondines wharf and objection could not be applied to other items in resolution 157, or to resolutions 156 and 154; the ground of objection relates only to the one item. Objections in relation to the Nova Scotia estimates were taken on other grounds and protests were made. It is only in connection with this particular item that we object on the ground stated; and I find some hon. members, in more articulate and dignified form, or more frequently, protesting that we are prejudiced against Nova Scotia. How foolish this is. We object to such a practice. I must commend the minister. He was rather frank in the matter; he admitted it was not the right practice. I accept that statement and only hope it will not be repeated.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I have personal knowledge of what took place when the item for this work was voted last year because I happened to occupy the Chair at that time. The item came up in the Supplementary Estimates in the closing days of the session, and with the exception of one or two questions the whole of the items were adopted without discussion of any kind. It has been the experience for many years when these things are done, that a certain amount is voted to begin the work, and the work is continued the year following, and so on, until the contract is completed. It has been suggested here over and over again that we might adopt a system, which I am told exists in England, by which when the estimates are prepared and a new work is undertaken a statement is made out showing the details of the work, what it will cost and so on, and the members can see at a glance exactly how the matter stands. If members will look through Hansard in past years they will find that with respect to any particular item very little information is given unless a question has been put concerning it; and the estimates themselves only state the amount to be expended during the year, or the amount voted the year previous. Whether there should not be a change in our present system is a matter which is well worth consideration.

With respect to this particular item I can say with respect to Grondines, which is forty miles from Quebec, that there is there a tide of fifteen feet, and a twelve or fifteen thousand dollar wharf there is out of the question entirely. It is a place much frequented during the summer season by the market boats of Quebec, and by the boats running to the south shore of the St. Lawrence. It has a population of over 8,000 people and is one of the most productive districts situated near the city of Quebec. Not far from Grondines is Donnacona where there is now one of the largest pulp mills in the province. The district is developing very rapidly, and if anything of substantial value in the way of a wharf is to be provided at that particular point, we must construct a wharf that will stand. The tides of the St. Lawrence at that place are tremendous, and a twelve or fifteen thousand dollar wharf is out of the question there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the pulp mill to which my hon. friend has referred use this wharf?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It is a benefit to the district I am told. Grondines is the nearest place to that settlement. As a result of the erection of the pulp mill the whole district is developing very considerably.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the pulp mill use this wharf?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I cannot state that, but I do know that the whole district has benefited very considerably from the erection of the mill in question. I think the committee should adopt this item on the assurance which the minister has given that the matter will be thoroughly investigated, and if the expenditure is not justified no other outlay will be involved except that under the contract now entered into. At a subsequent session, when a further amount will be necessary if the work is to be pursued, the committee with fuller information will be in a position to pass judgment on the matter. I think we should not hastily pronounce on it now with the limited information in our pos-

session, especially when the minister has assured us that the whole matter will be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. GUTHRIE: With that understanding I have no objection to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FORKE: I think the manner in which this vote has been submitted to the House is wrong both in principle and in practice. However, the Minister of Public Works has admitted that it was not a right thing to do and I think we should accept his explanation. I would like to add that I believe the leader of the Opposition and the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) have done a good service in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee. As I said before I believe it is a wrong practice. I can easily see where the principle might be abused and work carried on from year to year in an irregular manner, if the appropriations could be obtained in such a way without parliament being cognizant of all the facts. I should like very well if the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) would withdraw the amendment, because I will vote for the item as it stands in the estimates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will withdraw it.

Mr. DELISLE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the atttention of the committee to the fact that this wharf will be built in the interest of the agricultural class. Not only the farmers of Grondines have signed a petition requesting the building of this wharf, but also those of the parishes of Deschambault, St. Gilbert, St. Marc des Carrières, St. Casimir, St. Thuribe, St. Ubalde, and even those of Ste. Anne de la Pérade in the adjoining county; as it is far more advantageous for the farmers to carry their products by water than by rail.

I reiterate my statement that the construction of this wharf will especially be to the advantage of the farmers and I express the hope that the committee will approve of this item.

Amendment withdrawn.

Item agreed to.

Grosse Rouche—wharf repairs, $3,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this a similar case to the other? I see the item is $3,500, and it was $1,350 last year. What is the estimated expenditure, and why was it not given when the vote was asked for last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote last year was for urgent repairs. We are completing a certain amount of work this year to renew the superstructure of the wharf for the top three or four feet and paint the shed shelter and railing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the work expected to be completed with the $1,350 last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House should have been informed on that point.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $75,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent of the $75,000 voted last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $63,341.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was it spent on?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On small repairs to various structures throughout the province. It is a very long list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the largest item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The items vary from $85 to $916.

Item agreed to.

La Malbaie—wharf, $12,000.

Mr. HANSON: We should have some explanation of that. Is that in the same category as the Grondines wharf? It is a large sum.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I think not. This is for the construction of a crib and span wharf 299 feet long by 16 feet wide, including the headblock 24 feet by 36 feet.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the work under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, it is under contract?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Who is the contractor?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): J. O. Poliquin.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were tenders called for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, this was the lowest tender. There were some eight tenders in all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was the contract for? What is the estimated cost of the entire work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract is for $10,889.45 and inspection and contingencies $1,100, making $11,989.45.

Item agreed to.

Lavaltrie—reconstruction of wharf and approach, $2,300.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Last year's item was all spent, was it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure last year was $2,796.

Item agreed to.

Lanoraie—wharf construction, $5,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why?

Mr. CHAPLIN: This is one of the items the minister said it was proposed to construct without tender. I would like to ask if he is ready to reconsider that proposition.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I could not state that I am. The report that I have would indicate this work can be done better by day labour, and pending further inquiries I am not sure that I could suggest that a change should be made. That is the recommendation I have before me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is reconstruction—no difficulty in telling what is to be done. It may be better politically, but not better commercially.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think that is hardly fair. This work consists in the removal of timber all around the headblock down to extreme low water level, in building a reinforced concrete wall all around the headblock and in laying a six-inch concrete flooring on the whole surface of headblock and bridge. It is a question of removing old work and renewal. I imagine that as the work progresses there will be an opportunity for the engineer in charge to guide his expenditure by what he finds in the removing.

Mr. BOYS: Where is the wharf and what vessels use it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in the county of Berthier. Besides the Rita B and the Three Rivers, which stop there occasionally with excursionists the steamboat Soulanges calls regularly twice a week and collected during the last navigation season more than $2,500 in freight. Several barges of hay are also shipped yearly from this wharf and during the last few years many barges of stone and gravel have been unloaded there every year for the maintenance of the Quebec-Montreal highway.

Mr. BOYS: Is this inland or tidal water?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is on the St. Lawrence.

Item agreed to.

L'Islet—wharf repairs, $23,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is apparently a remarkable case. Last year the vote, without explanation too, was $1,500. Now the minister asks for $23,500. Why was parliament not informed that the appropriation involved this expenditure?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year, we made just small repairs to the flooring of the wharf. The report of the engineer this year would indicate that it is necessary to replace 80,000 feet of face timbers, 60,000 feet of cross ties, 15,000 feet of longitudinals, 65,000 feet of stringers, 100,000 feet of 3-inch flooring, and 500 square yards of gravel surface.

Mr. CHAPLIN: This is another case similar to those as regards which the minister told us a little while ago the work would be done by day labour. This is surely a work that should be done by contract.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, allow me to add a few remarks in regard to the vote for repairs to the wharf of L'Islet. It would astonish me if the House paid more attention to statements emanating from a member who resides hundreds, nay, thousands of miles distant from my county, rather than be guided by information which I can personally extend. The leader of the Opposition, just now, told us that the vote of $23,500 was a similar case to the one of $50,000 asked for on behalf of Grondines. Well, Sir. if parliament is called upon, to-day, to vote such a large sum, it is due to the fact that the government, while the leader of the Opposition was at the helm, neglected to carry out the necessary repairs to this wharf. The wharf at L'Islet dates back over a hundred years. It serves as a refuge harbour and is utilized by three or four hundred farmers. Goods to the amount of a $1,000,000 consisting of farm products and lumber are carried over it each year. At present five parishes handle at this wharf both the products they ship and the goods they import. The public works could, I think, economize considerably, and, one of the first ways to do so would be to carry out the necessary work at the proper time and thereby not allow public property to deteriorate as it has unfortunately happened during a certain number of years, especially down on the lower St. Lawrence. One of the reasons why this work is so costly is that the government is obliged to buy its lumber in the summer season. If it was possible to have the

lumber prepared by the farmers in winter, it would not only be an economy but at the same time a help to the rural class. Not only the present system of carrying out the work is of a more costly nature but it has for effect, in many cases, to delay the work for more than a year.

I sincerely regret that the majority of my hon. friends on the other side are not able to understand me; but I can assure them that my remarks have been made in a very good spirit, and that the money that will be voted for the wharf at L'Islet will be spent as economically as possible.

Mr. BOYS: I have had a little experience in my part of the world as regards the construction of wharves, and I know the most costly wharf we have, one of very considerable proportions, cost from $12,000 to $15,000. Now we find an appropriation of $23,500 asked for, not for construction, but for repairs only. I should think that would not repair,

9 p.m.

but construct a fairly large and very substantial wharf. We ought to know something of the size of this wharf, the nature of its construction, whether tenders have been called for and, if so, the amount of the tenders.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The wharf is 1,104 feet in length. The work comprises:

Gravel surface, 500 sq. yards, at 50 cents per yard	$ 250
Face timbers, 12 x 12—80,000 ft. board measure at $80	6,400
Cross ties, 12 x 12—60,000 ft.	4,800
Longitudinals, 10 x 10—15,000 ft.	900
Stringers, 9 x 12—65,000 ft.	3,900
Flooring, 100,000 ft.	5,000
Total	$21,250
Contingencies	2,250
	$23,500

Mr. BOYS: What is the width of the wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The report of the engineer reads:

After consulting a number of merchants, I have come to the conclusion that the traffic from May to November will be as follows:

Drygoods	$550,000
Pulpwood	90,000
Firewood	75,000
Agricultural products	125,000
Bricks	25,000
Miscellaneous	15,000
Total	$880,000

All going over the wharf.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the government get any wharf charges for this traffic?

[Mr. Fafard.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Wherever a wharf is turned over to the Marine department and a wharfinger is appointed, some revenue is collected. I have not that data here, and I am not sure as regards this wharf.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A little while ago I asked the minister if he would reconsider his determination and allow this work to be done by tender. I did not receive an answer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In view of the discussion which has taken place to-day, I purpose reviewing the situation; but the recommendation I have before me from the chief engineer is that this work can be done more economically and better by day labour than by contract.

Item agreed to.

Matane harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. BOYS: It must be apparent that hon. members should receive the very information which the minister gave us regarding the last item. I personally thank him for giving that information. It has an effect on me at once and I realize that the wharf at L'Islet is one of very considerable importance.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BOYS: This work of improving the harbour at Matane is of considerable importance, and it is surely not the desire of hon. members opposite that these items should be rushed through without any information being given.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I was on my feet about as soon as my hon. friend, with the intention of giving some information regarding this matter. This expenditure is required towards a fairly large project—the improvement of the harbour at Matane. It has been under the special study of an investigating board of five Public Works' engineers in charge of the assistant chief engineer on the understanding that if it were found practicable to build the harbour required we would ask for an estimate. The board of engineers have reported favourably. It is not a new project, it has been before the department for some years, but it has always been considered as a very large expenditure for the public benefit to be gained. Representations were made again last year. They were not entertained. But during the interval between last session and this session one of the large would-be users of this proposed harbour—the Hammermill Paper Company who are operating large pulp limits in this district—advised the department that they were prepared to contribute practically 50 per cent of the cost.

Matane is situated between Rimouski and Gaspe, a distance of about 150 miles, on a very bleak coast, and it is important that we have a harbour of refuge to accommodate that extensive coast line. Large undertakings in the way of fishing and lumbering are being carried on and there is a very heavy marine traffic on the river. Having received a bona fide proposition from the Hammermill Paper Company to pay to the government $10,000 a year for twelve years towards the cost of this work—estimated to amount to about $210,000—or to pay a lump sum of $100,000, we carefully investigated local conditions and fully considered the offer. As a result it is felt by the department and by the government that in the interests of the community at Matane and of the mariners who use the river, it would be good business for the people of Canada to supplement the cash offer and construct a harbour at Matane. Matane itself is a prosperous community.

Mr. BOYS: What is it, a village or a town?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A small town of 3,500 people, but there is a scattered population throughout the parish of approximately 7,000. Large lumbering operations are being carried on in the district. The Hammermill Paper Company have a very large pulp mill at this point and intimate that they will carry on operations over a term of twenty or twenty-five years, paying in wages some $300,000 per annum. In addition to its local industries Matane is the base for the operations of the big pulp and paper companies on the north shore. The St. Lawrence broadens out at this point and there is a very large expanse of water down beyond Rimouski, so that it is very important for the men who earn their livelihood along this bleak coast line to have a harbour of refuge between Rimouski and Gaspe.

This matter has been carefully considered not only departmentally, but by the government and by special committee of council, and the government has reached the conclusion that arrangements should be entered into with the Hammermill Paper Company and the work undertaken. So far as the company are concerned, they have already deposited $35,000 in cash and given a bond for the balance, the money to be paid over by them as the expenditure is made from time to time by the government.

Mr. HANSON: There is no natural harbour at this point as I understand from the minister. Are the Hammermill Paper Company actually in operation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, the government have a harbour there. Last year $15,000 was voted for improvements, but this larger project having been put forward we have only expended $11,000 of that amount.

Mr. BOYS: Was last year's the first expenditure for harbour improvements at this point?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work has been going on for many years.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister give the committee an outline of the proposed new works?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There will be considerable dredging at the entrance to the channel, 134,000 cubic yards, estimated to cost $60,000; dredging at the turning basin, 155,000 cubic yards, estimated to cost $69,750; extension to eastern breakwater $40,320; dredging for crib seats, 1,000 cubic yards, estimated to cost $450; foundation crib for beacon, $2,550; crib work wharf connecting old wharf and western breakwater, $26,000; pile protection work, etc., $2,500. The total expenditure will amount to $201,875.

Mr. PELLETIER: This item refers to work in my riding, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to add a little to the information which the hon. minister has so well conveyed to the committee. We have no place where vessels can shelter between Rimouski and Gaspe, and this has resulted in considerable loss of life and property year after year. The various companies operating on the north shore are: Ontario Paper Company at Franquelin, Shelter Bay and Maniquagan; North Eastern Pulp and Paper Company at Maniquagan, which has bought 3,000,000 acres of land and intends to build a pulp mill at a cost of between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000; Franquelin Lumber Company at Franquelin; St. Regis Paper Company at Godbout; Gulf Pulp and Paper Company at Clarke City, and H. F. Amory at Mingan. Several of these companies are waiting for the construction of this harbour in order that they may be able to bring their product across and ship it by rail from this point. The construction of this wharf will afford better transport facilities; it will increase the traffic of the Canadian National Railways as well as of the Canada and Gulf Terminal Railway. The minister has mentioned the Hammermill Company; I may say that Price Brothers are also operating at Matane and I know that Sir William Price himself is in favour of these harbour improvements. The minister has fully explained this vote and it it not necessary for me to repeat what he has said.

Mr. HANSON: Is it intended to do any export business here, or will it be local traffic along and across the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will accommodate both.

Mr. HANSON: What export traffic will there be?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Pulpwood.

Mr. PELLETIER: Price Brothers are exporting.

Mr. BOYS: Is this expenditure dependent upon an agreement between the company and the department? In other words, is it stipulated that the company must pay $10,000 annually for twelve years as a condition of this vote? To what depth of water is the dredging to extend at low water? Was this work the result of a request by the company, or did the government itself feel that harbour improvements at that point were necessary? It is a little unusual that important works of this kind should be undertaken by the department at the instance of a company who, naturally, would want the work done for their own private gain. I can appreciate, on the other hand, the fact that such work might be warranted on account of the magnitude of the proposed operations of the company.

Mr. PELLETIER: I have been asking for improvements at that harbour since 1917; I have repeated my request every year, but have up to now been unsuccessful. Petition after petition has been filed each year with the Department of Public Works, but without avail. These petitions were signed by the people of Matane, Ste. Felicite, St. Luc, St. Leandre, St. Ulric, and other communities whose merchants receive their goods through Matane harbour. There is no proper accommodation for the vessels, and I have seen them at times riding at anchor six or seven abreast. It is high time that something was done to provide proper facilities at that harbour. I have endeavoured for years to have something done in this line, and I have finally succeeded in arranging for the payment of a certain sum by a company interested in development there. As my request year after year met with refusal, I came to the conclusion that if I could not get some assistance from other sources it would be impossible for me to succeed in the object I had in view. So I made a success of it, and I sincerely hope that the item will carry.

Mr. BOYS: I am glad for my hon. friend's sake that he has at last found a sympathetic ear. I am not surprised to learn that he did his utmost to secure a grant in the past. For some eight or ten years, being a supporter of the late government I made many similar requests on behalf of my riding, but as that government was a most economical one, I was unsuccessful, and I am not surprised that my hon. friend also was unsuccessful. It is quite evident now that he is making up for lost time, for he is getting a pretty good chunk. I should be glad, however, if the minister would give us the information we seek.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is proposed to have a channel of a depth of nine feet at low water. A great deal of credit is due the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) in the matter of securing a contribution from the Hammermill Company; it is due entirely to his efforts that this arrangement has been made. The government like to help those who help themselves. There are times—they rarely occur, of course—when an industry is so interested in development that it can be prevailed upon to contribute something toward the cost of a work like this. The hon. gentleman has succeeded in going much further than is usual in negotiations of this kind. The company will carry on extensive operations, and they believe that with proper harbour facilities their undertakings will be successful. The government are taking advantage of their offer and are supplementing their contribution with an equal sum. We believe the result will be to afford a harbour of refuge not only to the people of Matane, but to those of the surrounding country as well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much has been spent up to the present time on this harbour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Over $121,000 has been expended since the inception of the harbour some years ago.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister stated that for many years it had been considered that this large expenditure would not be justified. The hon. member for the constituency makes a very strong plea respecting the need of refuge at this point. But has there not been a harbour there sufficient to give that accommodation to the people?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The expenditure seems very large, considering the depth to be obtained in the harbour—nine feet.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The present harbour could not afford refuge to the larger craft.

Mr. HANSON: What is the depth now?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not more than four or five feet, I am advised.

Mr. BOYS: Is it hardpan, rough bottom or mud?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it is mud,—soft material.

Item agreed to.

New Carlisle—wharf repairs, $1,200.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much was expended on this last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount expended last year was $999. The present amount required is to renew 8,000 square feet of three-inch flooring.

Item agreed to.

Peribonka—wharf repairs, $4,650.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the committee would like to have some information with regard to these various votes for wharves. I was not aware that there were so many ports in this particular locality. Would the minister give some information to the committee as to what the money is needed for as the items come up?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to give any information that is requested, but I do not want to block the work of the committee by interjecting unless it is necessary. This expenditure is recommended by the district engineer in order to lower the wharf approximately two feet, to cut some piles that are decaying, replace stringers and flooring. Apparently it is a necessary expenditure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is the work to be done by day labour or contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This being repair work, I presume it will be done by day labour.

Mr. HANSON: Going back for a moment to the harbour improvements at Matane, is that work to be done by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. The contract has not yet been let.

Item agreed to.

Piche Point—wharf repairs and improvements, $1,500.

Mr. BOYS: What in the world is wrong with all these wharves? Are they all going to rack and ruin since my hon. friends opposite came into power? There are no less than forty-nine votes for wharf repairs or improvements, aggregating $572,785. What is the trouble? Why is it that so many of these wharves are needing attention all of a sudden?

Mr. CAHILL: We were in opposition before.

Mr. BELAND: There is such a river as the St. Lawrence.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think the list is larger than usual. These are not new works.

Mr. BOYS: I do not suggest that they are new. They are repairs.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These items are mainly for repairs and maintenance. There is an annual upkeep in connection with these wharves. It will be remembered, of course, that during the war many of these works were allowed to go without the usual repairs and we are now getting them back into a normal condition.

Item agreed to.

Point au Pic, Murray Bay—wharf repairs, $18,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is this for the large pier at Murray Bay? Is that pier owned by the Dominion government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: There must be a very considerable revenue from that wharf.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the information as to the revenue. This work is owned by the Dominion government. Large steamers call at the pier.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it proposed to do this work by day labour or by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Apparently we have not received a recommendation from the engineer with regard to this work, so I am not in a position to say. It is a large amount, and evidently it would be preferable to have it done by contract.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would think it would be preferable, but some works for which we have passed large amounts the engineer is evidently of the opinion should be done by day labour. Murray Bay is a place of considerable importance, particularly in the summer time, and there must be many competent contractors there. It is a place of fine residences and fine buildings. I think at a point like that the engineer should not hesitate to recommend that the work be done by contract.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would imagine it will be done by contract.

Item agreed to.

Pointe a Elie—Magdalen Islands—wharf repairs and improvements, $5,850.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of last year's vote of $11,400 was spent? It looks to me as if these wharves were getting worn out very fast. I wonder if it is because of all the shells and boxes that are being moved over them.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount expended last year was $9,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And it is proposed to spend nearly $6,000 this year. What is in contemplation? Is there any more to follow next year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no knowledge of that. Apparently they are trying to get the wharf into a state of repair. It is proposed to build a shed, and to extend the breastwork for a length of 150 feet, and to renew the stringers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work to be done by tender or day labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is recommended that it be done by day labour.

Item agreed to.

Pointe aux Trembles—wharf repairs, $15,200.

Mr. HANSON: Is this one of those cases where a large undertaking was started without information being given to the House as to the ultimate cost? I do not think there should be much criticism of the previous item for repairs to the wharf in the Magdalen Islands, for anything we can do to better the condition of these people should be done, as they are very isolated. But that is not the case with the item under consideration. This is a very large amount. You must be rebuilding this wharf, or building two or three wharves, judging by the amount. You are spending $40,000 in two years. It does occur to me that some very considerable explanation ought to be given to the House as to why $25,000 was asked and probably spent last year, and why it is necessary to ask for almost as much again this year. The money is being largely wasted, I presume.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend has not got that right. If he will look at the vote again he will find that we are asking for a revote of $15,200. The contract was let for $21,266 and there are contingencies, $2,234, making a total of $23,500. The probable expenditure for 1922-23 is $8,300 on the contract leaving a balance of $15,200 as the revote this year.

Mr. HANSON: To complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The vote last year was $25,000 for this. It is all marked for repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could the repairs to a wharf cost $25,000. The wharves that have been brought to my attention, seemingly pretty large ones, cost about half of that to build new. Is it not merely a re-constructed wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not? How much has this wharf cost up to date, how much has been the capital cost to the country of this wharf up to the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In June 1904 a contract was entered into for the construction at a cost of $33,775. The construction cost $32,944, and since that date $14,308.75 has been expended in repairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been $46,000 spent on it up to this new venture in repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Forty-six thousand and $25,000 more, seventy-one thousand odd dollars in capital cost outside of interest. Now, will the minister tell us how much revenue has ever been collected from it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I cannot tell, I have not the information. That might be secured, but these wharves are not revenue producing, as a rule, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not saying anything as to that now but I would like to know the exact situation. Commencement was made apparently in 1904 and up to now, including the repairs under way, it has cost $71,000. Could the minister not give us an approximate estimate of the revenue collected from that wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Department of Public Works would not know what the collections are. I will inquire from the Marine department what revenues they are collecting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it amount to anything appreciable at all?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Practically nothing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not very much I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, let me put this to the minister: Does he know of any reason why public works of this sort, that are utilized in trade, should not pay a reasonable interest on

the cost? Does he know why they should not when, say, government elevators that are utilized in trade are compelled to pay interest on their cost? Will the minister explain the principle that distinguishes the one class from the other? What is the reason for applying one yard stick to one class and a different kind of yard stick to another?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no objection to my hon. friend making representations of that character. He knows well that his government—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): — did not advocate such a policy, and this government has not been carrying out a policy of that character either. It is a matter of policy. We know that in many of these country communities it would be subjecting the people to great hardship to collect wharfage charges for package freight.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am very much interested in the minister's statement because our farmers in New Brunswick pay wharfage charges for loading their potatoes on the wharf at St. John, and I do not see why we should have to pay such charges if farmers in other places are not paying for the same service. In this connection, Mr Chairman, it is just possible I am hardly in order, but due to the fact that I was serving on a committee which sat this afternoon I was not in the chamber when the estimates for New Brunswick were under consideration, and therefore I would ask the minister if it is proposed to bring down any estimate for the breakwater in St. John harbour called the Negro Point breakwater. This is a very great necessity. It is not, like some of the works we have had under consideration to-night, a local work. St. John is the winter port of the East for the whole shipping of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: No, Halifax.

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend called attention to Halifax. Well, there is a little place called Halifax from which they ship a few apples. But I still contend that St. John is the winter port, not because it is a bigger place or that the harbour is possibly better than that of Halifax, but due to the fact that St. John is nearer the bulk of freight that is sent east for ocean shipment. We have a condition there of such a character that unless this breakwater is built we shall not benefit from the wharves constructed by the government. There is a dock already constructed, I think it is dock 17, on which there is no building as yet, and it will be useless to construct sheds on that dock to handle traffic until the breakwater in question is built. The government have already constructed the foundation but the wharf is so exposed to the weather that until the Negro Point breakwater is built it will be very little used as a freight handling proposition. I do hope the government will bring down a supplementary estimate to take care of the Negro Point breakwater.

Now as to the point I spoke of first: Our farmers this year have been getting only a dollar a barrel for potatoes that cost them $2.50 a barrel. We have been getting less than 50 per cent of the cost of growing, and still we have been paying wharfage on our shipments over the wharf and through the shed the government provided for us this year and which we appreciate, I can assure the minister. Still I would like to insist that if this kind of traffic is not charged for over other government wharves, we should be refunded the money that we have paid this year and be relieved of the charge in the future.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend is probably under a misconception. In the larger ports undoubtedly there must be wharfage charges made. It is in the small outlying communities where the individual brings his package to the wharf. or takes it from the wharf, where fees are probably not collected. In the case of the larger ports charges must be made for the freight or traffic going over the wharves.

Mr. CALDWELL: I realize that it is the practice but I am still not convinced of the justice of it. It is the same class of freight absolutely, and I doubt if there is very much freight handled out of Canada to-day that is paying the producer as little as potatoes are paying the New Brunswick farmer. As I said before we have not received over a dollar a barrel of 165 pounds for our crop of potatoes this year and it cost us $2.50 to grow them. Still we are paying wharfage fees when farmers who happen to live at smaller points of shipment apparently are not paying these fees.

Mr. HANSON: I think the practice outlined by the minister is all right. The two cases are not analogous at all. The one case is the case of a small farmer bringing down his little cart load of stuff to send to the market, and the other case is that of a great export trade which runs into hundreds and thousands of dollars. As a matter of fact you never could collect wharfage on these little shipments, and nobody would ever be foolish enough to try it.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a matter of principle.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In the case of the particular item under discussion, what is the nature of the traffic over this wharf?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are about 5,500 inhabitants. The exports are largely farm products; there having been exported last year 75,000 bushels of potatoes and 20,000 bushels of other vegetables; 80,000 pounds of butter; 800 head of cattle; $100,000 worth of pork, and 80,000 baskets of fruit.

Mr. MILLAR: I believe there are thirty-five of these wharves items in which money is expended to repair wharves. In some cases it is mentioned as "wharves repaired"—just a little variety. How many of these have had to pay any interest at all? I was thinking it was rather strange that so much money was being expended without any thought that the people using those facilities should pay the interest thereon, as has been pointed out by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. In the case of grain elevators and similar facilities we expect to pay a rate that will enable them to pay their way. An hon. member on the other side was referring to the fact that he had asked the government on several occasions to have these improvements made, and now that he had succeeded in his request I could not help thinking of the times that the farmers in certain districts—not one but many—have asked for branch lines that were already graded to be completed. In many cases the ties and rails were lying there ready to be laid down, and yet they have been refused. Surely it is not good business. However, I will not discuss that matter now, but I hope the same generosity as is shown by the government at this time, in going forward with new work because it seems to be needed, will be exhibited when the Minister of Railways brings down his estimates and we take up the discussion of branch lines.

Mr. CANNON: Do the railways out west pay any more interest on the capital invested than the railways in these other provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The western railways pay all right, but it is the hon. member's "idols of the past" built in between that do not pay.

Mr. MILLAR: I assure hon. members that the railways in the West are the railways above all others in the Dominion that help to make the dividends.

Mr. PARENT: Is that the case of the Hudson Bay?

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. MILLAR: Yes, there has been a grant set aside for the building of that line for many years back.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: I can give my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) a case in which one of these wharves has brought some revenue to the country. We have a small wharf in my own constituency that cost the government $22,000. It was built 21 years ago, and since that time it has afforded free wharfage to 1,500 fishermen. It has been the means of bringing to the railways of this country an average of 365 carloads of freight every year. This shows what a small wharf built in a fishing section can bring to this country in the way of revenue. I believe that, so far as wharf accommodation is concerned, it should be left free to the fishermen. I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has overlooked the fact that for the past 50 years, in fact since confederation, the fishermen of this country have enjoyed free wharfage on all the wharves built in the Dominion of Canada, and I believe that money spent for the building of wharves at the gateway of the country is money spent, to the advantage, not only to the fishermen of eastern Canada, but of the agriculturists of western Canada and all the provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not rising to criticize the estimates at the present time, but to make a suggestion, which suggestion was made and acted upon in this House two years ago, when the little group I belonged to occupied a small pen down in the corner, where they could not hear anything when the estimates were going through.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member calls it a pen.

Mr. CALDWELL: At that time we asked that the minister when putting through his estimates might move down nearer the middle of the chamber. The "not still small voice" at all, but the voice of New Brunswick reminded me that some hon. members down in that end of the chamber do not hear a word of what is going on up here, and I would ask the Minister of Public Works, and the other ministers who still have their estimates to put through, if they would adopt that suggestion. We in this section of the House are entitled to hear everything that is going on, but a great many hon. members do not hear anything at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite aware that the government is only practising what has been practised since confederation, but inasmuch as of recent years we have extended

government activities into other spheres of public utility, such as grain elevators, it would appear to me pretty hard to account for treating the two cases differently, and if it is essential for the wharf to be maintained, it looks to me as if that principle can fairly be extended to government elevators. Those elevators feed the railways, as well as the wharves, and infinitely more so, in fact. When I was a minister and was asked to explain why we adopted a policy, I at least tried to do so. I am afraid the Minister of Public Works has felt himself unequal to the task on this occasion. He has sought rather to jockey his estimates through without giving us an explanation.

Mr. BUREAU: That is hardly a fair statement.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I hardly think that is correct. I have made myself very clear. In the larger sections where we have a wharf there is a charge made, but in the smaller districts it would not pay the government to hire a wharfinger to collect the charges, and it would only be a source of annoyance to the people, and I do not think he will recommend such a policy to be adopted throughout the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the charge in the case of large wharves representative of the interest on the cost at all, or is it merely negligible?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not advised as to that. The matter of charges is in the Marine department. I have no doubt that information could be had, but I have not got it.

Item agreed to.

Pointe Shea (Amherst)—Magdalen Islands—repairs to pier, $5,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, it is not under contract.

Item agreed to.

Repentigny—wharf improvements, $3,400.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a repair or improvement to the old construction. The old crib structure will be protected by dumping stone on each side of it. The top of this stone will be hand rip-rapped on a slope of one in one from the new slope built along the approach up to the headblock. A concrete wall three feet thick at the base and eighteen inches at the top will be built. The estimated cost is:

Stone	$1,650
Concrete	600
Riprapping	700
Demolishing of concrete, inspection and contingencies	440
Total	$3,390

Item agreed to.

Rimouski wharf reconstruction, $20,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is this under contract? Last year $15,000 was voted. Will this appropriation of $20,000 complete the work of reconstruction? What is the nature of the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This expenditure is required to rebuild upon its whole side and for a length of 115 feet, the easterly wing of the old wharf which was destroyed by a storm in September, 1922. The construction is to be " closed face," and its easterly face pile sheathed. The work is to be done by day labour.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Where is all this labour being obtained? Is any attempt being made to bring labourers into this country to do all this work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the work is being done largely by day labour.

Mr. BOYS: I should like to make a little correction. A few minutes ago, in speaking of these estimates which I observe total $572,000, I mentioned that the total number of items was 48. I observe now that was the number on page 38 of the Estimates and the total number is 75, or, in other words, one item for every single member and senator from Quebec. It is evident that most of these hon. members are in their places, and I congratulate them on their splendid attendance to-night. I notice, as certain items are passed, certain gentlemen leave the chamber. By the time we reach the bottom of the list, I do not believe there will be a quorum on the other side of the House.

Mr. CANNON: Would the hon. gentleman point out any item in my constituency?

Mr. BOYS: No doubt the hon. member's turn is coming.

Mr. HANSON: The hon. member is being overlooked.

Mr. BOYS: In this proposed expenditure amounting to over $500,000, there must be something entirely wrong if there is not an item for the hon. member. I understood that

this was a time of economy, and that this government of all governments was proposing to practise economy. I have before me the estimates of this department for the province of Quebec in the year 1921-22, and I observe that the total then was $303,000. In the estimates before us the total is $572,000. In Ontario, a somewhat important province, in the year 1921-22, the total was $370,000. The total for 1922-23, or last year, when the government got its first opportunity of practising economy was $643,000, and this year, it is $463,000.

10 p.m.

Mr. CANNON: A decrease.

Mr. BOYS: We may be getting economy in some departments although we have not seen it yet, and it is quite evident that economy does not exist in this department, certainly not in connection with the province of Quebec.

Item agreed to.

Rivière du Lièvre— Lock and dam—reconstruction of protection walls, $10,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is this to be done by day labour? It occurs to me that if the country knew that so much of this work was being done by day labour, in face of protestation of hon. members opposite when they were in opposition, the country would be greatly shocked. I have an impression that a very large portion of this expenditure is wasted on account of the work being done under that principle. I do not say that there is any corruption or anything of that sort; but we all know that under day work for governments, you do not get a good day's work for a day's pay. The minister ought to direct his attention to endeavouring, especially on these larger items, to see if he cannot get this work done by tender. I had some experience in municipal work in days gone by, and I would not think of spending sums amounting to from $18,000 to $25,000 on reconstruction, without seeing first what could be done by way of tender.

Mr. CAHILL: What province was that in?

Mr. HANSON: New Brunswick.

Mr. CANNON: The boys like it.

Mr. HANSON: That is the secret of the whole situation. The hon. member for Dorchester has revealed the whole scheme.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This particular item is under contract. I do not think it would be wise for me to repeat my argument in reply to remarks which the hon. member has made on numerous occasions this evening. I know that in the case of renewals and repairs, the department can, at times, do work more advantageously by day labour than by contract.

[Mr. Boys.]

Item agreed to.

Roberval wharf repairs, $4,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister give the committee some information regarding these matters? Those of us who live in some of the other provinces are not familiar with these localities and their requirements.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is in the Chicoutimi-Saguenay district. It is recommended by the district engineer. The work comprises:

Renewal of flooring, 30,000 feet, board measure	$1,500
Renewal of 10 x 10—stringers, 15,000 ft..	900
Renewing 12 x 12 cross ties and longitudinals, 15,000 ft..	900
Repairs to hoist apparatus, painting..	200
Contingencies..	500
Total..	$4,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What is the nature and volume of shipping at this point?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Roberval is situated on the west side of lake St. John and has about 2,000 inhabitants. It is the business centre of the region.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work to be done under contract or by day labour? Straight work, such as the minister has described, is eminently work that should be done by contract.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think this is recommended for day labour.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What rate of wages is paid, by the day or by the hour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The foreman is, I think, paid by the month and labour by the hour.

Mr. HANSON: What wages is the minister paying for ordinary labour on work like this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That depends on the locality. We pay the prevailing wage in the district.

Mr. BOYS: Does the minister pay more for day labour in one part of Canada than another?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend understands that contracts for public works have a clause stating that the prevailing rate is paid, and that is the rate that is paid by the government.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Some work was done on this last year, so that the minister can surely tell us the wages paid on the last job and the prevailing rate.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the wages paid, but I can assure my hon. friend they were at the prevailing rate in the district. The work included renewal of floors and stringers to a length of 250 feet. The foreman was paid $5 per working day.

Item agreed to.

Ste. Anne des Monts—reconstruction of training pier, $11,000.

Mr. HANSON: What is a training pier?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A pier to train or direct the current.

Mr. HANSON: Where is this place, and what does the work consist of?

Mr. CAHILL: Carried.

Mr. HANSON: No. We are not unduly critical, we are mindful of the "boys," but we want a little information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in Gaspé county. The pier is also used by coasting schooners and lighters in shipping lumber. Four steamers ply weekly between Quebec and the principal ports of the Gaspé peninsula. The lumber shipments alone amount to $800,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of last year's vote of $8,600 was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The whole amount was spent—or probably will be spent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will this $11,000 complete the work, or is it just a regular hand-out year after year to the "boys" that we hear about?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is an unfair and improper statement. These works are necessary public works, and I am informed by our officials that the expenditure is proper. The information I gave a moment ago should indicate to my hon. friend that this is not a hand-out. When you get $800,000 worth of business going out of a harbour, it is certainly important that that harbour should be kept in shape.

Mr. MARCIL: It is only fair to the county of Gaspé, represented by His Honour the Speaker, to say that Ste. Anne des Monts is the largest settlement on the south shore of the St. Lawrence in that county, with a population of over 2,000. It is a rough mountainous country, without communication except by the maritime road which skirts the shore and which was built and is maintained by the province. I think this small grant is money well employed, especially when it is remembered that the locality is deprived of all railway communication, the nearest railway station being at Matane, thirty miles away. I think if the Speaker were here he would be able to convince the committee of the wisdom of this expenditure.

Mr. HANSON: How much money has been spent at this point in the last twenty-five years?

Mr. CANNON: It may be well to mention that this place has been known as a harbour for several years—Jacques Cartier landed there.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount expended is $172,000. I do not know whether that dates from the time Jacques Cartier landed there.

Mr. HANSON: During the last ten years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): During the last thirty or forty years.

Mr. HANSON: During the last two years the equivalent of a bonus of $5 a head has been handed to the 2,000 people in that locality. On the same basis it would have cost this country millions of dollars to look after the rest of the people on the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. member for York-Sunbury should remember that these people have no railway communication whatever. They have seen railways spring up all over Canada, and have contributed their share of the building costs, without receiving any direct benefit. The nearest railway point is Matane, thirty miles away, and this small wharf is the only facility they have for carrying on their business. If the hon. member resided at Ste. Anne des Monts I am confident he would consider the money well spent.

Mr. BOYS: What bothers me is this: The minister asked last year for $8,600 for repairs to this pier. I presume inquiry was made at that time and it was found that that expenditure would complete the work then contemplated. If that estimate was accurate, I cannot understand why the minister now asks for another $11,000 for the same work. Are we to understand that this is not a sufficient sum to complete the repairs and that next year the minister will come back for a further sum to finish work that perhaps should have been completed this year? There have been a number of items of this kind, and if the work is properly estimated I cannot see why

there should be any necessity for these further expenditures. One can understand a fourth or fifth of this amount being required, but this is quite a large item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Urgent repairs were made last year. It is proposed this year to build the shore end of the training wall—a different portion entirely.

Mr. BOYS: But was not that as necessary last year as this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The engineer did not report it as necessary last year.

Mr. HANSON: Have we any assurance that this vote will fix the pier up for some years, or may we expect a request for another hand-out next year?

Item agreed to.

St. Alexis—wharf repairs, $8,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is that a contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Was the $15,000 in last year's estimates also under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. $3,500 has been spent on the contract. This is a re-vote of $8,000.

Item agreed to.

St. Charles—wharf reconstruction, $1,300.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Where is this wharf located?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): St. Hyacinthe-Rouville county.

Item agreed to.

St. Jean d'Orleans—repairs to wharf, $2,250.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of last year's estimate was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We spent $3,008.50.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Item agreed to.

St. Michel de Bellechasse—repairs to wharf, $16,000.

Mr. BOYS: Last year $40,500 was voted for this work, and this year the vote is $16,000, of which only $4,000 is a revote. That makes $52,000, which seems to me to be a very large sum for repairs. The committee should have some information regarding this large expenditure.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount asked for this year is to complete a contract entered into last year for $31,111. To that we add inspection and contingencies, $3,100; total, $34,000 odd. The expenditure on this contract in 1922-23 was $18,500, and $16,000 is now asked to complete the contract.

Mr. BOYS: Surely the minister must be wrong there. If he was able to secure a contract for $32,000 when the cost was expected to be $40,500, I congratulate him, but if that was the case and the money was not spent, the minister actually had more money than he needed, and the whole of this item should be a revote. The revote, however, is stated here to be only $4,000. Moreover, if the minister has $40,500 already voted, he has until the 31st of March to spend it, and if the contract calls for only $32,000 he should have a balance of $8,000 on hand and should not now be in need of anything.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The explanation here is not quite as clear as it might be. I find that there were two contracts, the first for $31,111 and the second for $18,600. The second was necessitated through recent damages to the wharf.

Mr. BOYS: That information satisfies me at once. That shows a total of about $49,600, and the difference between that and the $52,000 of which I spoke is made up by extras. In other words, instead of getting the contract for $32,000, the minister has entered into two contracts totalling $49,000, and finds he still needs another $3,000 to clear himself.

Mr. MILLAR: I have been tempted to ask a question, and I hope the minister will not think I am offensive in doing so. It is addressed more particularly to hon. members from Quebec, and I hardly expect an answer to it. I was wondering whether the excessive moisture in that province owing to the lack of prohibition had anything to do with the rapid decay of these many wharves. I would like to ask the minister if in view of the large expenditure on many of these wharves this year, it will be possible to make heavy cuts in expenditure next year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work being done should be of a permanent character, but my hon. friend will realize that these structures are subject to very great pressure from ice runs in the spring and often great damage is thus caused.

Item agreed to.

St. Omer—wharf reconstruction, $6,600.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Ville Marie—wharf repairs, $1,450.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice last year we voted $2,400 for this work. Will the amount asked for this year complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is the amount the engineers are asking for repairs. It is to be used for 20,000 feet of new flooring, and to supply wheel guards for two lines of traffic, and to paint the wharf capping.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What body of water is this wharf located in?

Mr. CAHILL: Lake Timiskaming.

Item agreed to.

Ontario harbours and rivers—Bayfield—repairs to piers, $4,750.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What constituency is this in?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): South Huron.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work under contract?

Mr. KING: I think it will be done by day labour.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much was expended of the vote last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $4,034.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Who had the overseeing of the contract last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Murdock Ross was the foreman last year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How far is this wharf from the city of Goderich, and what is the nature of the shipping at this point?

Mr. BLACK (Huron): I might tell the hon. member that nine fishing fleets go out from Bayfield harbour to fish on the lake. A year ago part of this wharf was taken away.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What took it away?

Mr. BLACK (Huron): A storm.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this to complete the work started last year or is it additional work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is to complete the renconstruction of the inner pier and also for repairs to superstructure requiring 4,080 feet, board measure, lumber costing $480. To complete the reconstruction of the inner end of the pier will require $4,250.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the amount asked for this year be sufficient to complete the whole job?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the report of the engineer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much of this is for dredging?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is not for dredging.

Item agreed to.

Big Bay Point—wharf repairs, $2,500.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think we ought to have some explanation of this item.

Mr. BOYS: We have now come to the garden of Eden. This wharf is in the well-known county of Simcoe. All I am concerned in is to find out whether or not the item provides for the removal of a sunken vessel about which I have had occasion to write to the department. There is a sunken vessel there which has been a source of danger to navigation and certainly should be removed, and if the item provides for that—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It does.

Mr. BOYS: I am glad to hear it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Upon whose recommendation is this expenditure made? Is it asked for by the member or the engineer?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The engineer makes the recommendation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the recommendation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is asked for by District Engineer Wilson to repair damage done wharf by ice pressure and sunken wreck, and to remove this wreck.

Mr. CANNON: Does the department draw any revenue from this wharf?

Item agreed to.

Blind River—wharf reconstruction, $21,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this to be done by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is suggested that it be done by contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what constituency is it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In East Algoma.

Mr. CANNON: How are ships steered up this Blind river?

Item agreed to.

Cobourg—breakwater construction, $25,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work being done by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally, Ontario—repairs and improvements, $65,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much was spent on this harbour last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure amounted to $21,669.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I again call the attention of the minister to the fact that in every instance he is asking amounts far in excess of what he spent last year for what is described as a contingent vote. I think I am within the mark when I say that he did not spend last year more than 50 per cent of the amount he is asking for this year, and as the Finance Minister has to raise by taxation the money we now vote why not reduce the item? The minister cannot get into trouble if he does that because if money is needed for an emergency he can always get it. Surely it is in the interest of the minister and the government to have the estimate reduced.

Mr. CANNON: Why does not the hon. member move for a reduction?

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend was not in the House this afternoon when I went pretty fully into this matter and did suggest a reduction in item after item. In the case of the estimates for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Northern Ontario I did suggest that the resolution in each case might be reduced and reduced with safety. If, owing to storm conditions, or something of the kind, larger amounts are wanted they can always be got. I would think it was in the interest of the department and of the government itself to keep the estimate down. Not more than half of the amount voted was spent last year and therefore why not cut off some of it?

Mr. MANION: Before the item carries I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that a wharf is required by the farming section at Cloud Bay. I may say that I have already written to him on the subject. I think that when such a sum as $65,000, or any part of it, is being spent, the interest of the farmers in the section referred to should be considered. Like the northern part of the province of Quebec, northern Ontario is a bush farm country and those who go out into such districts to do pioneer—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: I am not speaking of the districts represented by my hon. friends. As I say it is a bush farm country and those who go into such districts to do pioneer work deserve the consideration of those of us who do not follow suit. Therefore, I hope that when the minister is looking over the expenditures for the coming year he will give due consideration to the farmers in the Cloud Bay district who have no railway accommodation and who require needed assistance. I hope that he will take their case into consideration when the proper time comes.

Item agreed to.

Kincardine—repairs to piers, $10,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, it is under contract.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount is $21,676.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year, evidently, there was an expenditure of $24,000, or was that the amount of the outlay?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, there was an expenditure of $14,000 I think, last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And $10,000 is a revote? Will this amount complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the expectation.

Item agreed to.

Little Current—dredging, $38,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the contemplated expenditure here, and for what purpose?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a dredging contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is Little Current in Manitoulin Island?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, it is in the constituency of East Algoma. The amount of $38,000 is required to provide for a contract to dredge a through channel 150 feet wide to a depth of 22 feet, averaging about 125 feet long. The lowest tender for rock was $4.95 and for clay and boulders, $2.

Item agreed to.

Chatham—repairs to revetment wall and sheet piling, $16,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In whose constituency is this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in Kent county, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be the constituency of the Minister of Labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this new work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is to tear down and reconstruct for a length of 182 feet the present concrete revetment wall at the junction of McGregar's creek and Thames river, Tecumseh park, Chatham.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the work being done under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It has not been contracted for yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the intention of the government as to this work? Is it to be done by contract or by the more popular system?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The recommendation is to carry it out under contract, I understand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much has been spent on this work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Previous to March, 1923, a total of $62,884.

Item agreed to.

Meaford—repairs to pier, $5,400.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There was an item for this work last year of $5,100. Now there is another item for the same work of $5,400. Is this under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a continuation of a work undertaken last year. The sum of $5,281 was expended of last year's vote.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the present estimate complete the work, or will a further vote be needed next year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I presume this will complete the work. It is all that has been asked for by the engineer in charge. In his letter he asked that the work done in 1922-23 be continued to completion. So I take it this estimate will complete the undertaking.

Mr. BOYS: There is no contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I think not.

Item agreed to.

Midland—repairs to wharves, $9,400.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Did the department spend $3,000 at Midland last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $2,999 was expended last year.

Item agreed to.

Port Burwell—repairs to harbour works, $17,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this item under contract.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, it is a contract to repair damage to piers and breakwater occasioned by storm in September 1921.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $38,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What is the volume of traffic at Port Burwell?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is very large—a great coal centre. The revenue at this port 31st March, 1921, was $2,211,908. The revenue for the fiscal year ending 31st March last would add $200,000 to it. That is the duty on coal coming in. There has been a large expenditure on that harbour from its inception up to March 31st. The total freight carried by car ferry from 1906-1907 to 1921 amounted to 6,171,799 tons. There are three car ferry routes for the transport of coal and other merchandise across lake Erie from New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio points to Ontario. This combined lake and rail route offers a considerable reduction in the freight which has to be paid on coal and other commodities necessariiy imported from the United States.

Mr. BOYS: The contract calls for $38,000. Why is the total vote $42,000; that is $17,000 plus $25,000 voted last year?

Mr KING (Kootenay): There is an item for inspection and contingencies, $1,939.

Mr. BOYS: Is the difference made up of extras.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think it is just inspection and contigencies.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The item is very small considering the importance of this point and the volume of shipping. It is a main point on lake Erie and the transport of coal from this point is very great. The harbour is not in a very good state of repair at the present time, and a considerable amount of work should be done. I think the item is barely large enough to meet the requirements at this point. The figures just given the committee indicate the importance of this place. It is the main coal receiving point on the Canadian side of lake Erie. The Canadian Pacific Railway make this their chief point of entry for coal brought across the lake, and I am afraid that the amount in the estimates is not going to meet the requirements of that port during the present year.

Item agreed to.

Rondeau—repairs to piers, $10,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this work under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is not under contract.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the minister inform the committee of the volume of shipping that is done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is an important coaling station. The exports and imports during the year 1921 were as follows:

Imports—	Cars
Coal imported	5,129
Steel	143
Miscellaneous	60
	5,332

Exports—	Cars
Scrap steel	6
Miscellaneous	30
Total	36

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the nature of these repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): General repairs to timber sections of both piers, $7,600; 48 fender piles, 45 to 50 feet long along west pier, $1,200 and 52 sheet piles $1,000, incidentals $200, making $10,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Could this not reasonably be let by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is apparently recommended for day labour in the discretion of the engineer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is in Kent county also?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I believe it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the engineer who recommends day labour work in Kent county?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): District engineer Craig.

Mr. MEIGHEN: John Craig?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, it is Hugo Craig.

Item agreed to.

Southampton—breakwater repairs, $6,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is this under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, recommended for day labour.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Tell us the nature of the work.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): East breakwater, renewal of face timbers costing $560, and west breakwater, renewal of face timbers, crossties, sheeting, stringers and decking, $5,280, incidentals $160, total $6,000.

Item agreed to.

Thames River—repairs to lighthouse wharf, $1,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Where are these repairs to be made?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Thames river in Essex county, I think. The note I have is, "Renew the south side wall for length of 100 feet."

Item agreed to.

Toronto Island—breakwater protection, $30,000.

Mr. CANNON: What is the reason for those expenditures. Was there any report made and if so by whom?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to complete a contract entered into with the Randolph Macdonald Company for the construction of rubble mound breakwater 1,700 feet, and for repairs to the old breakwater by depositing at various points along the face, large stones. The total cost is $30,000.

Mr. CANNON: When was the contract first let?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): May, 1920.

Mr. CANNON: How much money has already been expended?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $216,000.

Mr. CANNON: What is the nature of the shipping there?

Mr. DUFF: Why was all the money not voted at one time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Maybe the minister could give the corresponding figures for Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. DUFF: We are discussing Ontario now.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are the parties that have this contract the same parties that had the original contract?

Mr. DUFF: They are the same Tories.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are the same firm.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I hope the minister will be able to give us some assurance that the recommendations which were made to him regarding the large work that the government has contracted with the city of Toronto to perform, will be carried out, in a measure at least, by a larger appropriation in the Supplementary Estimates. The minister has inspected the work to be done, and I think he fully realizes the need for it. I think he is advised also of the Privy Council Order, I believe, No. 1426, wherein the government contracted with the city of Toronto to do a certain work.

11 p.m.

The city has gone ahead on the basis of that contract; it has expended very large sums of its own money, and having faith in that contract, the city is looking forward to a larger expenditure in connection with completing the breakwater, which is an absolute necessity in view of the work that has been done. I feel that Toronto has the sympathetic consideration of the minister in this matter, and I hope he will realize, in pursuance of the undertaking, the contract already entered into, the necessities of the case as regards Toronto.

Mr. CANNON: Will this $30,000 enable the government to complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will complete the present contract.

Mr. CANNON: Will the present contract finish the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are in the department recommendations for further work at that point; but we are not providing for any further expenditure at this time.

Mr. BOYS: Are there any extras in connection with this large contract?

Mr. CANNON: I am sorry to see that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is not in his seat. This is certainly an item where his economy would be applied to good purpose. This money is not being spent to improve shipping facilities or to help trade; but hon. members will, no doubt, be surprised to learn that this is for an amusement park at Toronto, and I do not think this government should provide amusement places, even—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Will the hon. member pardon me? I should like to ask him where he gets his information that this is for an amusement park. I may tell the hon. member that not one dollar nor one cent of the money that has been spent or that will be spent by the Dominion government will go towards the end he suggests. The fact of the matter is that the city of Toronto has spent in the neighbourhood of $22,000,000, and I will admit that some of that money has gone into making a very beautiful city; but not one dollar of the money that the hon. member is so careful about in this item is going in the way he suggests.

Mr. CANNON: What is the use of this government spending $246,000, if it took $20,000,000 of the money of the city of Toronto to try to make a harbour and they have not yet succeeded? Everybody knows about this amusement park. My hon. friend wants to know my sources of information. I read the Toronto papers very carefully every day.

Mr. GRAHAM: Including the Orange Sentinel.

Mr. CANNON: Including the Orange Sentinel. That is where I get my information. I am very sorry the hon. member for South Wellington is not present. I should like to have him repeat, in connection with this item, the lesson in economy which he gave us earlier in the evening. Moreover, is Toronto a fit place for the government to build an amusement park? It is altogether immoral to do so. It will disturb the population from its religious and holy thoughts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like to appear in the role of a pedagogue towards the government party; but I really think it would contribute to the usefulness of this Chamber if the government would see to it that some little preliminary instruction was given to its members on the facts associated with the government's estimates. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) has clearly been under the influence of a delusion for some time. There has never been a dollar of public money spent towards any amusement ground in Toronto, and I do not think there is in this Dominion a city that has itself contributed so much towards those purposes for which, in other places, the Dominion government provides, as has the city of Toronto. If the hon. member will commence his oration by showing that a dollar has gone to any amusement purpose in Toronto out of the treasury of Canada, from that on there will be an intelligible lesson to be drawn from his remarks. But the onus is on him to show that, and it cannot be done. Not only can he not show that; but he cannot succeed in showing that the city of Toronto itself has not done very much that, in other places, has been wholly done by the Dominion government in the way of navigation and port facilities.

Mr. CANNON: I withdraw absolutely nothing of the remarks which I have just made, notwithstanding what the leader of the Opposition has said. As to the lesson which he has intended to give me—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I meant that his minister should give it.

Mr. CANNON: —I might say to the right hon. gentleman that I know parliamentary rules and customs well enough to dispense with any lesson from him. I have shown this on former occasions, and if my right hon.

friend again uses towards another hon. member in this House the fatherly language which he has just adopted, he may find that I am a rather unruly child.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That the hon. member is an unruly child, I have found out already; I do not need that lesson again. I did not suggest that he did not know the rules of the House. I know he does. I suggest that before he endeavours to raise some fun at the expense of Toronto by intimating that it has received special favours, he owes it to this House to prove that the money of Canada has gone to afford amusements for the people of Toronto. That he has not done, and that he cannot do.

Mr. SPENCE: It is a pity hon. members are not better posted when they get up to speak. I would tell my hon. friend across the way that this is not to add to the harbour, but to protect the eastern entrance to the bay, which is government property and the city gets no benefit from it whatever.

Mr. CANNON: Is not the bay in the harbour?

Mr. SPENCE: No, sir.

Mr. CANNON: Or the harbour in the bay?

Mr. SPENCE: The harbour is on this side of the bay. If my hon. friend will come to Toronto—

Mr. CANNON: I am going next week.

Mr. SPENCE: —and see what sports we have there, he will be very well satisfied.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Before the item carries I wish to state the position in which the hon. member for Dorchester places himself by declining to withdraw a remark which we are told upon authority is untrue, namely, that of asserting something which he cannot prove.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Friday, March 9, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 53, respecting Canadian Press Limited.—Mr. Ryckman.

[Mr. Cannon.]

REPORTS PRESENTED

Third report of the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization.—Mr. Kay.

First and second reports of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Second report of the special committee to inquire into agricultural conditions.—Mr. McMaster.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved that the second report of the special committee to inquire into agricultural conditions be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

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

That the special committee to inquire into the operation of chapter 12, 8-9 George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, pursuant to the resolution adopted by the House on the 22nd of February last, consist of the following members: Messieurs Brown, Carmichael, Chevrier, Copp, Drummond, Hughes, Garland (Carleton), McBride, McKillop, McMurray, Malcolm, Marcil (Bonaventure), Martell, Parent, Rinfret, Shaw and Simpson, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its proceedings and the evidence taken, for the use of the committee, and to report from time to time; and that rules 11 and 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE

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

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the first report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce, the said committee be given leave to sit while the House is in session, and to have their proceedings printed from day to day for the use of the members of the committee, when deemed advisable; and that rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) the second report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce was concurred in.

RUSSIAN TRADE MISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): In the Manchester Guardian of 2nd February, in the report of an interview with Litvinoff by Arthur Ransome, it is stated that

the Canadian government has refused to admit the Russian Trade Mission which we ourselves had previously invited. I should like to ask, has Canada a treaty with Russia, and has the Russian Trade Mission been refused admission as stated? And, if so, why?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce):- There was an understanding arrived at that Canada would accept the conditions agreed upon between Russia and Great Britain, that Canada would send a trade mission to Russia and that Russia might send a trade mission to Canada. But in looking into the possibilities of trade with Russia we discovered that the principal source of purchase for Russia was in London, and the department considered that it was not advisable that Canada should spend money in sending a trade agent to Russia in view of the fact that all her purchases were made in the city of London. Russia proposed sending a trade mission to Canada and submitted certain names as members of that mission, but in view of reports presented it was considered that certain members whose names had been submitted were undesirable citizens, and an intimation was given that it was not advisable to admit these citizens with a record against them into Canada. Canada proposes to advise the British government, which is handling the matter, that we will be prepared to admit any Russian trade delegation which has a clean record in the British Isles.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not catch the answer to the first part of my question. Have we a treaty with Russia at the present time?

Mr. ROBB: No. We have accepted the conditions agreed upon between Great Britain and Russia, and that allows us to have trade relations with Russia.

PRIVILEGE—MR. SHAW

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): I rise to a question of privilege. An article appeared in the Grain Growers' Guide under the heading of "Our Ottawa Letter," apparently from the Ottawa correspondent, under date of 14th February last, in which the following reference was made to myself:

> The fourteen Progressives who voted against the Shaw amendment did so because not only was it, in their opinion, surperfluous, but they for the most part thought that it was presented somewhat as a result of an understanding with the Conservatives, who refrained from submitting a motion. Reports had been going the round to the effect that there was an understanding in this direction.

I want to say that there is not the slightest foundation in fact for the insidious suggestion contained in the portion of the article which I have just read.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is very damaging, too.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not blame you.

Mr. SHAW: I make this statement because I think it is only fair not only to myself but also to the Conservative party. I think it is also only fair to state that it was not a member of the Press Gallery who wrote the article in question. Readers of this paper, the Grain Growers' Guide, will, however, be interested in noting that the Ottawa correspondent is the press representative in this city of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in addition writes for a well known Wall Street financial journal.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I owe it to the hon. member (Mr. Shaw) to say that his words as respects anything in the way of an understanding are absolutely true; I had no knowledge direct or indirect of his motion. I may add as well that now I hope that he, and others more or less associated with him, will understand how I as leader of the Conservative party have been, at the hands of this same journal, very frequently done grave injustice to.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

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

> Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers; for the administration of the proposed act by a Minister of the Crown to be named by the Governor in Council; for the appointment of a registrar to receive, register and deal with applications for such investigations, and for the appointment of commissioners from time to time by the Governor in Council to hold investigations; for the payment of the registrar, commissioners and witnesses and to establish such offices, with assistants, as may be required; for power to remit or reduce duties where combines are proved to exist; for the revocation of patent rights in certain cases; for prosecution by the Attorney General of any province, or upon his failure to act, by the Solicitor General; and for the imposition of penalties for violation of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I will make the explanation at the moment that I thought of making on the introduction of the bill. It will cover the same ground.

There is at the present time no effective legislation against combines which are operating or may operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, whether producers, consumers or others. Such legislation as has been enacted by this parliament on the subject of combines in restraint of trade, the enhancement of prices and the like, is divisible broadly into three groups: first, the legislation with respect to conspiracies and combinations in restraint of trade which is embodied in the Criminal Code. It was originally enacted in a statute passed in 1889, which statute was to all intents and purposes declaratory of the common law. In 1892 this act was repealed by the Criminal Code, but the substance of its essential provision was re-enacted in section 520 of the code of that year. The section of the code was amended in 1900 and again I think in 1906 when the Criminal Code was under consideration. It now stands as section 498 of the Criminal Code in virtually the same words as the original enactment of 1889.

The second group of provisions dealing with combines in restraint of trade, or operating to the detriment of the public, were those of the Combines Investigation Act of 1910 which provides for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers.

The third group is comprised in the legislation embodied in the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919.

The Combines and Fair Prices Act repealed the Combines Investigation Act of 1910. Such protection, therefore, as that act may have been presumed to have afforded to the public was removed by the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919. On the other hand, the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919 was itself dependent upon the Board of Commerce Act and the functioning of the Board of Commerce under that act. As hon. members of the House know, the Board of Commerce, under the Board of Commerce Act, never did function properly and has ceased to exist, so that such protection as might have been presumed to be afforded consumers or producers under the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act also no longer exists. While the Board of Commerce Act is not effective in any of its provisions so far as the protection of the public is concerned, Section 11 of the Combines and Fair Prices Act provides that no prosecution can be commenced under section 498 of the Criminal Code except under the written authority of the Board of Commerce. That section is still in the statute and as long as the statute remains, such protection as the Criminal Code may be assumed to have afforded producers and consumers is also of no effect.

The legislation which the government proposes to introduce, repeals the Board of Commerce Act 1919 and the Combines and Fair Prices Act 1919, in that way freeing the statutes of two enactments which have become dead letters. On the other hand, this repeal will have the effect of reviving what there may be of virtue in section 498 of the Criminal Code which relates to conspiracies or combinations in restraint of trade.

Now, it is recognized that there are distinct limitations in the matter of the protection of the public under the provisions of the Criminal Code. The legislation which the government is introducing proceeds on the theory that the reason why section 498 of the Criminal Code is of so little effect is not that there are no combinations that are detrimental to the public or that such combinations are rare, but rather that the existence of these combinations, and their method of operation is difficult to discover; that what is needed is effective machinery of investigation which will disclose the existence of combines operating to the detriment of the public, and afford the information whereby proceedings under the Criminal Code can be made really effective in the case of individuals who are violating its provisions, or who are associated with combines that are operating to the detriment of the public. The legislation to be introduced provides machinery for investigation which it is hoped and believed will be effective toward this end. I will describe the proposed method of investigation a little more in detail when I refer to that particular phase of the subject.

The bill proposes to supplement the clause in the present Criminal Code by a provision creating a new criminal offence; making it an offence for any person to be a party or privy to or knowingly to assist in the formation or operation of a combine operating to the detriment of the public—a combine as defined in the legislation which is proposed. It will be readily observed that to be effective, the definition of the word "combine" must be made sufficiently comprehensive to include any agreement or arrangement, whether tacit, implied or expressed, which has the effect in practice of creating a combination that is operating against the public interest; and the definition of the word "combine", as set forth in the proposed legislation, has been drafted with the end in view of having it sufficiently broad to include all possibilities under that head. On the other hand, that

parties may be properly protected in the matter of criminal prosecutions and in order that no one may be prosecuted without having the advantages which the courts of law and the procedure in the courts throw about one who is brought before them for trial, a provision is included in the proposed legislation to the effect that no prosecution can take place except at the instance of the Attorney General of a province or the Solicitor General of the Dominion.

The remedies that are proposed are first of all, as indicated, the remedy of publicity. There are some offences as to which publicity is more effective as a remedy than penalty. The law is drafted so as to make possible the widest publicity with respect to any offence under its provisions.

Then there is the remedy of penalty, to which I have already referred, as a result of criminal prosecution. There are other remedies which may be exercised as the circumstances warrant—for example where it would appear that in the case of an article of commerce the parties concerned were profiting by virtue of the tariff as it is, power is given to the Governor in Council to reduce or to abolish duties with respect to that particular article. Similarly, where a patent is being used to limit manufacture, or in other ways limit conpetition, to the detriment of the public, power is given for the revocation of the patent.

In the proposed legislation the government has sought to be guided by such experience as the country has had in the workings of previous legislation; to retain what may have been of value in the Combines Investigation Act of 1910, and what may have been of value in the Board of Commerce Act and the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919, but to meet, as far as may be possible, what has been found defective or in the nature of limitation in the successful working of both these enactments. The Combines Investigation Act of 1910 provided that where any six persons were of the opinion that a combine existed which was detrimental to the public they might appear before any judge of a high court and make out a prima facie case. If they succeeded, the judge was required to report accordingly to the registrar appointed under the act. The registrar thereupon called upon the parties who had made out the prima facie case, and upon the parties concerned in the combine, each to name a representative for a board, the two to agree upon a third representative, and the three thus named were constituted a board of investigation, which board was given all the powers of a court of record. When the board had made its report the Governor in Council was then free to take such action as was thought best in accordance with other provisions of the statute, provisions similar to those respecting the reduction of customs duties, the revocation of patents, and criminal proceedings, to which I have already alluded.

It was found under the Combines Investigation Act that obliging individuals in the first instance to associate themselves together and make out a prima facie case before a judge discouraged in large measure any investigation. The parties seemed to be under the impression—although the law did not give ground for it—that they would necessarily have to bear the expense of the preliminary investigation, and might have to bear the expense of the investigation before the board that was subsequently appointed. For that reason, and possibly others as well, the Combines Investigation Act of 1910 was not used to the extent expected at the time that that measure was passed.

In the present proposed legisation the objection which I have just referred to has been removed by not obliging the parties to get together and prove a case before a judge in the first instance, but by permitting parties who believe a combine is operating in restraint of trade to make direct application to the registrar to be appointed under this act, and giving power to the registrar himself to make an investigation to satisfy his own mind as to whether such a combination does exist or not. The act gives the registrar very full powers. He may, if he so desires, proceed on his own initiative. The act further provides that the government may appoint one or more commissioners, where it is shown before the registrar, or for other reasons there are grounds for believing that the combine is operating to the detriment of the public. The government may appoint these commissioners with all the powers that commissioners have under the Enquiries Act, take evidence under oath, visit the premises, inspect books, compel the production of documents, if they like. Ample provision is made to secure the due exercise of these powers. Under the Board of Commerce Act there was created an extraordinary court, a court of record with powers of inquisition, accusation and judgment, all exercisable by the same body. I will not go into the reasons which seemed to render a court of that kind valueless for the purpose for which it was instituted. I will simply point out that it had functions which seldom are combined in any one body, that namely of beginning investigation, of laying information, of prosecuting,

of pronouncing judgment and seeing to the enforcement of that judgment. It moreover was a single court, constituted of a definite personnel; it was supposed to have and did have virtually the whole say as to what prosecutions should be commenced, even as I have already indicated, for violations of the Criminal Code. Experience has shown that a board of that kind cannot be expected to function properly, and instead, therefore, of a board of that character, this measure proposes to give full power of investigation to commissioners to be specially appointed from time to time as occasion may require.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that that broadly is the outline of the proposed legislation.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not think any great object could be served by a prolonged discussion, but I felt that I could say something anent the historical summary given by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I remark first of all that the title of the bill, as it appears in the introduction of bills, and as it is summarized again, reflected at least in this motion, is not in accord with what was promised in the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne promised legislation "to safeguard the interests of producers and consumers" against Trust monopolies and combines, thereby foreshadowing, not investigatory legislation, but executory legislation, legislation that would itself have a controlling and final authority over such trusts, monopolies and combines. The promising language of the Speech from the Throne was considerably modulated when the title of the bill came down—"an Act to Provide for the Investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers." The Enquiries Act today would give us as ample powers of investigation as anyone would wish, that is to say, if the contemplated legislation is for investigation, and nothing further. The Combines Investigation Act was, it is true, repealed by the Combines and Fair Prices Act, 1919. The Combines Investigation Act provided for the investigation of trusts or mergers upon information of six persons and certain responsibilities taken by them not of a financial character. That act was on the statute books for a good many years. It was an investigatory act, that is to say, it looked to investigation and investigation alone. There could be no prosecution under it but there was one investigation commenced, in the course of its long existence. That was against the United Shoe Machinery Company. That company was charged with being a trust combine within the meaning of that act. The necessary complaint was laid, and the whole paraphernalia of the act was gone through. It lasted some years, went through some of the courts, cost many thousands of dollars, and as the end approached, it appeared that by the time the end was reached we would be exactly where we began, assuming we would succeed. In a word, after all the machinery of the act was exhausted, one had to start all over again and prosecute the alleged combine monopoly or trust, adduce again the evidence before the court, call upon the court for injunction restraining proceedings, and in the meantime of course the company under investigation would simply have to alter its procedure by such degree or by such angle as evidently would comply with the dictum that may have been secured from the judge in the process of the investigation, which done, it would be quite absolved from liability under the effective prosecution that would follow. In a word, the presence of the act, in so far as it was a necessary preliminary to prosecution, was really a buffer as between the consumer and producer on the one hand and the trust and merger on the other. It would have been better and more effective legislation to have had the criminal code in effect alone, and have machinery provided whereby the company, the trust or combine, could be prosecuted under the terms of the code. The Combines and Fair Prices Act was passed in 1919, and that, in conjunction with its accompanying legislation, the Board of Commerce Act, provided a body and endowed it with power to do what the Prime Minister fairly describes, namely, lay—not institute—proceedings itself when it had reason to believe that trusts were operating in restraint of trade, a combine against the interests of the public. Whatever may be said of those two acts —I do not for one moment say they were not subject to criticism, and that weaknesses did not develop—it cannot be said that ample powers were not given to the Board of Commerce, the board that was entrusted with the enforcing of both statutes. The powers given were wide and sweeping—wider than had ever been given before in any country in the world; in fact they were undoubtedly in my judgment too wide, and as a consequence of that—perhaps there were other causes as well —when the proceedings brought were called in question and challenged before the courts, the courts held that parliament in endeavouring to arm the board with power to control the depredations of trusts and combines had gone beyond its jurisdiction. Since that time, while the statutes have remained, they are not effective statutes because there has been no board operating. The

Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) states that a section in one of these acts, I think the Combines and Fair Prices Act, provides that the interposition of the Board of Commerce and its authority should be secured before there should be criminal prosecution under section 498 of the code and that, inasmuch as these two acts still exist, although not operative, criminal presecutions are now forbidden. If that be the case, it had not been drawn to my attention. Undoubtedly that should be removed and there should be a re-establishment of the full right of prosecution under the code.

Another section provided for the repeal of the Combines Investigation Act of earlier years. This, of course, was necessary as a new, much more complete and drastic method was being adopted.

The experience of these years has led me to one main conclusion. Before I mention it, I will make some reference to what I understand by the Prime Minister's explanation. So far as I can gather from his explanation, what he purposes to do is substantially to reinstate the old Combines Investigation Act, not in its exact terms, because there are some alterations. There are to be registrars or commissioners appointed before whom complaints are to be laid and who are to have investigatory powers. Apparently, they are to exercise some of the functions which under the old act, were exercised by the courts of the land. I have not much hope of that being an improvement. What I apprehend is this, that this bill, when it comes, will not get any further than the old act, and that means that it will simply compel prosecution to travel in a circle and to traverse the circle twice instead of once.

In the United States, they have approached the subject in another way. The Federal Trade Commission has certain powers; but the government of the country, having established laws which define trusts, monopolies, combines and restraints of trade, having limited the activities in scope and character, of trusts, monopolies and combines, then take it upon themselves to execute these laws and to institute prosecutions for violations of their law, such prosecutions requiring the readjustment of the whole merging companies. They operated this legislation against the United Shoe Machinery Company; but they had much better success than we could ever have had under the old act. The government of the United States, carrying on its prosecution, obtained the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, declaring that this company's methods of operation were illegal, assessing them with damages for the same, and demanding that within a certain time the whole method be altered. It has been altered, very much, undoubtedly, to the loss of the company; but at all events effective curtailment has taken place, because the principle of government responsibility for prosecution is embodied in the United States legislation. The initiative is there; the powers are there, effective powers and not merely circuitous, ambitory and purposeless powers. I hope this bill will go further than we are led to expect from the title; in a word that there will be something executory, final and effective about it, and it will not be merely a repetition of the old act, the Combines Investigation Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) to judge the proposed legislation, not by the title, but by its provisions. As he well knows, a title is meaningless when it comes to courts of law and positive action, but the provisions of an enactment are everything. I think my right hon. friend will find, that all that was promised in the Speech from the Throne that:—

> A bill will be submitted to you to safeguard the interests of consumers and producers from undue enhancement of prices or unfair restriction of trade by combines, monopolies, trusts, or mergers.

—has been adequately met in the proposed legislation.

I may mention to my right hon. friend the reason which has prompted the government to lay particular emphasis on the investigation aspect of the legislation. I pointed out, in speaking on the measure at the outset, that the difficulty of proceeding under the Criminal Code has been found to be due, not to the circumstances that combines are rare or that they do not occasion restraint of trade, but to the fact that their existence and particularly their method of operation, is sometimes very difficult to discover, and the only way in which it can be brought to light is by thorough and full powers of investigation. The section in the Criminal Code relating to conspiracies and combines in restraint of trade differs from most other sections of the code in this particular, that other offences under the code are, for the most part, obvious, whereas the existence and operation of combines is not. If murder, or theft, or perjury is committed, the fact is known at once, and the main difficulty of those whose duty it is to enforce the law is to apprehend the offender and bring him before the courts. But when the matter is one of the existence or operation of a combine, the difficulty is, not to apprehend the offender, once he is known, but to find out first of all to what extent he is operating

against the public interest; to make clear the nature and extent of the offence. That can be done only by giving very full powers of investigation, and for that reason the government has thought it well to lay particular emphasis on the investigation feature of the legislation.

As to the proposed legislation being something more than a mere act of investigation, I would like to quote just one clause which appears in the bill and which is in the nature of the creation of a new offence. I only hope that when we come to enacting this clause, my right hon. friend and those who sit around him will not raise the objection that it goes too far and that it is likely, perhaps, to effect more in the way of concrete, executive action than he and his friends would like. The clause reads:

> Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $10,000 or to two years' imprisonment, or if a corporation to a penalty not exceeding $25,000, who is a party or privy to or knowingly assists in the formation or operation of a combine as defined in this act.

The definition of "combine" as given in the act reads:

> The expression "combine" in this act shall be deemed to have reference to such combines immediately hereinafter defined as in the opinion of the registrar or any commissioner have operated or are likely to operate to the detriment of or against the interest of the public, whether consumers, producers or others; and limited as aforesaid, the expression as used in this act shall be deemed to include (1) mergers, trusts and monopolies socalled, and (2) the relation resulting from the purchase, lease, or other acquisition by any person of any control over or interest in the whole or part of the business of any other person, and (3) any actual or tacit contract, agreement, arrangement or combination which has or is designed to have the effect of (i) limiting facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing; or, (ii) preventing, limiting or lessening manufacture or production; or (iii) fixing a common sale or a resale price, or a common rental, or a common cost of storage or transportation; or (iv) enhancing the price, rental or cost of article, rental storage or transportation; or (v) preventing or lessening competition in, or substantially controlling within any particular area or district or generally, production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, storage, transportation, insurance or supply; or (vi) otherwise restraining or injuring trade or commerce.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And now I might say a word with reference to the re-enactment of some sections of the Combines Act of 1910.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the Prime Minister goes further would he explain at this point wherein that is at all more stringent than the provisions of section 498 of the code as it now stands?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Section 498 of the code uses the words "unduly" and "unreasonably",—"unduly enhancing", and "unreasonably advancing" prices; and—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not always. The word "unduly" appears in subsection A in regard to certain matters, for example, unduly limiting the facilities for transportation. In subsection B, however, it is not used in connection with trade or commerce in relation to any article or commodity. In the general clause about injuring trade it is not used at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not the two provisions side by side, but if my right hon. friend will make a comparison of them when we are in committee on the bill he will find that of the two definitions this is very much broader and goes very much further than the Criminal Code as it stands to-day. As my right hon. friend has pointed out, the word "unduly" does appear in the code where it does not appear in this definition; and he will also find elsewhere in the code the word "unreasonably". But there are other particulars in which this definition is broader, and I will indicate them to the House when I have the two provisions side by side so as to be able to compare them. With respect to what my right hon. friend has said as to this legislation re-enacting some of the provisions of the Combines and Investigation Act of 1910, let me say to him and to the House at once that it does. But I would draw his attention to this fact, that the legislation of 1919 also re-enacted certain of the provisions of the act of 1910. For example, the Combines and Fair Prices Act and the Board of Commerce Act between them re-enacted the provision giving the Governor in Council power to reduce duties, which appeared for the first time in the Combines Act of 1910, and also re-enacted the provision with respect to the revocation of patents, and as well, I think, with respect to providing information for criminal prosecutions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are in the Combines and Fair Prices Act of 1919; they are the law to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are in the act of 1919, but they were all taken from the act of 1910.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I have said, the object of this legislation is to retain anything of value in the previous legislation. I am quite willing to go halves with my right hon. friend as to the previous legislation, both his and the legislation I had to do with, not meeting the case fully. I think it has all been by way of experiment with a very difficult subject; and I believe that the experience, both under the act of 1910 and

under the legislation of 1919, will be helpful to this House in deciding upon the worth of the parts of the legislation which we have retained and of the new clauses which we have introduced. Our aim has been to take from all existing or past legislation what is likely to be effective and helpful and to add additional features where there has been something lacking in the law as it stands or previously stood; for our desire is to place on the statutes an act which will be of real service to consumers and producers alike in protecting them against the operations of combines which may be detrimental to the public interest.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Mackenzie King thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 54 to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS—HARBOURS AND RIVERS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Public Works—Manitoba—harbours and rivers generally, $15,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under this heading I want to ask the minister what he has done towards restoring to the city of Portage la Prairie the facilities for its sewerage outlet of which this government deprived it by the construction of a ditch in the Assiniboine river in 1908. I have been in communication with the minister on the matter, as also have the city and the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Leader). The latest information I have is that no progress at all has been made and I see nothing in the estimates to indicate that there will be any progress. This estimate is the same as it was a year ago; but this sum stipulated here, if it were all applied to the one purpose, would not, according to my information, be a beginning towards the repairing of the damages which the government caused that city. We are right now at the edge of spring; the minister knows the circumstances, I need not at this moment detail them, because he is fully aware of them. But already about eight months of delay have occurred and no matter what the government does now there are sure to be somewhat serious conditions. I am sorry indeed that no provision is made here, because this vote is not for Portage la Prairie work and in any event is quite insufficient for anything practical. The government cannot make speed enough to repair this damage, and apparently no effort is being made to do anything at all. I hope for a more favourable reply and a more definite statement than has yet been obtainable from the department.

4 p.m.

Mr. LEADER: On December 6, 1921, I was elected representative for the city of Portage la Prairie.

Mr. DUFF: Whom did you defeat?

Mr. LEADER: For the information of the House, and incidentally for the information of the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen), I want to say that up to this time I have not delegated my duties to anyone else, nor do I intend to do so. I leave that to a higher tribunal.

Now, let me say a word in regard to this item. Last year a serious condition prevailed in Manitoba through the overflowing of the Assiniboine river. I brought the matter to the attention of the government, and instead of throwing brickbats at the administration, as we sometimes have to do, I want to throw a bouquet to-day; I want to thank them for coming to the assistance of the settlers along the Assiniboine river and to voice the appreciation of my constituents in Portage la Prairie for the prompt action taken in that connection. I pointed out last year that this question of repairing the dykes along the Assiniboine river had been a live one for the last forty years. The banks of that river overflow periodically, and usually no attention is paid to the matter until on the eve of an election, when some candidate is promised that assistance will be given. In that respect I cannot exonerate either of the late governments; both were guilty. I suggest to the government to-day that they take this matter up and, in conjunction with the province or perhaps with the municipalities, enter into some kind of arrangement under which such a situation may be taken care of in the future. As it is now, nobody seems to be willing to take the responsibility. There is no doubt in my mind that the Dominion government is liable, because the river, having been declared a navigable stream, is certainly under the jurisdiction of the federal authority, and the province has very properly declined to assume the responsibility. But I believe that an arrangement could be made whereby the situation would be taken care of without reference to election promises—that is Progressive politics. I have been negotiating with the government for some time with respect to the diversion of the waters of the Assiniboine river from their original channel and the resulting exposure of the mouth of the sewer outlet from the city of Portage la

Prairie, but I must admit that the government have been very slow in the matter. I know, however, that they have had their engineers over the ground; various estimates have been made and various solutions of the problem advanced. I would like to know from the government—in fact, I may tell the House that I do know, but for the information of the hon. members I would ask the minister to tell us what proposal he has in mind to take care of the situation that has developed at Portage la Prairie.

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Public Works): The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) are right in assuming that there is no appropriation under this item for taking care of the sewers at Portage la Prairie. The right hon. gentleman stated in his opening remarks that this government had failed. That is not right; the government are dealing with conditions as they found them. The government of Canada probably did fail. This work was designed and carried through at the request of the people of Portage la Prairie and adjoining districts. In 1908, on account of the lands being flooded, they asked the Dominion government to construct a channel that would carry off the overflow during the high water period. If the work had been carried out as designed by the engineers, probably the difficulties we find to-day would not exist. However, appropriations were not forthcoming and the work was neglected, with the result that the main stream became diverted and to-day the bed of the river is in the new channel, leaving the sewer pipe from the town of Portage in the old channel and causing it to discharge at this season of the year on an empty river bed. That is undoubtedly a serious matter from the point of view of the public health of the citizens of Portage. When it was brought to my attention last year I took a sympathetic attitude and instituted a careful investigation to see in what way the Department of Public Works could afford relief in connection with a difficulty that had developed, to some extent, through its own activities. But we found a rather peculiar disposition on the part of those controlling the affairs of the people of Portage la Prairie. Evidently they are going to sit back and continue to cry for help from the Dominion government. I am desirous of assisting them, but I would like to see them try to do something for themselves. Undoubtedly the work was originally carried out for the advantage of the people of the town and the adjoining territory; in fact, it was constructed on their application. We are trying to negotiate with the council with a view to arriving at an agreement in the matter. I have had a report made by the district engineer, supported by a report submitted by the late Chief Engineer, Mr. St. Laurent. I have a recommendation that I propose to make to council if we can succeed in our negotiations with the citizens of Portage la Prairie. I am of the opinion that the Dominion government should supply the funds necessary to extend the sewer pipe from its present position into the new bed of the river or into another portion of the river, and that, I think, is as far as the Department of Public Works should go. Apparently, however, that is not the wish of the citizens of Portage la Prairie; at least, they have not so stated to us. The matter is under negotiation. I think that is a fairly clear statement of the facts.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What does the government propose to do about the Assiniboine a little higher up, at the town of Brandon—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. member will permit me to interrupt; we are not through with this phase of it yet. I did not know I had represented myself, Mr. Chairman, as the member for Portage la Prairie. I quite recognize that the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Leader) was elected for that constituency at the last election. Notwithstanding that fact, however, it so turns out that I have been requested to take this matter up by the council of the city of Portage la Prairie. Having such authority I do not require the further authority of the hon. member. I have been written to repeatedly and asked to assist the city in the matter, by the clerk as well as by the mayor. What I want is to get this work done and get the minister's promise to do it now. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie can have the glory—if he so desires. I had in no way reflected on him.

Mr. LEADER: May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. LEADER: The hon. gentleman is very kind. He said he had been requested by the mayor and council and by different citizens of Portage to take the matter up. Does he not think it was an ungracious act to bring it up here in the parliament of Canada without consulting the proper representative of Portage la Prairie?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am looking after the city as I was asked to do—I am not looking

after the representative. I was about to remark that when an hon. member of this House spurns assistance in any effort for his constituents, it does not speak very highly of his judgment.

Mr. LEADER: I did not spurn the efforts; I objected to his manner of presenting them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am presenting the matter to the government, not to the hon. member. I wish to give some history of this matter, and I think it will show to the committee that I am not at fault in being somewhat concerned. I know of the subject from its commencement, I say in answer to the minister's assertion that there should be an effort on the part of the city to help themselves out of this difficulty that the difficulty in which the city finds itself is due originally to the action of the government of Canada, and it is now due to the inaction of this government—to its delay in meeting the situation. The cause of the trouble was the work of a former government, the government of 1908. When I give an account of this construction as it developed in the fall of that year, hon. members will understand that the responsibility is not on the city but on this government, and that this government has no reasonable excuse for not coming to parliament now and in this vote and asking for an appropriation to remedy a state of affairs created by the government of 1908. The responsibility for finding a solution and putting the city in the position it was in up to 1922 is on this administration and it is on no one else. It is not on the city at all.

The city of Portage la Prairie is situated to the north of the Assiniboine river. The Assiniboine river immediately to the south takes a bend in the shape of a horse shoe, the ball of the horse shoe being projected northward almost up to the city. In the years 1902 and 1904, years of great flood in that locality, the river overflowed its banks, not at Portage la Prairie, but to the east of Portage la Prairie, and flooded farm lands in very large area between that city and the city of Winnipeg causing very considerable damage. The government of the country was appealed to, to remedy that situation. The method of doing so was not directed at all in the petitions to this government. The method was left to the government. The government chose to seek a remedy by digging a ditch across the horse shoe between the one extremity and the other, thereby diverting to the extent the ditch would divert the course of the river from going around the horse shoe. Such was the method the government adopted. It was pointed out indeed it was feared at the time that if this were done there would be a probability of the horse shoe drying up. Now at the time this was done in 1908, at that very time and for three years before the city had had constructed a sewerage system which emptied into the horse shoe, which emptied into the part from which the water was about to be diverted. All went well, of course, until the ditch widened in extent, and that happened gradually through these years, but chiefly of late years, and last year it had proceeded to such an extent that the ditch the government dug in 1908 became the course of the river, and the whole horse shoe was deserted by the water altogether and dried up. The consequence is that the sewerage of the whole city is emitted on dry land at the very verge of the city right in the neighbourhood of a fairly well populated farming district. Such is the consequence of the government's action.

Now the minister wants to imply that in some way the city of Portage la Prairie was a party to the action of the government in 1908. Not at all. But before I come to that let me give just another phase of this story. This was a piece of work done on the favourite plan of the present government, the foreman and day labour plan. The floods were in 1902 and 1904. The petition was on January 10, 1905. The communications to the then government, the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, of which I see more than one member sitting in front of me now as a member of this government were in 1905. The communications came in January, 1905, the only petition that ever came was presented in that month. On that petition there is not the name of one man who was a citizen of Portage la Prairie at that time. All were farmers or residents between that city and the city of Winnipeg. Not only did the city not petition or become a party thereto in any way, but no resident of the city was a petitioner. The government did it without any acquiescence of any sort and without consulting in any way the city of Portage la Prairie.

Did the government do anything in answer to the petition? Not in 1905, not in 1906, not in 1907. In these years there was no general election on or pending. The government waited until the general election of 1908. The election was on the 26th of October, 1908, and the 19th of September of that year the Laurier government placed down there a number of men, a very large number for the work, and put them in charge of a good Liberal foreman, kept them all well corralled in the ditch, and marched them up in caravans on election day in order to make sure of defeating me in that contest. Of course, when the elec-

tion was over, the government's sense of responsibility ceased because the government's object ended, and the men were all taken out on the 31st of October, five days after the election was decided.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The government's responsibility did not cease then in regard to this ditch, although that government has disappeared.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I am trying to impress upon the minister. I seem to have succeeded more rapidly than I expected. It did not cease, it still exists. On the 31st of October, the election being safely by, though they were frustrated in Portage la Prairie, they took all the men out, did not complete the work that was projected then, just left it as it was. What was apparently projected, though at that time I did not know it, was that there should be something in the nature of a weir placed at the entrance of the ditch so as to provide that a share of the water would still flow around the curve. This was not done. As a consequence, the ditch that formerly was 20 feet wide at the bottom now is nearly 200 feet wide, and very deep; The whole river is diverted, and the city of Portage la Prairie is entirely without an outlet for its sewerage. Who then can suggest for a minute that the responsibility for such a state of affairs is not on the government, and the whole responsibility? The responsibility for finding a remedy is on the government. It is not on us.

I put a question on this subject in parliament on the 3rd of February, 1909, and I obtained an answer which I have now before me showing that the petitions all came in in January, 1905; that nothing was done until September, 1908; that everything was done between the 19th day of September and the 31st day of October of that year, the election being safely passed; that it was not done by tender and contract, and that no provision whatever was made for taking care of the sewerage outlet of the city. Here is the weighty reason given by the government for not doing so. I asked:

> What, if any, provision has been made by the government for disposal of the sewerage of the city of Portage la Prairie, as the present method of disposal of same is said to be interfered with by the work so done?

Here is the answer:

> No provision has been made as this is a public work, constructed by the government, at the request of citizens of Portage la Prairie, and for the benefit of the city and the adjoining country.

It was not for the benefit of the city at all; it was not at the request of the citizens, nor of any of the citizens. It was done for the benefit of others farther down, or supposed to be for their benefit. I presume it did work for their benefit, although a better method could have been found. The city of Portage la Prairie was a stranger to it altogether. Why all these months of hesitation? It was a political ditch dug for a political purpose, to defeat an opponent of the government at that time. That is why the work was done at the time it was done and in the way it was done. The damage caused the city is now seen. Work that originally cost some five thousand odd dollars has caused the city damage which to repair along the line now suggested by the minister, but for which he does not provide,—by extending the sewer on to meet the ditch—will cost according to the minister's engineer, $65,000.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. gentleman state what he did as private member for Portage la Prairie, as Solicitor General, as Minister of the Interior, and finally as Prime Minister to remedy the situation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The situation did not need remedying when I was there. The water was flowing around the bend. But if the present condition had developed it would have been remedied and eight months would not have been lost with the sewerage emptying into the dry bed of the stream.

Mr. CANNON: But two years were lost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We were often called upon when in office to remedy the blunders of hon. members opposite, but we waited until the evil appeared before applying the cure. If we had set out to take care of this case before the damage arrived then we would have been told we were wasting money and that no damage would ever develop.

Mr. CANNON: If the evil did not exist how could my right hon. friend mention this matter in 1909?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked some questions in 1909. I had a fear it would come and I said so. There is no need of meeting damage until it is at least in sight, but a government that puts off dealing with an evil when it does appear is responsible for the consequences. If we had been in power when the time for action arrived, we would have been obliged to remedy the consequences of the folly of hon. members opposite.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend no doubt is taking a great interest in this question and has made a reference back as far as 1909. But he is probably also aware

that in 1917 and 1918 the engineers did deal with this work. They made certain recommendations, and my right hon. friend failed to get a vote to carry out those recommendations. Had the recommendations been carried out this condition would not have existed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1917 and 1918 there was no damage done, and there was no damage pending. There was no pressing need then for anything being done. The damage was apparent this last year; that was the first year that the stream was dry. I had no request from the city—I feel sure I had not until 1922. Now, that situation has arisen, and the minister sits inactive with the damage existing and continuing, and that is why I find fault with him. If he had come down this session with an estimate for the repair of this damage I could have found no fault with the minister; none could have been found with him. But he has not done that. Now I was assured and I hope it is true—although I find no sign of it in the minister's speech—that he has a plan and that he is going to carry out his plan. Why is he not at work, why is he not seeking money to-day for the purpose? There is no excuse at all for his delay. If ever there was urgency in any matter there is urgency here. Suits are threatened to-day not only against the government but against the city as well. The government, of course, can say "We cannot be sued unless we give a fiat," but the city has no such shelter. The government of Manitoba has called upon the city of Portage la Prairie to remedy this nuisance. The provincial government has a right to call upon the city to do so, and the city, in the face of that demand from the provincial authorities, knocks in vain at the door of this government which is in office and responsible for providing a remedy.

What I am pressing for is that provision for a remedy be made in these estimates now; that we get to work at once, so that when the soft weather of the spring and summer comes the city will not find itself without an outlet. I am prepared to work with anybody to that end, and if the minister will promise to do so, I am prepared to end the discussion here and now. If the minister is prepared to state that he will insert an item in the estimates at once to take care of the situation I am prepared to support it and to press him no more. I am prepared to support such effective plan as may be devised by the officers of his department to carry off the sewage of the city. I have seen the estimate of his engineer as to what the plan intimated by the minister will cost, but the government's responsibility is to remedy the existing condition and to do so now. I am not responsible for finding a remedy; I am not obliged even to put my imprimatur on the government's remedy. The government is responsible for finding a remedy and for installing it, and should have been at the work before this.

Mr. LEADER: Day by day and in every way I am learning more about politics. The information which the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has conveyed to the committee to-day was dug up as a result of a lot of hard work and at my own private expense and submitted to the city council of Portage la Prairie. What my right hon. friend has said in regard to the digging of this canal in 1908 is true. I am not a politician. I do not owe allegiance to either one of the old parties and I never shall.

An hon. MEMBER: You are too young yet.

Mr. LEADER: I want to be fair in anything that I say. When the right hon. gentleman was a minister in the federal government and the Hon. Robert Rogers was Minister of Public Works in the same administration, the Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba, Hon. Hugh Armstrong wrote Mr. Rogers a letter on the eve of the provincial election, telling him that if he would grant some money to do work along the Assiniboine river in the constituency of Lakeside no doubt it would prove very popular. The right hon. gentleman, (Mr. Meighen), as hon. members know, was member for Portage la Prairie for a great many years but ceased to occupy that position in 1921. This situation has been developing since 1913, and I saw a letter sent from his law partner at the last Dominion election, subsequent to dissolution, asking the city of Portage la Prairie to take this matter up. Consequently I assume that the right hon. gentleman was fully conversant with the situation while he was member for Portage la Prairie. During that time why did he not do something to relieve the situation? Why he is doing so much worrying now I cannot understand. I realize that I have not had much experience in politics, but so long as I am member for Portage la Prairie I am going to represent that constituency to the very best of my ability; and when I want anybody to help me I will ask for that assistance. I asked the right hon. gentleman to help me when I came down to Ottawa last year and he said "Harry, I will do anything I can for you." Yet

he makes a long statement to the committee this afternoon on this matter without saying a word to me on the subject. My right hon. friend says that I am thin-skinned. Let me inform him that he has been discourteous to me, and I resent it.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: It is not my intention to speak at any great length, but I must say that I am pleased to discover that Portage la Prairie is so happily situated as to possess two members. In that respect Portage la Prairie is one of the most favoured constituencies in the Dominion. I was considerably surprised to find only the paltry sum of $41,265 in the estimates of the Public Works department for Manitoba. Of course we have no harbours in my riding although we have lots of home brew. However, what I want to mention is this: The Assiniboine was in flood last year and if it had risen about six inches more a lot of water from Portage la Prairie would have been thrown into Provencher. We would not like that, because the electors of Provencher do not want the waters of Portage la Prairie running over their ground; those waters are very troublesome waters. I think the Minister of Public Works should really give this matter prompt and earnest attention because it is very serious in its nature not only to the electors of Portage la Prairie but also to a certain number of electors in the county which I represent. If the Minister of Public Works does not take this matter into very serious consideration there will probably be some very hot arguments, and perhaps even fighting, between Provencher and Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I am most anxious about is to get some statement from the minister as to what he is actually going to do and when.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not wish to prolong this discussion, it is not really in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it is.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): However, let us get done with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, the discussion is in order.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think not, not on the present item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When would it be in order?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Do not let us misunderstand the situation. This is not a new matter. We find that the district engineer in 1917, and again in 1918, recommended widening the cut, but not deepening it, as he feared the cut might become the main channel of the river and leave the city sewer outlet dry. It was proposed as part of the work to build a weir, or barrier, at the mouth or upstream end of the cut to prevent further scouring from deepening the cut, but funds were not made available for this purpose. Had it been constructed, its efficiency for the purpose intended would be doubtful in the soil at that point. Between 1918 and the flood of 1922 the yearly floods had widened the cut to about 50 feet and deepened it to 12 feet below top of bank.

Now if it is a question of fixing the responsibility it is not difficult to do that in the light of the report which I have referred to. If the work had been carried on as recommended by the engineer in 1919 there would not have been the condition we find to-day. It is true that a great flood occurred in the spring of 1922. As far as we are concerned, this matter has engaged the attention of the department, and we are prepared to deal fairly with the city of Portage. I have made a proposal to them. We have an estimate of the cost of replacing this sewer in connection with the new channel and the figure has been placed at $45,000. I will recommend to the government of Canada, and I hope to this House, that a sum be given for that purpose. We will give the money to the city and let them restore the sewer. But it is not the intention of the Department of Public Works to construct the sewer system for the city of Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister proposes to offer the city $45,000 to continue the sewer on down. I presume that is the estimate of the department as to what it will cost.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I saw it stated as $65,000. Suppose the department, which will exercise some supervision over it, finds that it costs more, will the department provide the money?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised that this will be about the cost. The department has received a report on the matter. I may say the department does not want to injure the city. We want to help them, and this is an estimate which has been made. The thing will be checked carefully and a proper estimate made for the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The intention of the government is to provide for the extension down, such extension to be constructed of course at reasonable cost.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the minister gives an affirmative answer.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad, and now I only add, no petition came from Portage la Prairie to me to have this work done while I was in office. There may have been individual communications, but I cannot recall one. The matter never came to a head till 1922, as the hon. minister said, and there was no reason to take action sooner. It was time enough in 1922 to deal with the matter. All I am complaining about is the delay since August, 1922, because the communication reached the minister, if not in July, early in August, setting forth fully the situation.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a further matter in connection with the Assiniboine river. On the westerly part of the city of Winnipeg that river is eating away part of my constituency. As any one who knows these western rivers will realize, the rivers are apt to encroach. This river continually curves and is apt to encroach on the land with very serious damage in the case of urban municipalities. There has been considerable communication from the municipality of St. James with regard to the waters in that district encroaching on the land. It seems to me that some provision should be made to take care of this situation. I should like to call attention to the situation as it prevails higher up the river, at the city of Brandon. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) is not here, but we have talked over this matter, and I think I am not encroaching on his territory when I speak of this. There was a very serious flood in Brandon last spring. In the district generally known locally as "the flats" hundreds of homes were flooded. Immense damage was caused, not only to the houses but to the gardens in the vicinity. Many of the poorer people of that district lost their all. I understand that the department gave assurances that, although damages could not be given—and I do not see why damages could not be given for this—that at least an investigation would be held and the department would see to it if possible that a similar flood would not recur. It is a very serious thing when it is considered that several thousand people live in the north end of Brandon and that in springtime when the water is high they may have their homes flooded. Is anything definite being done to prevent a recurrence of this flooding?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The government does not hold itself responsible for the natural erosion caused by floods in Canadian rivers. That would be a tremendous undertaking. It is being grappled with throughout Canada. I know that in our far western provinces the municipalities and the provincial governments do a good deal towards the protection of the banks. At times the Dominion government have assisted where it seems the public interests have demanded it. But it has never been intended or acknowledged that the government would undertake to prevent erosions of these banks from floods or other natural causes, or to give protection to a community where lands have been flooded at times.

Mr. HOEY: In the absence of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) I would like to ask the minister if a survey was promised in connection with the district immediately surrounding Brandon city, and if so has that survey been undertaken? I was given to understand that this survey had been promised with the object of readjusting conditions, so that floods in the future would be rendered almost impossible.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think there was a suggestion last year and we did instruct the district engineer to keep in touch with the flood conditions and I am advised that he made a report during the summer on that question.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: Is there any provision in this particular vote for improvement on lake Killarney as recommended by the engineer of the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think not.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like to call attention to conditions on a part of lake Manitoba. That lake has been steadily rising for the last three years, to the great damage of the settlers in that vicinity. Very much of the land has been flooded in that district. I think some 5,000 acres in one municipality have been submerged in the last two years. It seems this condition arises periodically. It was flooded I think in 1902. About that time there was a period of high water for a few years and a great part of the country was flooded. For the last three years it has been rising again. I am informed that if the water rises another foot fifty per cent of the people west of Dog lake will have to leave their farms, and many have had to leave them already. Mixed farming is carried on very largely in that district and the farmers depend very largely on the wild hay to feed

their cattle. This hay land has been flooded for the last two or three years, and they have to import the hay to feed the cattle. At the present price of cattle, a farmer cannot afford to pay the freight on hay for a long distance, let alone buy it, and I hope the government is doing something in this connection. I think it was stated last year that they were taking measurements and trying to do something in this connection. Is this work being carried on?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think there have been some investigations carried on, but as to committing the government to an expenditure of public money, that has not as yet been broached.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: With regard to the improvements at Killarney, the minister's deputy the other day informed me that this improvement had been provided for in this vote. Apparently it has not. Will the minister reconsider his estimate and include that small amount? It is very necessary that it should be attended to.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure, but it is quite possible that it might be taken out of this vote of $15,000; I have not the information in regard to it with me.

Red river—repairs to channel protection work, $4,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is this for the protected channel at the mouth of the river. Is the work to be done by contract, or by this popular day labour system, or by the Department of Public Works at Selkirk?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work consists of placing riprap alongside and inside the protection work, so as to strengthen it and to prevent damage by storms. In all probability this will be done under the direction of the engineering staff.

Item agreed to.

Selkirk wharf repairs, $13,665.

Mr. BANCROFT: Are transfer works provided for in this figure for the repair slip at Selkirk?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think not. The work consists of renewing the decking, replacing piles and deck structure where necessary, and placing stone filling and gravel on the approach.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is it the purpose of the government to provide in this amount for transfer tracks? This winter there are eight steamboats on the repair slip at Selkirk. There is not room for them and they have to be carried out on the side. No transfer tracks are provided for this purpose. I understand provision of transfer tracks would not entail a very large expenditure, and at the present time the Department of Public Works had to supply blocking for keeping the ships in position. If transfer tracks were provided, there would be no necessity for supplying blocking for this purpose. I understand the government gets a fee for bringing those ships up, and this would, in a measure, cover the expenditure.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It would seem that transfer tracks are a necessity to the work there, and I am advised that a recommendation has been made to that effect.

Mr. BANCROFT: Was the recommendation that something would be done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I did not intimate that. There has been a recommendation from the engineering staff for that work; that it is necessary work. Provision is not made in this estimate.

Item agreed to.

St. Andrews dam, repairs to fishway, $1,100.

Mr. BANCROFT: Will this work on the St. Andrews dam and also the work at Selkirk be done by the Public Works department at Selkirk?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Wanipigow, (Hole river) reconstruction of dam, $3,600.

Mr. HOEY: This is for the reconstruction of a dam that was formerly built at the mouth of this river as it enters lake Winnipeg. I visited that district last summer, and I should like to remind the minister that building this dam will, in my humble judgment, be of comparatively little use unless the river itself is cleared of logs. I traversed that river some eight miles east of lake Winnipeg, and I experienced the utmost difficulty in doing so. I learned from the residents up there—there are not many of them—that the river was cleared some years ago; but it has become badly congested, particularly at certain points, and it seems to me that, in the interest of economy, this work of clearing the river of logs should be undertaken at the same time that this dam is being rebuilt. It is scarcely necessary to remind the minister that there is at present considerable traffic in this river owing to the operations of the Selkirk Mining Company. I should like to get a promise from the minister that this matter will be taken into consideration.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Is my hon. friend speaking of drift wood resulting from lumbering operations?

Mr. HOEY: The natural fall of the trees across the river.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I did not have it brought to my attention that it was necessary to clear the river. I will have inquiries made.

Item agreed to.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—harbours and rivers generally, repairs and improvements, $20,000.

Mr. KNOX: This does not seem to be a very large item for two provinces such as Saskatchewan and Alberta, and when we compare it with the items we were discussing yesterday, I think we should receive credit when we take up some other items in connection with those provinces. I see that $20,000 was voted last year. How was it expended?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditures apparently were very light last year. At Fort McMurray, East Edmonton, there was an expenditure of $435, a small expenditure at Banff and another at Craven. The total expenditure was only $459.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Out of the $20,000 voted last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose this is put in just for padding, to make it appear that something is being done in these provinces.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would not say that. This has been the custom for many years.

Mr. KENNEDY (East Edmonton): What is the nature of the work done as a result of the expenditure of $450?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Launching three floating wharves and putting them up on the river bank in the fall. The largest expenditure was made at Fort McMurray.

Mr. SHAW: What works are in contemplation for the present year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am informed nothing is noted for expenditure under this appropriation at the present time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is done with the $19,600 that is not spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not being expended, it would lapse.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What does the minister do with it? Is it left in the public treasury or is it spent for some other purpose?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It lapses entirely.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Voting of this amount of money, if there is no expenditure expected, seems to be an absurdity.

Mr. MILLAR: It will be readily seen that Saskatchewan is at a great disadvantage in not having room to place its wharves. The amount expended there is very small. The minister is probably aware that my attitude towards this "free gift" is that I do not favour it. Quite seriously. I am going to ask the minister for his reply to a question that has been passing through my mind. Let us suppose that two types of men whom I will describe, were to ask him a certain question. First, I will describe the two types of men. One of them has been producing grain at a loss for the last two years, and I need not more than state that such is the case, because many members know that is a fact. This man does not lack in either industry or efficiency, and through no fault of his own he is producing grain at a cost of perhaps $1.25 a bushel and selling it at 90 cents. That is one type. Another is the stock raiser who is producing stock that he cannot sell for more than about half of what it actually cost. I know that this is true because I have purchased such stock. Indeed, I should be ashamed to state the prices at which I purchased some last fall, were it not for the fact that I bought it at an auction sale which was open to everybody. What would one expect these men to say to the minister? Why, they would say: We are carrying on our business at a heavy loss, drawing from our capital, and getting no assistance; and why should we carry our own burden and the other fellow's as well? Why should these people pay in taxes, as they do, their share of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are levied—yes, and more than that, one might say millions—

Mr. MARTELL: We are all paying for your railways.

Mr. MILLAR: I see that the truth strikes home. You can always tell when it cuts, because you hear a howl. As I was saying, however, why should these people carry their own burden and be called upon to shoulder the burden of other people by enabling the government, not to carry out great undertakings for the good of the whole country, but to do little things to help industries which are in no greater distress than their own? I do not want to be offensive, but I

ask a plain question to which I should like a plain answer: Why should these men carry their own burden and the burden of those who are not as badly off as themselves?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I should desire to be sympathetic with both parties.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia—harbours and rivers generally, $75,000.

Mr. CLARK: Is any provision being made for the renewal of the work on the contract relating to the dry dock in North Vancouver?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not under this item.

Mr. CLARK: Is there any other item under which this matter might be discussed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend will have an opportunity to deal with this matter under the item relating to governmen dry dock expenditures at Victoria, which will come up later. I shall be glad to have the subject discussed then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is in regard to Victoria. But this is the item under which are discussed all matters connected with docks and waters in the province. This is where the general discussions take place. The discussion might be admitted under the item with regard to the Victoria dock, but there would be far more reason for ruling it out under that item than under this one. In fact, there could be no reason for ruling it out here. It is under the vote for harbours and rivers generally that all matters of this kind come up for discussion.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not objecting to the hon. member discussing the matter he has raised. He asked me whether there was any other item under which he might bring it up and I simply informed him that there was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not objecting to the answer that the minister has given the hon. member. I am merely pointing out that it would be more in order to discuss the matter now.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I was evidently misunderstood. I suggested that it might be an opportune time to take up the question when we were dealing with dry dock expenditures. But I have no objection to the discussion taking place now.

Mr. CLARK: It would probably be advisable to refer briefly to the history of this matter. In 1910 an act was passed to encourage the construction of dry docks throughout the Dominion of Canada. That act provided that the chief engineer of the department should certify as to the necessity for dry docks in various parts of the country, and the chief engineer has on various occasions certified to, and three governments have recognized, such a necessity in Vancouver. In February, 1920, authority was given for a subsidy under the act for the construction of a second-class graving dock. The parties to the contract were the Dominion government and the Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, and the subsidy was based on a valuation of $2,500,000, at 4½ per cent, for a period of thirty-five years. A contract to that end was executed on October 27, 1920. In 1921, the Coughlan Company apparently found that it was not practicable to erect this second-class graving dock. It was an odd sort of dock anyway, and apparently they could not finance it. The result was that another shipbuilding company in Vancouver, the Wallace Company, negotiated with Coughlan's, and an arrangement was arrived at between them whereby the two interests should combine and erect a floating dock. These two interests then came back to the government with revised plans for the floating dry dock. I may observe at this juncture that it was early in the summer of 1921, before any election was contemplated, that the negotiations were completed. And it was arranged with the government of that day that in consideration of the surrender of the old contract a new contract should be executed confirming the revised plan and giving the same subsidy. That contract was executed shortly before the election of 1921, and I have the personal assurance of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) that it is above suspicion. Since the execution of that contract the company has expended a very large sum of money; its commitments already amount roughly to $400,000. Just after the election a telegram was sent by the department placing on the contract an embargo which has not been removed. Protests have been made by every conceivable organization in British Columbia interested in the matter, including the Vancouver Board of Trade, and boards of trade representing practically the whole of the lower mainland of British Columbia. The Shipping Federation of Canada has unanimously adopted a resolution urging upon the government the necessity of this project. Even the government's chief organ in British Columbia, the Vancouver World, has expressed in no

5 p.m.

uncertain terms its opinion that this work is necessary. I quote from an editorial in that paper:

> In view of these facts, repudiation is impossible and unthinkable. Every consideration of national policy, of national honour and of national necessity—as well as every commercial necessity of the port of Vancouver—requires the carrying out of the contract and the keeping of public faith. On the issue of public honour, there is no room for evasion, repudiation or compromise. On the fact of commercial necessity there is no room for argument—the need of docking and repair facility is a recognized need of every active port. There is no answer to the justice of this claim and right.

In answer to these protests the Prime Minister stated that the Minister of Public Works would, at the close of the session of last year, proceed to Vancouver and investigate the matter further; he had already made some inquiry into it. The time for investigation has now passed, but we have no statement as to what is to be done. The contract still stands; the commitments made by reputable firms are such that the shipbuilding industry on the coast may be ruined. It is a recognized fact that there will be no shipbuilding for at least a period of years, and the only possibility of carrying on the industry is in securing the repair of the ships entering the harbour, the numbers of which are rapidly increasing. Cases where great loss has actually been sustained have been brought to the minister's attention. For instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have intimated that they are quite prepared to have repairs made in Vancouver that would run into at least $120,000 a year. Balfour, Guthrie and Company stated that in less than four years they would have spent almost $200,000 in dry dock work at Vancouver had there been facilities for doing so. The same applies to many other lines. A few years ago there were only two steamship lines entering Vancouver; to-day there are seventeen. The number of ships entering that port is increasing daily; it now largely exceeds the number entering the port of Montreal. Facilities have been provided for dry docking at practically every port in Canada. St. John has a dry dock; Halifax has one; Quebec, two; Montreal, two; Kingston, Collingwood, Toronto, Fort William, Prince Rupert and Victoria, all have their facilities, but the port which does the greatest volume of shipping has no facilities. If Vancouver is to continue as a great terminal shipping port, something will have to be done in this connection. Shipping companies will locate only in those ports where proper terminal facilities are available, and one of the prime requisites is dry dock facilities. Seattle has several dry docks, and for that reason many shipping companies will go there instead of to Vancouver. The delay in providing proper dry dock facilities at Vancouver will result in great loss of revenue to the country through loss of volume of business. The expense of the project would not be great, because the capital expenditure would be provided by private interests. The first year's outlay could not exceed $40,000, and for a period of thirty-five years the expenditure would be about $112,000 per annum. The Dry Dock Subsidies Act was passed for the express purpose of encouraging the construction of dry docks in our various ports, and to my mind it is unreasonable to refuse to grant a subsidy to the port which has a larger volume of shipping than that which can be claimed by any other port in the Dominion.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very glad my hon. friend has again brought this matter to the attention of the House. Dry dock construction on the Pacific coast seems to have had a rather stormy career; agitations have taken place over a period of very many years. What seemed rather to disturb the government on taking office was to find that a time when governments and people were trying to practise economy, we had two large works launched on the Pacific coast for dry dock purposes. There was a large commitment in respect to the dock at Victoria, which is now under construction and presumably is to be operated under government control; and there were also commitments under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. It was found that no large expenditure had been made in connection with the work at Vancouver. It is true, the companies had arranged their organization, and purchased some plant and material, but the outlay was not very large.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that figures have been furnished to the minister indicating an outlay on the part of the companies concerned of $398,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Expenditures, as I say, have been made, but not in proportion to the expenditures made by the government at Victoria. It was considered wise to hold this work in abeyance. The matter is receiving the attention of the government and I am in hopes that we may be able to advise the House of some conclusions in regard to it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I wish to say a word in reference to the Fraser river improvements. The minister is to be commended upon the interest which he has displayed in this important work. I appreciate the fact that it is receiving his attention. I also think that

it is pretty generally agreed that he and his department are doing their best to provide a proper, safe and reliable channel from New Westminster to the gulf. We are not asking for a harbour to compete in any way with the harbour at Vancouver, which is only a matter of some fifteen or twenty miles from us by water and less than that by land. We appreciate the fact that Vancouver harbour is suitable for large shipping and we believe in the necessity for the improvements at Vancouver harbour. But on the Fraser river we have a somewhat different proposition. What we require there is a channel which will enable us to bring in ships more particularly for the purpose of taking care of the lumber which is manufactured on the Fraser river. It may not be generally known, but I think I am correct in saying that approximately one-third of the lumber and shingles manufactured in British Columbia and that is a very considerable amount, of course—is manufactured on the Fraser river; I am referring now to the main channel and also to the north arm. We have mills there which are doing an export business and shipping lumber to the markets of the world. A very large trade has grown up, and a much bigger trade is in prospect providing it is possible for us to ship our lumber at reasonable rates. The rate by water compares very favourably with the rate by rail. For purposes of comparison I might mention that the rate from New Westminster by water to the eastern states, say to the port of New York, is no greater than the rate by rail from New Westminster to Calgary. That means that we have a very big market for some of our manufactured products, more particularly our shingles for which there is a very great demand in the eastern states. There is also a great demand, of course, for our other manufactured products. Our lumber is shipped to various parts of the world, and the demand for it is constantly growing.

Now, in order to economically ship our products we have to be able to bring vessels right into our docks. There is no reason why we should not do that providing the channel is put in proper shape, because with the exception of one or two shallow spots, the channel is sufficiently deep to take care of any lumber-carrying ships which might be expected to come in there. In that connection I might point out that the draught of lumber-carrying vessels is increasing. They are using much larger ships now than they did a few years ago. At one time the department under the previous government appointed a board of engineers to inquire into conditions on the Fraser river, and that board reported as to the class of vessels which might be expected to take lumber from our ports. In that report it was stated that the great majority of the ships which might be expected to do business with us were of comparatively light draught. I believe that that condition has changed and that larger ships are now in the business. It is necessary for us to have a depth of at least thirty feet. I believe that a good deal has been accomplished, and in this connection I would like to pay my respects to the late Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, who was out at the Pacific coast last year. It was my privilege on a number of occasions to confer with Mr. St. Laurent and I always found him very courteous, very much interested in his work, and more particularly did I find him very much interested in the problem of endeavouring to improve the Fraser river. I think that his death is a distinct loss to this country.

I would urge upon the minister the advisability of continuing this work on the main channel of the Fraser river. I think that we have obtained results, and I am glad to see that the present minister is carrying on the work which was started by the previous administration, that he has taken hold and given this work a good deal of consideration. The business is there. What we require is a good safe and reliable channel so that our ships can take out our manufactured products to the various parts of the world. Our business is a very large one, and in that connection I might refer to the fact that the development of the Fraser river will mean something to this government, because the government owns something like four billion feet of standing timber in the Fraser river valley, which would pay dues to the Dominion when taken out. That timber is all in this district and is all available.

I should also like to refer to the fact that we have on the Fraser river sites for elevators. We have land already owned by the Dominion government or by the Canadian National railways at Port Mann, at New Westminster, and at Woodward's Landing, with water front suitable in all respects for the construction of elevators. If the government is going to build any elevators it will not be necessary for them to buy land any place else, they have it already on the Fraser river, and that land is already connected with their own railroads. If you establish elevators on the Fraser river you are going to assist the Canadian National railways because they have direct access to that land and sufficient trackage is available. The railway is already there. The Canadian National railways are already established at Port Mann. Perhaps that

would be an ideal site for an elevator. At Woodward's Landing, if you wished to get lower down and closer to the mouth of the river, you have half a mile of water front, which is also connected up with a line of railway built by the Canadian National system, but which is not at present being operated. It would not require a large expenditure to put that railway into shape. If you have elevators on the Fraser river your operating expenses for unloading the grain would be considerably less than at any other place. I quite appreciate the fact that the minister is very familiar with conditions, and I would impress upon him the advisability of giving very serious consideration to the necessity of establishing at least one elevator on the Fraser river. But if the government are not going to enter into that business—and, of course, they may feel that should be left to private enterprise —then I would say that if the improvement of the Fraser river channel is attended to, private concerns will have available a great many miles of very desirable sites for elevators. I am looking forward to the day when we will not have simply one elevator on the Pacific coast but dozens of them. The development of trade towards that end is bound to come. The feasibility of the Pacific route has been demonstrated. It used to be thought at one time that the Panama canal could not be utilized, and that grain could not be shipped economically or safely from a Pacific port. However, that day is past and we know now, it has been established beyond question, that the Pacific route is a desirable and a profitable one, and that from an economic standpoint a very large proportion of the grain that is grown on the prairies could be shipped through Pacific ports. Now, I would say to the minister that the Fraser river is the place that this grain should be shipped from; I do not think there is any doubt in the world as to the desirable locations we would have if only our channel were placed in proper condition.

There is a point in connection with the sawmilling industry, which is not generally known and which I would like to mention. That is that fresh water is better adapted for the operation of sawmills than salt water, owing to this fact: In a salt water the logs will be badly affected by the teredo and damaged to a very considerable extent in a few months. That is not the case at all in fresh water. It has been proved by experience that sawmills should, wherever possible, be located on fresh water. Sawmill concerns are now taking advantage of that fact and are to a large extent removing their mills from salt water to fresh water. That is where the importance of the Fraser river comes in.

There is another branch of the Fraser to which I would like to refer for a minute and that is the north arm. The minister knows the north arm very well. He has been over it several times and he has also, I think, been presented recently with a petition asking for some further improvement of the channel of the north arm. Now the north arm is a different proposition, inasmuch as we cannot expect within a reasonable time to have any great depth of water, but we may look forward to seeing industries located along that channel which require attention. Now, the minister has before him a petition dealing with this matter and I would urge upon him the necessity of giving that petition every consideration. I do not wish to take up time unnecessarily but, as I see it, the main channel and the north arm of the Fraser river provide a fresh water port for the peninsula upon which Vancouver and New Westminster are situated, and it is very necessary, if the future of that district is to be assured, that the channels in both cases should be improved. I hope the minister will continue the good work which he has been doing and that it will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not intend to take up very much of the committee's time but I would draw the attention of the minister to the riding of Cariboo. Although that riding contains 165,000 square miles these estimates do not contain one dollar for the carrying out of improvements within its limits. Not only does the riding contain the area I have stated, but it also contains 1,500 miles of navigable waters in the shape of rivers, and indeed one lake has no less than 800 miles of shore line. Now I do not see why the minister has entirely ignored improvements for that immense district. I certainly think he should pay some attention to the Cariboo riding.

There are three matters that I would like to bring to his notice. First, Canoe wharf. This wharf has been recommended by the engineer for the last three or four years, the estimated cost of the work being $4,500. Before I came down here I went over the ground with the engineer and we agreed to cut the estimate down to $1,200. The wharf was built some eight or nine years ago, at a width of 16 feet and a length of 500 feet. When a team goes out to the end of the structure it has got to back out to the shore again, indeed, the wharf is practically useless in its present condition. The $1,200 in question would widen the wharf at the outer end so that

teams could turn. I would ask the minister if he can see his way to including this improvement in the estimate of $75,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It could not be included in the present estimate.

Mr. McBRIDE: Then I would ask whether the minister could see his way to including the item in the Supplementary Estimates to be brought down later?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I thought he was discussing "Fraser river improvements $75,000." My hon. friend, however, was discussing the general vote?

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes. I would ask the minister to see whether he cannot make provision for carrying out this work under the general vote.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter will be considered.

Mr. McBRIDE: There is still another matter, in connection with Salmon Arm, to which I wish to draw attention. Last year the government voted $4,500 to improve the wharf there. That work was carried out very satisfactorily and the people of the locality appreciate it. However, there is a channel that was dredged out, I think about thirteen years ago, and owing to the dredge being dismantled some time during the war nothing has been done since to keep the channel clear. Now that channel needs to be dredged out, in fact the wharf is of very little use unless that dredging is done. I hope the minister will see his way clear to have that work carried out without delay.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand that the dredge is to be reconditioned, and it is the intention of the department to do some dredging on the lake this year.

Mr. McBRIDE: There is another item I want to bring to the attention of the minister, although possibly it may be out of order under this heading. In Kamloops there are some five buildings being rented by the government at a cost of $9,000 a year. A building could be erected for less than $100,000 which would accommodate all the departments now using the buildings referred to. I would like to know from the minister if he is prepared to recommend the carrying out of something along this line. Even if the outlay reached a total of $100,000 the money would not cost the government more than 6 per cent and there would still be a saving of $3,000 as compared with the cost under the present system of renting. Not only that, but the employees concerned would be provided with far better accommodation than they now enjoy. The buildings now occupied are far from being fire proof, in fact, the post office at Kamloops has been twice condemned by the sanitary inspector there. For many reasons it is very important that the improvement which I have suggested should be carried out without delay. I would like to know from the minister if he will also give this matter his consideration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister replies I would like to take the opportunity of expressing, in common I know with others, the high appreciation I feel, and have always felt, of the services of Mr. St. Laurent who, unfortunately, has died lately. I came in contact with them very intimately, and over a long period of time. I was the means of having him appointed on the Dominion Power Board, and in other special matters of great engineering difficulty I availed myself of his services. I found him a man of high professional capacity, and as well, possessed of a keen sense of duty; to duty he devoted himself unceasingly throughout all the period of our acquaintance. I learned with the very deepest regret of the death of a servant of the public such as he, and I desire to record before this House my sense of our loss.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sure I can concur in every word that has been stated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the member for New Westminster. It was my good fortune as minister of the department to come closely in contact with the late Mr. St. Laurent while he was acting in the capacity of Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works. As has been stated, he was a man not only of excellent engineering knowledge and ability, but of excellent parts and character, a very lovable man, and his loss is and will be greatly felt by the department and in government circles.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister give us a short statement of what he proposes to do on the Fraser river?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have listened with great interest to my hon. friend's address on the requirements of the Fraser river, and the north arm of the Fraser. These are two important waterways in British Columbia and the Department of Public Works has tried to solve certain natural difficulties that exist there. During the flood season great quantities of alluvial material come down

the Fraser and are deposited in the lower region, which results in the necessity of a very large expenditure being made from year to year in dredging and keeping the channel clear. Under carefully prepared plans, and after consultation and so on, the Department of Public Works, or the engineering board, did make certain recommendations. Last summer when going west I had the chief engineer the late Mr. St. Laurent accompany me, in order that he might have local knowledge of conditions for himself, and if possible concur in the recommendation of the engineering committee. He made that trip and spent considerable time on the Fraser river and did concur in the plans and suggestions made by the engineering commitee. That being so, we have let the contract for the construction of a retaining wall, amounting to something over $100,000, and this vote is for the purpose of taking care of that contract. It is hoped the construction of this wall will bring about a deepening of the channel and will also elminate the annual loss which now takes place through the filling up of the channel at that point.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What depth of water would that give us?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Thirty feet. In regard to the north channel, the department has from year to year carried on certain dredging operations, and at one time built a retaining wall at the mouth of the river. The matter of extending that wall further out to sea, or continuing our dredging operations, is now under consideration in the department.

Mr. LADNER: I presume the minister refers, in connection with the extension of the wall, to the jetty on the north arm.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. LADNER: Apparently the present vote does not cover it, and my purpose in rising is to urge upon the minister and the government the expedience and the necessity of making that extension. With the presence of the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding) I feel that my appeal is particularly strong, because if we cannot justify the request on the basis of business necessity then we would not ask for an appropriation for the extension of that jetty. In making this appeal to the government and the minister, which I hope will have their favourable consideration when the Supplementary Estimates come up, let me urge upon the minister the fact that I speak not only in behalf of private individuals, who favour this project, but I make the appeal for the reeves, councillors and boards of trade of South Vancouver, Point Grey, Richmond, Burnaby and New Westminster, all of whom have met on two or three occasions, coming from great distances to get together. They have given the matter consideration and are of the opinion that, both in the interests of preserving the channel on the north, and preventing filling by cross drifts at the mouth of the Fraser river, and in order to provide booming grounds for the large quantity of logs that are towed up the river, an extension of the jetty there is necessary. It is a business justification. At the present time the mouth of the north arm of the Fraser river fills in with silt caused by the cross currents in the river. There are two projects I believe under consideration, one being to clear the channel by dredging and the other to extend the jetty. I believe reports are being forwarded to the minister and that these reports are favourable—at least so I would judge—to the extension of the jetty. This is regarded as the least expensive method of preserving the investment the government has already made on the north arm, which investment exceeds $600,000. The extension will only cost, I believe, in the neighborhood of $40,000, and it will be a direct benefit to a very large number of industries. I would draw the attention of the government to the fact that there is a capital investment of $3,000,000 in the different industries along the Fraser river, which depend upon the channel of the north arm on which they carry on their business. There are four large shingle mills, having a daily output of 3,000,000 shingles, and six sawmills with a cut of 130,000 feet of lumber each day. They have 1,035 employees with a monthly payroll of over $22,000. There is not only the question of keeping the channel clear of the sand and silt that come in there so that the sawlogs and other traffic can be carried up the river but there is the equally important, and perhaps more important, question of the extension of this jetty in order to provide a booming ground there. At the present time the booms coming from the northern coast of British Columbia are brought down to a place called Howe Sound. They are brought down in large quantities, and at Howe Sound they are split up into smaller booms, and are brought down to the north arm of the Fraser to supply these mills. Sometimes they have to remain there for a considerable period before they can get up the river, or they have to be broken up into still smaller booms. The extension of the jetty is necessary, not only to protect the

channel, but to provide facilities so that these large booms which come down from the north can be taken to the north arm of the Fraser river, split up there into smaller booms and taken up the Fraser river. Competent men engaged in this industry state that there will be a saving of 50 cents per thousand on logs if the booms can be broken up at the mouth of the Fraser river. It is well known that a saving of 50 cents per thousand to the lumber and shingle mill industry in British Columbia would be of the very greatest advantage in competition with the many American mills just across the line, some few miles distant. Therefore, on behalf of the reeves, councillors and boards of trade of five large municipalities and cities, with some 75,000 of population, tributary to the north arm, who are asking for this improvement, I would strongly urge on the government the wisdom and necessity of including that in the Supplementary Estimates as it is not mentioned in the present appropriation.

Mr. CLARK: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the Girrard Bridge Company, whose object it is to bridge the Narrows, separating Vancouver from North Vancouver. Last year a three-year extension of their charter for doing this work was granted in this House. The company has recently filed plans with the Department of Public Works to complete that work without financial assistance from the government. Have those plans been approved, or is there immediate likelihood of their being approved?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The plans are under consideration now with a view of approval or non-approval, depending upon what the finding is of the engineers in the department.

Item agreed to.

Port Renfrew, wharf reconstruction, $10,000.

Mr. DICKIE: I would just like to urge on the minister that action be taken in connection with this appropriation as quickly as possible because the people in this locality are at a great disadvantage. I quite realize why the appropriation of last year was not expended. The people have no means of getting to the steamers except in small boats, and I can assure the minister the need is great. I do not know any item that requires more immediate attention.

Item agreed to.

Vancouver, Stanley park, foreshore protection, $8,000.

Mr. CLARK: What is the total amount required for this work?

[Mr. Ladner.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is some seashore protection at Stanley park. Ten thousand dollars was voted last year and will be expended before the end of the fiscal year. We are asking for an appropriation of $8,000 to construct 800 feet of protection work. This work is being done in connection with the park board, they contributing a portion of the cost.

Mr. CLARK: What is the ultimate amount required to complete this work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The whole scheme will cost probably $71,000.

Mr. CLARK: Why is the work being shut down this year? My instructions are that about $20,000 worth of work was planned for this summer, and that it was urgently necessary that this should be done in order to preserve that part of the foreshore.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the estimate is sufficient for the year. My reports are that this is the more urgent work, and that if this 800 feet is constructed, it will be sufficient for this year.

Mr. LADNER: Will these moneys be available almost immediately, because there happens to be a particular urgency.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not until the 1st of April.

Mr. LADNER: Perhaps the minister is aware that on account of the tide at Stanley park, the flood goes in and out very quickly, and the work has to be done during certain periods. I was informed on the coast that it is very important that the money should be available as soon as possible.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Before we leave this question of wharf repairs, I should like to ask the minister if he has made provision in any way for several small repairs to wharves on Okanagan lake which have been recommended by the district engineer?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some repairs are, I think, being considered, possibly for the Supplementaries later on.

Item agreed to.

Quebec—Contrecœur, reconstruction of wharf headblock, $5,500.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I should like to go back to vote No. 157, Contrecœur. The other items were passed yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the minister the consent of the committee to go back to the item, Contrecœur?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally, $30,000.

Mr. SHAW: Perhaps the minister would give us particulars of the work proposed under this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is a contingent item. This amount is required to cover travelling expenses, telegrams, printing, stationery, instruments, etc., which cannot be conveniently charged against anyone in particular of the general appropriations for construction, improvements or repairs in each province. The chief engineer asks for an allotment of $15,000 out of this appropriation to pay expenses of staff in making test borings in connection with materials. He states that $2,000 will also be required in connection with the laboratory for testing materials.

Item agreed to.

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

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 46, respecting The Community, General Hospital, Alms House, and Seminary of Learning of the Sisters of Charity at Ottawa.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 47, respecting a certain patent of Clarence P. Landreth.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 48, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada, —Mr. McMurray.

Bill No. 49, respecting a patent of Robert A. Campbell.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate the Protestant Federation of Patriotic Women of Canada.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 51, respecting a certain patent of James M. Richardson.—Mr. Chew.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

Bill No. 5, respecting certain patents of Charles A. Channell.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 19, respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 25, respecting a certain patent of Arthur R. Wilfley.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 27, respecting a patent of Hans M. Olsen and Esther Maud Butcher.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS—DREDGING

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Dredging—Maritime provinces, $600,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): All but $20,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the programme in the Maritime provinces for the coming year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The details are as follows: Pictou bar, dredging of 121,050 cubic yards; Miramichi bay, 151,000 yards; Dalhousie, 10,600 yards; Restigouche river, 152,750; Miramichi bay, Grandoon flats, 100,000; Newcastle, Ritchie's Mill wharf, 1,850; Newcastle to Bridgetown, 20,000; Bathurst, 100,000; Lunenburg county, Riverport, 200,000; Liverpool, 60,000, Malagash, 8,676; Georgetown, P.E.I., 9,540; Panmur island, 8,112; Montague river, 103,770; 1,370; Inverness, N.S., 15,000; Alberton, 8,000; Miminigash, 8,667; Red Point' wharf, 16,000; Mount Stewart, 65,000; Conway inlet, 60,000; Port Hawkesbury, 26,000; Cape Anget, 11,175; Margaree, 50,000; Smith's cove, 22,500; Little Bras d'Or, 12,000; Sydney, 9,000; Port Hood, 15,000; Rose bay, 12,000; The Squam, 4,800; Sperry's Cove, 3,000; Yarmouth, 150,000; Beaver harbour, 1,310; Centreville, 2,300; Chocolate cove, 340; Curry's cove, 5,725; Haulover, 1,350; Miramichi, Northumberland, some snags to be removed; Pictou Landing, 15,000 cubic yards; Richibucto cape, 4,200; St. Andrew's, 7,625; St. Nicholas river, Kent, 4,700; Shediac island, 530; Windsor, 5,160. That is the tentative programme suggested by the engineers for the operation of the government plant during the coming summer. It will probably be carried out in the main, though it may be found necessary from time to time to adjust the amounts in order that the more important works may be carried on.

Mr. BROWN: I presume this dredging is necessary, but those of us who live so far inland do not know why these large expenditures are required. Is it that the harbours are filling up with silt carried down by the rivers, or is the draught of the vessels increasing? Why has it been necessary last year and this year to spend so large an amount as $600,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The dredging is necessary chiefly because of silt coming down and filling up the harbours. There is a very long coast line, as my hon. friend knows. Where possible the department is constructing retaining walls to try and keep these deposits out.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is this work to be done entirely by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is departmental work largely.

Mr. MacLAREN: Can the minister say how the money will be spent proportionately as between Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the information here in that form, but if my hon. friend desires it, I shall be very glad to advise him later.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member for Lisgar asked why it was necessary to repeat this expenditure from year to year. Now if he were down to the province of Nova Scotia and saw the Atlantic ocean throwing itself up against the rocks and upon the coast he would not wonder why it was necessary for the minister of this or any other government to come and ask the House for an appropriation for this work. Often when the work has been done a storm will come up in the fall, or in the spring or winter months and beach rocks and stones and all sorts of debris will be thrown up and the work has to be done over again.

I rose particularly to call the minister's attention to the needs of the port of Windsor on the river Avon in the county of Hants. As my hon. friends all know, Windsor is one of the oldest ports in the Maritime provinces, standing near the mouth of the Avon river. This river is subjected to tremendous tides, and the dredging work which is done one year must of necessity be repeated next year in order to make navigation possible. Besides being one of the oldest ports in the Maritime provinces Windsor is, if not the third, at least the fourth most important port in the province of Nova Scotia, from the standpoint of shipping. We have great gypsum deposits there, and the Wentworth Gypsum Company of Windsor, the J. B. King Company of New York export annually about 200,000 tons of gypsum. We have also the Mosher quarries and other plaster companies using that port. It is also a great lumbering section, and the people have no other way except through the port of Windsor to get their stuff to market save over the railway, which costs a great deal of money by way of freight. There are many hundreds of thousands of feet of lumber to be shipped to the United States annually through that port, and it is necessary that it be put in proper shape to enable the shippers to get their gypsum and lumber and other products to the markets of the world. There is also a great potato growing country, as well as a great apple growing country, adjoining the port, but to-day we are in such a position that it is impossible for us to get vessels to come to that port owing to the unsatisfactory condition of the harbour. There is urgent need for dredging there.

It is all very well to follow the policy which has been followed in the past of getting some ten or fifteen men to shovel some of the mud away from around the docks, probably at a cost of $2,000 or $3,000 annually, but while that does some little good it is practically worthless work, as it is not nearly sufficient to enable the port to be a success. When the tide is out the vessels lie aground and it is necessary that the mud be shovelled up and taken away so that these vessels can lie at the docks. It is utterly impossible to charter a vessel to come to Windsor to-day without paying a higher freight percentage than she will get for going to any of the other ports of Nova Scotia, and the result is that the trade of the town is becoming stagnant or is being taken to other places. We have been hampered through the condition of the harbour for a great number of years.

Windsor is the fourth most important port from the standpoint of customs receipts in the province of Nova Scotia, and in the old days it was one of the most wealthy ports of the province, and a great shipbuilding place. To-day some thirty or forty thousand people from the town and surrounding country are dependent on the port of Windsor for getting their goods to market. In 1914 we had public docks in the town of Windsor, but for some reason or other the government of the day leased these wharves to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, along with the railway to Windsor Junction for ninety-nine years at an annual rental of about $22,500 a year. Prior to that time there was an agreement whereby the wharves were held by the people, but the railway was leased on a basis of one-third of the gross receipts, and in 1913 the gross receipts were something like $43,000. In the year 1914, notwithstanding the fact that the receipts had reached the amount of $43,000, the railway took over this wharf and the railway for a term of ninety-nine years at an annual rental of $22,500. We have a very small wharf there, and we were told at the time of the lease that this would be extended and that considerable dredging would be done and the waterfront put in a proper state for shipping. But as a matter of fact we have a small wharf there to-day at which a vessel of 150 tons cannot lie, and she is a very small schooner, without the bowsprit projecting over the old government wharf, which is now in the hands of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, and the main boom extending over the Smith wharf on the other side. I would therefore ask

the minister to consider well the needs of the port of Windsor and to put a substantial item in the estimates this year for dredging and a wharf at that port. It is all very well to say that we will allocate from this general vote two or three thousand dollars for dredging, but the port of Windsor needs from $50,000 to $60,000 for the improvement of the wharf and harbour and for dredging in order that the channel may be made safe and efficient, so that the port of Windsor shall take its rightful place in the province of Nova Scotia and be able to maintain its record. I believe that if we get adequate shipping facilities, Windsor will be at least the third most important shipping point in the province. If we had the adequate dock facilities we enjoyed in days gone by, there would be sufficient return from these wharves in wharfage charges to pay the interest on the capital expenditure. I therefore bespeak from the minister his most earnest attention to the needs of this port, which is one of the oldest in the Maritime provinces, and whose hardy people do need proper facilities to get their goods to market.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister be good enough to inform me what the distinction is between this vote and some of the items in resolution No. 154? This vote is for dredging; in resolution No. 154 there is also an item of $85,000 for dredging Yarmouth harbour; then in the list my hon. friend read to the House a few moments ago there was a further item for Yarmouth. What is the distinction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The dredging referred to in resolution 154, as I explained the other evening, is under contract. In addition to that the government have one of the units of their own plant in Yarmouth where it is proposed to remove a certain yardage this year, and that will come under the general vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister given —I have not been in regularly—details of the contemplated work of dredging in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have not reached that item yet.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many dredges are engaged on this work in the Maritime provinces and are they all owned by the government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The dredges are No. 1, No. 2, the St. Lawrence, No. 4, No. 5, No. 9, No. 11, No. 12, No. 13, No. 15, No. 115, and the tug Lisgar.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are they all owned by the government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are all government plants.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Have any new dredges been added this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, none.

Mr. LUCAS: Does the $200,000 for dredging appear in the item of $600,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the yardage which I gave, 200,000 yards.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what constituency?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Lunenburg.

Mr. DUFF: The best county in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there any dredge by the name of Duff?

Mr. DUFF: I think there will be one.

Item agreed to.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, $625,000.

Mr. HALBERT: What proportion of that has been spent and where?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure that the vote is divided as to provinces; the estimate is for the two provinces named. My notes have not been prepared so as to give my hon. friend the information for which he asks, but I will be very glad to have those details supplied to him.

Mr. SHEARD: Has any provision been made for dredging in connection with the port at Toronto? I would also ask whether the western channel, as well as the southern channel, has been provided for and will receive attention from the government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The items referred to by my hon. friend are provided for in the Toronto harbour vote.

Mr. SHEARD: To what extent, may I ask?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To complete contracts, I think, that are now under way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the general vote of $30,000 for harbours and rivers include any dredging?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member was asking if this vote includes any dredging in Toronto?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not this one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the other one?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the capital vote which we have not yet reached, there is an item for dredging in Toronto harbour to complete the contract we have there. There is none in this vote.

Mr. SHEARD: What amount is provided for dredging? There are two pretty large channels at Toronto, the western channel and the southern channel, through which vessels are passing. It would require, I think, the whole appropriation to dredge out those two channels. I would like to know what amount the minister has provided for that dredging?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To complete the contract of the Randolph Macdonald Company dredging at the eastern entrance, $17,415 is provided under the vote for harbour improvements, Toronto.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is there anything provided in this vote for the dredging of Port Burwell harbour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, there is provision in this vote for dredging at Port Burwell by departmental plant.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Could the minister give the amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): At Port Burwell, 155,000 yards by dredge No. 17, and 50,000 yards by dredge No. 1.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the minister realizes that the first vote for the Maritime provinces in 1921-22 was $500,000. It is increased now $100,000. The vote for Ontario and Quebec is increased by $175,000. The vote for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta is decreased by $30,000. The vote for British Columbia remains as it is. Why is there an increase of $275,000 for dredging in the Maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my right hon. friend will understand the reason. I am advised that during the war there were but small expenditures made, in fact a great deal of the departmental plant was laid up. Today we find that many of these harbours have silted up and require a larger expenditure to get them into proper condition again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course the minister was not here then, but if he had been he would remember that we were roundly abused when in power for having such a large expenditure at that time.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Possibly.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Dredging—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $100,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Could the minister give us some particulars as to where this money is to be spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The work proposed is as follows:

Place—Method—Estimated quantity.
Winnipegosis, Dredge No. 210, 40,000 cubic yards.
Plamondon, Dredge Plamondon, 20,000 cubic yards.
Cumberland lake, Dredge No. 208, 27,000 cubic yards.
Big George island, Dredge No. 205, 12,000 cubic yards.
Grand beach, Dredge No. 201, 5,000 cubic yards.
Mantagao river, Dredge No. 205, 1,150 cubic yards.
Red river-mouth, Dredge No. 201, 73,000 cubic yards.
Winnipeg, Dredge No. 202, Red river at C.N.R. bridge 11,060 cubic yards.
Red river at Lake bar sand and gravel wharf, 2 800 cubic yards.
Red river at Harbour Commissioners' wharf, 3,000 cubic yards.
Red river at Bannatyne to Water ave., 16 800 cubic yards.
Red river at C.P.R. bridge, 1,700 cubic yards.

I think that covers the programme.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has the department considered doing anything at all in regard to the harbour at Port Nelson?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, we have made no provision in the Public Works department for work of that character.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is the work that is done there appreciating in value—the artificial island?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sorry I am not able to give the information. That work is in the Railway department, not under the Public Works department.

Mr. LEWIS: Is any work to be done in Saskatchewan at all?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is work at Cumberland lake, Saskatchewan.

Mr. KNOX: Are the dredges at Port Nelson under control of the Public Works department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. IRVINE: We have not very many large harbours in Alberta and our shipping is not very extensive. The biggest sea that I know of there is the large hole we have in the basement of our prospective post office. What amount is spent in dredging harbours in Alberta?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think we have nothing noted for Alberta in the way of dredging. At Plamondon, East Edmonton, there will be some 20,000 cubic yards.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Where is that work to be done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Plamondon, East Edmonton.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the necessity of the work there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My note would indicate that this is a village on Horse Creek, which flows into Lac la Biche at its western end. The town of Lac la Biche at the southern end of the lake is a station on the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway and supplies for settlers are brought in and their produce exported by the railway from Lac la Biche station. The lake is the only means of transport and access to and from Plamondon is greatly hindered by the presence of trees, stumps, brush and weeds in the channel at Horse creek, so that to accommodate the population of 2,000 affected it is proposed to clean out the channel where obstructed on a length of 7,000 feet by removal of snags, weeds, etc., and widening and deepening the creek so as to give a depth of 5 feet and width of 23 feet. Total quantities to be removed are estimated at 50,000 cubic yards, so that the work will extend over three seasons. A small dredge was constructed for this work in 1922-23.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is that the total amount for dredging in Alberta?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: I was not quite clear as to what the object of this excavation was.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is in order that the citizens may get access to the lake and may be enabled to move their produce to the railway station.

Mr. KELLNER: Is it the intention of the government to complete the work at Plamondon? I would like to advise the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) that there are several ports out in Alberta. We have a navigation route of over 1300 miles in the northern part of Alberta in the Northwest Territory, and while there is not very much money in the estimates to take care of them, there is a vast amount needed in that district, especially for expenditure at Lac la Biche. That lake is blocked up now, the water is rising, and the farmers are suffering, as they are suffering in other parts of the West.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the work will extend over two or three seasons.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is it the intention of the minister to have the dredge that is working at Big George island clean out Grassy narrows? They expect to complete the work at Big George island some time during the summer and we want to get the Grassy narrows cleaned out, as it would facilitate shipping up and down the lake.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have an appropriation for Big George island. If my hon. friend will make representations I will have them considered.

Mr. BANCROFT: I have already done so, and I understood from the answer of the minister that the representations would be considered.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter is probably being considered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much money was spent last year in the three provinces?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We spent $114,000 last year in the western provinces, out of a vote of $144,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean in this vote. At what points was that money spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We spent $114,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would only be a few points. Would the minister tell us the points and how much was spent at each point.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amounts are:

Edmonton East, Plamondon, 5,582 cubic yards	$3,307
Mackenzie, Le Pas, Manitoba	12,252
Mackenzie, Le Pas, days labour, boulders	400
Goose river	452 85

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is up at Nelson, in Manitoba. The next item is Big George island $20,031.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is in Selkirk riding, Manitoba. Then the further items are:

Red river, mouth	$12,882 00
Selkirk	595 31
Grand Marais	537 00
Victoria beach	3,746 00
Winnipeg	3,715 00

Mr. KELLNER: I do not think the minister gave me the information in regard to Lac la Biche.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think I gave the committee all the information I have. This item is for the removing of brush, trees and weeds in the channel of Horse creek, to accommodate the population of 2,000 people affected. It is proposed to clean out the channel, to dredge to a length of 7,000 feet to a depth

of five feet and a width of twenty-three feet. The total quantity to be removed is estimated at 50,000 cubic yards. The work will be extended over three seasons.

Mr. KELLNER: Does the minister expect to do some work there this season?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We expect to do a portion of it.

Mr. ARTHURS: By a dredge?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A small dredge was constructed for this work in 1922-23.

Mr. ARTHURS: At what cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am sorry I have not that here. The expenditure would not be very large.

Mr. LEWIS: As regards the item of dredging in Quebec, does that include the dredging of the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, that is not done by the Public Works department. That is under the control of the Marine department.

Item agreed to.

Dredging—British Columbia, $400,000.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Is any dredging contemplated at Shuswap lake this season? If so, is there any provision for dredging Shuswap river, between Sicamous and Mara.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are reconstructing that dredge with the view of doing dredging this year.

Mr. DICKIE: Is a dredging programme for the harbours of Nanaimo and Victoria provided for this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is the intention of the department to do some work in both Nanaimo and Victoria harbours this season.

Item agreed to.

Roads and bridges—Dominion roads and bridges generally, $5,000.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is any construction work in forest reserves and national parks under the jurisdiction of the Public Works department, or does that come under the Department of the Interior?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Parks branch of the Interior department. I think, at times, we have done some work for that branch, but such work comes primarily under that branch.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The committee will understand that particularly in Alberta, above all other provinces, a somewhat peculiar situation exists in the extent of forest and park reserves. This has caused considerable hardship sometimes to the people there, for this reason. Roads, as a rule, are, of course, under provincial jurisdiction, and they are looked after as well as finances will permit; but in many cases communities are divided from other communities by parks of forest reserves. Through those reserves and parks, the province, of course, can build no road, and in many cases it is almost impossible to get access to those places because of that fact. If this matter might be discussible under this item, I would discuss it now. If there is another item coming up under another department, I will reserve my remarks, but I want to make a few remarks about a particular situation which exists in my constituency.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the matter would come more particularly under the appropriation for the Dominion parks, but I have no objection to my hon. friend's discussing it if he so wishes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: If it would be more properly discussed under the appropriation for the Dominion parks, under the Department of the Interior, I would discuss it at that time.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not relevant at this time.

Item agreed to.

Interprovincial bridge over Restigouche river at Matapedia—repairs, $4,250.

Mr. LEWIS: Is this work being done by contract or by the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): By contract. S. M. Adams, Matapedia, is the contractor.

Item agreed to.

International bridge across St. John at Edmundston, N.B.—revote of lapsed amount, $14,100.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this a federal responsibility?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This work was undertaken some two or three years ago under an arrangement entered into between the Dominion government and the state of Maine, to build an international bridge across the St. John river at Edmundston.

Item agreed to.

Calumet—Bryson bridge, reconstruction, $4,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this a federal responsibility?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This bridge was constructed some years ago by the federal authorities, and it has been repaired from time to time. Last year there was an appro-

priation of $16,000 and the expenditure for 1922-23 was $12,000. This is a revote of $4,000 to complete the repairs under way.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—maintenance and repairs of bridge and approaches, $7,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What bridge is this? Why is the federal government taking it in hand? Is it an interprovincial bridge?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This bridge was built by the joint action of the two provinces and the Dominion government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Between Ottawa and Hull, some three or four years ago. It is the replacement of an old bridge that the central authority built, I think, before confederation, and it has always been under federal control.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it is built.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, but somebody has to maintain the bridge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do we maintain it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the bridge over to Hull down near the Chaudiere falls?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. We have maintained it for many years, I think since long before confederation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand why we should maintain that bridge.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Neither do I.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister ever been over it? I am not saying this because this government is in office now; but really we ought to have some principle that we follow and not just vote money according to pressure. Why do we maintain this bridge?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The bridge, I understand, was built many years ago, indeed, I think, before confederation, by the United government. It was replaced again entirely by the Dominion government. It was replaced again in the eighties, and again in 1918 on an agreement with the two provinces, each province contributing one-third and the Dominion one-third. We find the bridge completed with apparently nobody in charge. I think it is well known to residents of Ottawa and Hull that the approaches became almost impassable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the Hull side?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. We have been trying to interest the municipalities to get them to take over the care of those
9 p.m. approaches. We have not, however, succeeded in doing so. We made temporary repairs last year. The bridge and the roadways must be kept in repair. I quite agree with my right hon. friend that it is doubtful whether the Dominion government should be contributing to the repair of that bridge. It would seem to me that the responsibility should be assumed either by the municipalities adjoining or by the provinces. That, however, is the situation we find.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not know there was any responsibility assumed by the Dominion government. It is the first news I have had of that. Now, I know it is a very unpopular thing to object to any spending of government money around the city of Ottawa. At the same time, however, there is a right and there is a wrong, and we have to defend these things all over Canada. As for the building, I know that that arrangement was made—a third, a third and a third. Possibly that could be justified on the ground of construction. But as regards the maintenance of the bridge, I do not see why 100 per cent of it should be federal when the approaches are essentially a provincial responsibility. So far as I can remember, the approach to the bridge on the Ottawa side is all right, but on the Hull side it is fearful. Is the government undertaking to maintain the streets of Hull?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, that is the only repair I know of that is necessary. I do not know of any expenditures made on maintenance by the late government. What are we going to do? Are we going to maintain other bridges in the Dominion?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Unfortunately, the Dominion government do own and control the roadway and the approach to the bridge. The title is in the Crown, and apparently we cannot get anyone to take the responsibility off our hands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand it, then, the Crown owns the approaches to the bridge and has given the free use of these approaches to the municipalities.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And because the Crown has been so generous as to give the municipalities the free use of the bridge and the approaches, that puts an extra responsibility on the Crown to maintain the whole thing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Apparently.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should think the argument would lean the other way. The same view has been advanced to me before and I have always resisted it; I could never see any reason in it. I do not see why the fact that we give the free use of our property should involve us in a liability to maintain it as a road for the use of the municipality.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It does, unless the other fellow will take care of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the municipality wished to buy it I have no doubt the government would sell it. But it seems that, notwithstanding that we are giving the free use of the bridge to the municipality, we are involved in the liability of keeping up the approaches to it.

Mr. McMASTER: The right hon. gentleman should remember the Good Book says that if a man takes your coat you should give him your cloak also.

Mr. LEWIS: Is there much traffic over this bridge, and is that traffic on the increase these days?

Mr. KYTE: I think it is, while parliament is sitting.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister says that the road is vested in the Crown. All highways were originally vested in the Crown, but not in the right of the Dominion; highways are vested in the Crown in the right of the province. Is this road an exception to the general law? Has it been dedicated to the Dominion of Canada? Apparently it is not like all ordinary highways in the province, because those highways are vested in the Crown in the right of the provinces. In Ontario that has been changed recently and now the municipalities own their own highways. I did not know that this road was vested in the right of the Dominion.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Many years ago the Dominion government built this bridge in its entirety, paying the whole cost, and it replaced it in the 'eighties. In the recent arrangement they did succeed in getting the provinces to come in and pay two-thirds jointly. But the provinces did not assume the responsibility of the roadway or approach to this bridge. Now, it is all right to say let the municipality do the repairs, but if they do not do it the bridge is of no use and your money has been wasted. The bridge is in the control of the Dominion government, and the island in the middle of the river is Dominion government property. The matter is one that has given us considerable concern. I allowed that roadway to go in such a state of disrepair last year that I became ashamed of it and we did make some temporary repairs, because someone must assume the responsibility in the interests of the travelling public who use the roadway.

Mr. LEWIS: Will this be an annual expenditure of $7,000, or will the cost of upkeep be less?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think it will be an annual expenditure.

Mr. COOTE: Apparently there has been $7,000 voted for this bridge for the last three years, and in 1920 there was a vote of $34,000. Has the minister asked the municipality of Hull to take care of the approach to the bridge?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have had repeated conferences on the matter.

Mr. COOTE: And have they refused to look after it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: What would happen if they kept on refusing? Suppose every province refused to repair its bridges, would this government assume the responsibility for all the bridges that the municipalities might wish not to repair?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This bridge is in a different position from the ordinary bridge. In connection with the ordinary bridges the Dominion government does not own the approaches; they are under the control either of the province or of the municipality. But here is a bridge which we have maintained for many years. When we finally induced the province to come in and pay a portion of the cost of construction, that was the time we should have made some arrangement to divest ourselves of responsibility for the approaches. But the bridge is there and someone must keep it in repair; and apparently it is left to the Dominion government to perform that duty.

Mr. BROWN: What recourse would the municipality have against the Dominion government if we did not repair it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They would have none. But it will not be suggested that after having expended many thousands of dollars in providing a roadway, some governmental body should not take charge of it and keep it in repair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We contribute to lots of bridges, but we are not liable to maintain

them. It is inherent in municipal obligation to maintain the approach or roadway. It is true we own the title, but all we have to do is dedicate the roadway to the province the same as we have dedicated all highways, and we thus get rid of that responsibility. If the fact we have been generous in the past brings us under obligation, let us be a little more generous and dedicate the roadway to the province. I go over this bridge quite a little myself. I may explain that this is the road to the golf club; it is not the usually traversed road, and I know friends of mine who are anxious that it be taken care of by the government. But I never yielded to the solicitation, and I do not know where we shall stop if we yield now.

Mr. COPP: Are the approaches not taken care of at all?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not taken care of except on the Ottawa side. The approach to the bridge on the Ottawa side has been all right, but on the other side there are, I should say, two or three hundred yards where it is very bad and has been allowed to stay that way.

Mr. COPP: I understood an hon. gentleman to say that there was a vote in 1920 of a considerable sum of money for the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The assumption of maintenance was never yielded to, to the best of my knowledge. I remember that it has always been resisted.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Battleford—Isle la Crosse telegraph line, $5,000.

Mr. EVANS: The telegraph line running from Qu'Appelle through Humboldt to Battleford, a distance of some 350 miles, has been maintained for the last fifteen years although, so far as I know, no one has had any particular use for it. This line has always been paralleled by that of the Canadian National Railway. Some six or seven stations are maintained east of Battleford, with line repairers, and so on, at a cost, I should say, of at least $12,000 or $13,000 a year. What is to be done with that line?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is the intention to abandon that portion of line.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia—Vancouver Island district—general repairs and improvements, $2,000.

Mr. NEILL: Does this include an appropriation for extension of the telegraph line from Uchucklesit or Kildonan to Ecoole, a distance of some five or six miles?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No provision is made here for extensions. This is simply to cover maintenance and repairs.

Mr. NEILL: Application has been made for the construction of this line; it is a necessary work and would serve many people. The request has been made for a number of years now. The distance is only short, and the construction would not be expensive.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia—mainland telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $8,200.

Mr. MacKELVIE: What extensions are contemplated under this vote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No extensions; simply maintenance and repairs.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Is there any expectation that there will be provision in the Supplementary Estimates for extensions in the Sugar lake district?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have certain recommendations for extensions before us; they are being considered.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—Engineering branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draftsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $465,000.

Mr. LUCAS: Are we not to get any information in regard to the number of employees in these branches?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There are 200 employees, with salaries amounting to $457,950. To that is to be added contingencies $7,050, a total of $465,000.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—monument to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, $25,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember a year ago there was a determined protest because this work had not been gone on with under the late government. Will the minister explain why it has not been gone on with under this government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter has been under consideration—

Mr. MEIGHEN: We got that far.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): But no further. We have gone a bit further; we are arranging for a competition, and I understand that a committee of the Cabinet has had under consideration the matter of location. I believe that the Prime Minister was to confer with my right hon. friend on the subject; I do not know whether that conference has yet

taken place. The department is ready to proceed when we get the necessary information from that committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite true that the Prime Minister has conferred with me just within the last day or two as to something the government has in mind. All I wanted to emphasize was that the criticism of a year ago was wholly unjustified. It would have double force to-day, for this government has only got to the conference stage.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—National Gallery of Canada, $100,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Why is there an increase of $50,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The commission in control of the National Gallery have represented that this is an opportune time to purchase valuable paintings in the Old Country, and they have asked that in the interests of art in the Dominion this vote be increased. We have consented to increase it from $50,000 to $100,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Does parliament have any supervision over the purchases?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The commissioners or trustees make their own purchases.

Mr. COOTE: In view of the statement that it is the policy of the government to practise economy, does the minister think we are justified in spending $50,000 for the purchase of pictures? If so, how much of this vote of $100,000 is to be devoted to that purpose?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend will agree that the development of art in any country is a great asset to the people—is, indeed, a matter of national importance. The National Gallery is serving a very useful purpose. It was reopened in September, 1921, and during the first year after its reopening it was visited by 106,000 people. The year ending March 31 will show an attendance of an equal number. The chief work of the National Gallery during the past year has been the maintenance and development of the national collection and the continuation of the loan exhibitions throughout Canada, of which eighteen have been held. The trustees arrange to take pictures from the National Gallery and have them exhibited in the larger centres throughout Canada, thus giving the people an opportunity to acquaint themselves with activities of the gallery.

In addition, we have the Canadian war memorial paintings. An exhibition of one-half of the paintings is now being held, and it is hoped to have the balance ready for exhibition at the same time next year. I would suggest to any hon. gentleman interested in art that he would be well repaid by a visit to the National Gallery and an examination of the war memorial paintings and the other pictures there. The total amount appropriated by parliament since the establishment of the National Gallery Board in 1907 is $550,000. Making allowance for expenses and maintenance not more than $450,000 has been expended in works of art. The total value of the collection is conservatively estimated at current prices to be worth from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000, and in the opinion of competent judges it is one of the best collections on this continent. The trustees have made strong representations that they can secure from the Old Country to-day some very valuable pictures at a very reasonable cost.

Mr. COOTE: I have visited the National Gallery and have seen some very nice pictures there. I think the collection we now have at the National Gallery is as good as we can afford at the present time. I think this vote should not be increased this year, and I am surprised that the Finance Minister has given it his sanction. I know how strong an advocate he is of economy, and when we are taxing the clothing and other necessaries of our people in order to raise the money on which to run this country I do not think it is right to vote an extra $50,000 for the purchase of more pictures. Pictures are nice things to look at, but they will not keep you warm nor fill an empty stomach, and I would move that this vote be reduced by the sum of $50,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are these gentlemen going to the Old Country to purchase these pictures? Who purchases them?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The trustees serve without charge. I do not know of any charge that has been made in connection with trips to the Old Country.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Who are the trustees?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Sir Edmund Walker, Toronto, Chairman; Dr. F. J. Shepherd, Montreal; J. Auguste Richard, Montreal; Newton McTavish, Toronto, and Warren Soper, Ottawa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I remember rightly, this is the former grant.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And it was diminished in what year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1915-1916, to $75,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And then to $50,000 later.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): These purchases are not confined entirely to Europe? Several are made in Canada, I understand?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. They are trying to encourage Canadian art. There are many pictures by Canadian artists in the National Gallery.

Mr. FIELDING: There are quite a number of items in the Estimates concerning which the same criticism might be offered as that which has just been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Coote). There are a great many items of which you could say: They do not keep you warm or do not feed people. But after all, there is something in the encouragement of art, and I do not think this is a very extravagant sum for us to vote. We must not be heartless, but we do not want to be artless, and I think the grant proposed, especially as it is simply a renewal of the former grant, is one that ought to commend itself to the House. We ought not to be too materialistic. Let us have a little admiration for the fine arts. If we do not appreciate them as much as we ought to, let us make good our defects by doing what we can for those who do appreciate them. I am not a connoisseur in the fine arts, but I would not like to see parliament reducing this item simply because it will not keep us warm or give us food.

Mr. COOTE: I just want to say a word in defence of my action in moving this amendment. If the estimate had been left at $50,000, the same as last year, I would have offered no objection. I am not objecting to art at all. As I said before, I have visited the National Gallery and seen some very fine pictures there and enjoyed them, but I think we can get a good deal of enjoyment out of the pictures that are already there and out of what may possibly be purchased with the $50,000. Beyond that I do not think this committee ought to go at this particular time, when we have the Minister of Finance reminding us on every occasion that we must practise economy.

Mr. MILLAR: Notwithstanding what has been said by the Minister of Finance and the respect that I have both for him and the minister whose estimates we are now passing upon, I am entirely in sympathy with the amendment. I cannot imagine any member of this House passing through the districts covering hundreds of miles of the prairie provinces and seeing the difficulties in which many of the farmers are, drawing their grain sixteen or seventeen or twenty miles, and they have been doing so for many years, seeing the children ill-clad because of the lack of the wherewithal, seeing the schools closed because they cannot hire a teacher—I cannot imagine anyone who has seen these hardships who would think it wise or right to pass this item and expend the money for this purpose at this time. It may be thought that at times we are over-stating the case, and that we are, as the Finance Minister has said, too materialistic, but I assure you that the difference is this: We come from those districts. We have moved from home to home among these people and have seen the conditions, and that is the reason we have a greater sympathy for these people. While I do not wish to embarrass the government when they are doing what is right and wise I think it is for the reason I have given that the hon. member (Mr. Coote) has been moved to bring forward this amendment, and it is for that reason also that I must support it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Before we vote on the amendment, I think I should give the committee the representations which the trustees, who, as I have already said, have undertaken this work for the people of Canada without any charge, have made to the government. This item was not placed in the estimates until they had come before the department and before the government and made their representations, and I think it is due to them that I should make them known to the committee:

> As chairman of the trustees, National Gallery, I am authorized to apply for sum of $100,000 to be placed in the 1923-1924 Estimates on behalf of the National Gallery of Canada.
>
> It is only natural that this work requires steadily increasing support on the part of the government if it is to be maintained and to progress in accord with the development of the culture and education of the country. In addition to maintaining the galleries at Ottawa, the National Gallery is conducting a very extensive campaign for the education of the country in a knowledge of the fine arts. During the past three years over fifty exhibitions of Canadian art have been held, and practically every city of importance from the Atlantic to the Pacific has been served in this way. In a great many communities the remarkable progress of art in recent years is almost entirely attributable to these exhibitions from the National Gallery, and in every case they have been the cause of great encouragement and permanent benefit.
>
> In asking for the sum of $100,000 the trustees are fully cognizant of the necessity for economy and they are therefore only asking at the present time for a return to the appropriation received in the years 1913-

14 and 1914-15 when the activity and importance of the National Gallery was comparatively limited to what it is now and when all works of art were cheaper. The trustees note that the government's grant to the Royal Canadian Academy has risen from $5,000 in 1914 and $2,500 during the war to $7,500. At such a scale of increase the National Gallery would be justified in asking for $150,000.

The trustees also wish to point out that owing to the unfavourable financial and other conditions in Europe at present, one hundred thousand dollars judiciously expended now will be of greater advantage than a much larger amount a few years hence when rare works of art will undoubtedly have still further increased in price or have become practically unobtainable.

I think that is all I wish to say. Undoubtedly the work is an important one. We have some very celebrated artists in Canada and the development of art will prove a benefit to the people of this country. I would be sorry to see the committee refuse this vote.

Mr. IRVINE: I think I can appreciate the point of view of the hon. member who moved the amendment. I agree that there is much suffering and difficulty in the economic world but I do not think this is the best place to begin and correct it. Certainly I am not one who believes in the seemingly cynical popular idea of economy; I think that money well spent is the best kind of economy. Out of the hundreds of thousands of dollars we have voted in the last few days, I do not think money could be spent in a better way than is proposed here. I would not be surprised if this money brought greater benefit to the country than any of the other expenditures we have authorized.

Amendment (Mr. Coote) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa Parliament building—tablet to the memory of the late Bowman B. Law who lost his life in the fire which destroyed the old Parliament Building, $5,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the minister give us some information in respect to this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is proposed to erect a tablet in the corridors of the building to commemorate the death of Mr. Bowman B. Law, member for Yarmouth, who was unfortunately caught in the building at the time of the fire and lost his life. A design for this tablet has been prepared and submitted to the trustees of the National Gallery and models have been invited, received, and referred to this committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This item, it seems to me, is on an altogether different basis from that to provide money for the purchase of paintings for the National Gallery. I know nothing about the gentleman to whom this tablet is to be erected. We have not been told that he has performed any great or special service to the country. I take it that the chief advantage in this would be that we are to have an ornamental tablet to further decorate the parliament buildings. It does seem to me that here is a case where we might well effect economy. All through the country there are many cases of estimable men who have lost their lives in various ways while engaged in carrying on the industrial work of this Dominion, and many monuments might be erected, from coast to coast, to the memory of such men. It seems to me that there is a danger that we are centralizing these things in these parliament buildings and I, for one, feel that only under exceptional circumstances should we spend money for such a purpose at this particular time.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and inspections, $110,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Where is this inspection taking place at the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This vote is required to provide for any surveys or inspections that may be necessary during the fiscal year 1923-24 in connection with harbours, rivers, slides, booms and bridge work, and other services under the control of the Department of Public Works. It is a contingency item. A little while ago some of my hon. friends made inquiry regarding certain investigations made last year in connection with the flooded area in the Northwest. I imagine this expenditure would be connected with work of that character.

Mr. SPENCER: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The sum of $102,687 was expended last year.

Mr. LEWIS: I notice that an item above, amounting to $465,000 seems to include engineering equipment, surveys, etc.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The item my hon. friend refers to is to provide for the salaries of the regular staff. This vote is to meet inspection, travelling expenses, and expenditure of that kind in connection with extra work undertaken.

Item agreed to.

National monument on Connaught place, $10,000.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The possibility of erecting a national monument on Connaught place which my hon. friend probably

knows is the square located between the post office, Central Station and the Chateau Laurier, I understand has been under discussion for some years. It has been suggested that some form of national monument should be erected, and we are placing this amount in the estimates with a view to getting the matter under way. There have been several suggestions as to the character and form this monument should take. The whole matter is being considered carefully by a committee of council and the present item is placed in the estimates on their recommendation.

Mr. IRVINE: Is this a preliminary vote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, it is a preliminary vote.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I for one wish to object to this expenditure. It seems to me that this is also a matter which ought to require very careful consideration indeed before we embark on such expenditure. Men who served in the recent war are walking the streets to-day without work and their families are on the verge of starvation. I submit that we ought to fully provide for every one of these men before a cent is expended in the erection of a monument of stone.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I must also express my objection to this item. I think it is a very unwise expenditure at this time.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would like some further information respecting this matter. What form is the monument to take?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think that has yet been determined. I tried to make it plain to the committee that a committee of council are giving this matter consideration, with a view of developing something that would be suitable as a national monument. There have been several suggestions made, one being that we might have a monument in the capital city of the Dominion to commemorate confederation. Since the Great War it has been suggested that the efforts of the Canadian soldiers in France should be commemorated and that it would be a fit and appropriate thing to have a monument of that character in the capital city of Canada. There have been several suggestions. I think the desire of the Prime Minister was to put a small item in the estimates this year, in order that the matter might be given consideration, and that a monument that would commemorate some of the phases of Canada's history might be erected in the capital city of Canada.

Mr. HOCKEN: What does the minister hope to accomplish by an expenditure of $10,000? How will the money be spent to accomplish this object.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These matters are usually arranged by the government advertising a competition. The artists will prepare designs and submit them in competition. These designs will be judged according to their merits, the successful competitor securing the contract for the final work. That will be the first step.

Mr. LEWIS: Is parliament to bear the whole cost. In other districts the cities have to contribute to any monument erected in those cities. It seems to me the city of Ottawa which is just about as rich as any other city in Canada should bear a part of the expense of the erection of the monument.

Mr. HOCKEN: The hon. member does not know Ottawa.

Mr. MacLAREN: It seems to me this is rather vague. There is no definite object apparently nor is there any concrete idea in this proposition, except that we should have a national monument? I think it is an excellent idea, provided there is some special reason for it, and the time is suitable. I would suggest to the minister that the time is hardly suitable. It is not a pressing matter. There is no urgency about it, because the minister cannot tell us what it is for. I think this is a fair case for delay. Let us have this monument some time, but I do not think this is the appropriate or suitable time. I think we should withhold that expenditure for a few years to come.

Mr. HOEY: It seems to me that before we pass this item we should have some idea from the minister as to what the total cost of the monument when finished is likely to be. Is it going to be $10,000 this year, $100,000 next year, and $300,000 the following year? Before we can pass intelligently on this matter, we should have some idea as to the extent of the project.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I must apologize for not having a better knowledge of this item. It was inserted at the request of a committee of the Cabinet who had been giving considerable consideration to this matter. I would prefer to let the item stand for the present and bring it up at a later date, when further information might be given.

Item stands.

New Brunswick—St. John Quarantine Station Partridge island—repairs and improvements, $3,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is that in reference to supply of water?

Mr. FIELDING: No, the next item is.

Item agreed to.

St. John Quarantine Station—Partridge island water supply, $1,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: I would like some particulars in reference to the water supply. What improvement is being made in the supply?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is required for general repair to the pipe line conveying supply of water from the main land to Partridge island.

Item agreed to.

Maritime provinces generally—Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $38,000.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the difference between this item and the others we have had? Why separate them? This amount of $38,000 is for the Maritime provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is a general vote to maintain the Dominion public buildings in the three Maritime provinces, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. It also includes the items that formerly were voted separately for the cities of Halifax and St. John. It is all included in the one item. The expenditure under this item is $25,268. The items vary from $1,568, down to $558. It is for repairs to the buildings which take place from time to time.

Item agreed to.

Montreal ordnance stores building, $26,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is this a new building? or repairs to the old one?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount of $26,000 is required as a third payment on the purchase of Grant garage, No. 1 Hillside avenue, Westmount, as authorized by order in Council dated April 16th, 1921, which is being used to house the ordnance and barracks stores and garage service previously located in the Head building, which was given up on the expiration of the lease May 1st, 1921. This is the third payment. The payments extend over ten years. The total price is $140,000.

Item agreed to.

Ontario—Kitchener—government's share of cost of local improvements, $1,750.36.

Mr. HOCKEN: Why should the government pay for the local improvements?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount of $1,750.36 is provided for the payment to the city of Kitchener of the government's share of the cost of asphalt pavement on Benton street in front of the Kitchener public buildings. The municipal council of the city of Kitchener, under authority of by-law No. 1616, passed on 16th May, 1921, constructed a concrete asphalt pavement on Benton street, between King and Alma streets. This pavement had a total frontage of 698 feet and the cost of it amounted to $7,745.11, of which the city paid $1,798 for street intersections, culverts, etc. The balance, viz., $5,947.11 is charged against the properties which have a frontage of 581 feet. The cost per foot frontage therefore amounted to ten decimal 236 dollars and as the government property has a frontage of 171 feet along the street, the government's share of the cost amounts to $1,750.36. In other words, government properties, like other properties, are paying for local improvements at Kitchener. That is the common practice.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is that the practice in all other cities?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, for local improvements.

Mr. HOCKEN: I did not understand it in that way.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am rising, not to object to this item, but to get a little information which will apply to some other items also. As I understand the matter from the information of the minister, the government, in the case of all public buildings, is liable for its share of municipal improvements according to frontage, but it is not liable for any other form of municipal taxation.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We do not pay any general taxes; but with the government consenting we do pay for local improvements.

Mr. HOCKEN: With the government consenting? How long has this practice been in vogue?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): For about twenty-five years.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa printing bureau improvements, $1,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is a new building not to be erected for the Printing bureau? If so, is it necessary to put any improvements on the old one?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is the balance of a contract that was let for some improvements to the present building.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa—towards purchase of Daly building, $148,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to provide for payment of the third instalment of the purchase price of $1,000,000 for the Daly building. This building was leased to the government at an annual rental of $85,000. The owners of the building offered to sell it for $1,000,000, payable in ten annual instalments of $100,000 each with interest at 6 per cent. This is the third instalment, and there will be seven more payments.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When was the first payment made?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): August, 1921.

Mr. LEWIS: What was the original cost of the Daly building? It seems to me that $1,000,000 for that kind of a building is out of all proportion to the cost.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This building was not constructed by the government. This is a purchase, and the chief architect of the department, in a memorandum 10 p.m. dated May, 1921, recommended the purchase of this building on the above-mentioned basis of $100,000 a year with interest at 6 per cent; spread over a period of ten years, as such a purchase was manifestly to the advantage of the Dominion government, if we regard it only from a rental basis, but a further consideration of this renders it desirable also as a rounding out of the property already purchased by the Crown.

Mr. LEWIS: How much will it cost to put this building into shape for government offices?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We were in occupation of the building under a rental costing $85,000 a year, and it was apparently considered advisable at that time to purchase the building, extending the payments over a period of ten years.

Item agreed to.

Saskatchewan—Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $17,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Last spring I brought to the attention of the minister the post office facilities at Swift Current. I understand some years ago that the government bought certain ground in order later on to build a post office. Last year, when I was speaking to the minister, he said that he intended to look over the situation. Has he looked over the situation and if so, what conclusion has he reached? Is there in this appropriation any money for a post office at Swift Current?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have made some inquiries, and we have entered into a new lease at a reduced rental for a term of one year for the property that we are now occupying.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the minister consider the present building suitable for a post office at Swift Current at the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Our reports are that it is suitable.

Item agreed to.

Moose Jaw public building—improvements to heating, $12,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: What does this comprise?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to provide for the installation of new boilers to replace the five existing boilers which are in poor condition and which cannot adequately heat the building, and also for the installation of 2,000 square feet of additional radiation which is necessary in order to maintain a temperature of 70 degrees inside the building during zero weather. It is asked for by the chief architect and requested by the mechanical engineer for the western provinces.

Mr. LEWIS: I think I asked, under the former vote of last year of $17,000, where the money was intended to be spent, and I think the minister said last year that a certain amount of this $17,000 was to be spent at Swift Current. How much of it was spent at Swift Current last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year, $880.

Item agreed to.

Alberta—Calgary—customs examining warehouse—local improvement taxes, $3,737.10.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is this a rented building and so subject to general taxation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a government owned building.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The explanation given in regard to the last item applies to this?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: There is some discussion as to the general taxation that can be levied by municipalities on public lands or properties. The general principle is that no taxes can be levied on the Crown in that respect, and sometimes, of course, it works a great hardship on the municipalities. It struck me that, in the matter of taxation, pavements

fronting government buildings would almost come under the same class as roads fronting government lands or properties. Is this item arrived at by arrangement between the government and the municipality concerned?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Improvements on the sidewalk leading to government property is a fair charge against that property. The matter is one of consent on the part of the government.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was not objecting to the item. I was simply referring to the application of the principle and as to how far it extended.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $17,000.

Mr. IRVINE: I want to make a few remarks with regard to the Calgary post office. The Calgary post office, as a matter of fact, is something that does not exist. I quite understand that the matter has been under consideration by the government, for representations have been made, I believe, on numerous occasions by the people of Calgary, through the mayor and council and other public bodies, requesting attention to that post office. The minister, no doubt, is aware that the Calgary post office was pulled down by a previous government, that, I believe, of Sir Robert Borden, the intention having been to prepare the way for a better and more commodious building. For some reason or other it was found advisable, it seems, not to carry on the work, and since then we have been looking at a huge hole in the ground instead of a post office. Before the government pulled it down the post office was giving reasonable service, and the city of Calgary has a reasonable and urgent claim upon the government at this time for a new building. The government is paying $50,000 or so annually for the rental of public buildings, all of which could be saved if a post office building were put up. This unseemly hole that is left in the ground now is a disgrace to the city and perhaps a greater disgrace to the government that made the hole. The building of a new post office has been urged by the city council, organized labour, and other public bodies, and I should like to know whether the minister intends making any provision for the work this year. It is badly needed; the people want it; and the appropriations for our province are comparatively small. Besides this, the building of a post office at this time would materially relieve unemployment.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We are well advised as to the necessity of a public post office at Calgary, but to construct a building suitable for the district would mean a very large expenditure at this time, and it is not the intention of the government to proceed with the work this year.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia—Bamfield—public building, $1,500.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is this for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is for work in connection with the public building at Bamfield, which is situated on the west coast of Vancouver island where there is a cable station.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $35,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What are the details of this item?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is required for improvements, renewals and repairs in connection with the maintenance of public buildings in British Columbia, including those in the city of Vancouver for which previously a special appropriation was taken. This year, up to January 31st, we have spent $33,595. It is the usual maintenance vote.

Item agreed to.

Victoria—Old Post Office—taxes due city for 1922, $1,482.62.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): An explanation was given of this vote last year, but the committee may have forgotten it. This is an old public building in the city of Victoria which the government have been renting, and for that reason, it being in competition with other property, for many years a tax has been paid on it as on other property. The government are now going to use the property for their own purposes, and once it reverts to that position we shall not pay taxes.

Item agreed to.

Armouries—fittings and alterations, $37,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What is this appropriation for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is required for fitting up rented buildings throughout the country for use as armouries as requested by the Deputy Minister of National Defence in a letter dated November 27th, 1922, in which he states that this estimate represents the minimum amount required by the department for repairs and alterations to non-permanent active militia headquarters, and it is

therefore requested that the amount be included in the estimates for the fiscal year 1923-1924.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings generally, $30,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This includes travelling expenses, stationery, drawings, instruments, etc. The appropriation for 1921-22 was $30,000; the expenditure was $29,767. This year our expenditure to January 31, was $18,775, leaving a balance unexpended of $11,000.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, etc., $76,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister give the reason for the increase there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The increase is accounted for by an appropriation of $5,292 due to transfer of an amount formerly paid out of another vote, together with an increase of $743 in the allotment for contingencies. These two items amount to $6,035, but there are a few slight decreases throughout the Dominion which reduce the total to $6,000.

Mr. KNOX: How much of the vote for Dominion public buildings, which totals $5,135,500, is to be spent in Ottawa?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): All the items under the heading "Ottawa public buildings" relate to Ottawa services. The others are for buildings outside Ottawa.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—rents, $1,450,000.

Mr. JELLIFF: Will the minister please explain that? There is a big increase there.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The increase is due to provision being made for the rental of premises for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Soldier Settlement Board, for which no provision was made in the estimates of 1922-23, and which were formerly charged to demobilization vote; and to increases in rentals and new rentals entered into in 1922-23. Under Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment we have rentals of $115,000; Soldier Settlement Board, $43,582; increase in rentals, $31,486; new rentals, $46,322.

Mr. KNOX: Is any portion of that for the city of Ottawa?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.19 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1923

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=First, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Live Stock Acts Amdt.

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., breakwater, 4563

Abitibi Region
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Transcontinental railway, 2833

Abolition of Capital Punishment. *See* Capital Punishment

Abolition of Grand Jury system. *See* Grand Jury

Academy of Arts. *See* Royal Academy of Arts

Accidents
Automobile, 3958
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Industrial and other, 3957
Insurance, 3978

Accounts. See Board of Audit Act; Finance

Accredited Herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Acland, Mr. F. A. *See* King's Printer; Printing Bureau

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* National Defence.

Actuarial Computations. *See* Labour, Annuities

Adams, Dr. Frank, the coal situation, 1265

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 9, 34, 54, 75, 99, 122
Mover (Mr. Putnam) 9
Seconder (Mr. Rheaume) 16
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) 65; neg. 178
Amdt. to (Mr. Shaw) 72; neg. 177
Motion agreed to, 179

Address—*Con.*
Speakers, Messrs: Bancroft, 99; Baxter, 132; Black (Yukon) 85; Brown, 47; Carroll, 80; Drayton, 153; Duff, 108; Evans, 145; Fielding, 89; Forke, 34; Graham, 54; Hoey, 63; amdt. 65; Hughes, 123; Kellner, 106; King, Mackenzie, 27; Lewis, 117; Lucas, 75; McConica, 166; McMaster, 172; Martell, 101; Meighen, 17; Millar, 50; Neill, 174; Raymond, 160; Robinson, 72; Shaw, 66; amdt. to amdt., 72; Stewart (Leeds), 169; Stork, 149; Woodsworth, 41

Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 1256

Legislation referred to in, qu. 2612

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration. *See* Government

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Act Amdt. Bill (Deputy Local Judges and Deputy Registrars) Res., 1080, 2051; 1r., 2r., com., 2052; com., 3r., 2204

Adulteration of Grain. *See* Grain

Adulteration of Mill Feeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Advertising. *See* Immigration; Labour; Magazines and Periodicals; Press; Publicity

Advisory Council. *See* Research

Advisory Fuel Committee. *See* Fuel Supply.

Advisory Tariff Commission. *See* Tariff

Advocate, N.S., wharf, 4560

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air.

Aeroplanes. *See* Air; National Defence, Canadian Air Force

After War Conditions, 1231. *See also* War

Agassiz experimental farm. *See* Agriculture

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agricultural Conditions. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Implements. *See also* speeches on Budget; Reciprocity with United States; Treaties, French Treaty
Comparative prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Duties, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
See also Budget; Customs Tariff
Complaint of, 2863
Increased by increased price, 2848, 2975
Reduction of, 2743
Free admission to United States, 3017, 3062, 3499
French Treaty, 2001, 2246
Georgia pine, importation for, 3411
Imports, qu. 617
Live stock, required to purchase, 1408
Manufacturing of, 2247
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., speech in 1911, 2848, 2974
Prices, 2836, 2991, 3070. *See also that title*
Comparison with United States, 2739
Standardization, 789, 805
Stumping machines, duty, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Taxation of, 1850
Wheat, bushels required to purchase, 1912 and 1922, 1408

Agricultural Institute. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Instruction Act. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Farmers; Immigration; Labour

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 641, 1165, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1196, 1201, 1231, 1357, 1398, 1402, 1407, 1423, 1438, 1841-47, 1880, 2797, 2810, 2815, 2829, 2830, 2861, 2872, 2928, 2961, 3002, 4038. *See also* Western Provinces
Aird, Sir John, 1407
"Calamity howlers", 2928, 2977

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions—*Con.*
Canada generally, 2763
Farmers' profits, 2873
Financing. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits
Great Britain in. *See that title*
Interest rates 2962
Larcombe, Mr. Samuel, statement, 2873
Parliament difficult to convince, 2730
Past and present price comparison, 2978
Pioneering, 2870
Prince Edward Island, 2972
Production costs and prices, 2835
Special Committee
Appointed, 706
Bradshaw Mr. Thomas, statement, 2829
Evidence, 2972
Inquiry as to, 667
Leave to report, 911
Leitch Prof., dairying industry, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1858
Oleomargarine, 3271
Railway and shipping combine, 1395
Reports qu. 2612
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 1209
Fourth, 2127. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Interim, printing, 2181
Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 4295, 4363
Fifth, 4007
Sixth and Seventh 4075
Tariff Commmission evidence, 2296
United States. *See that title*
Western provinces 1885, 2845. *See also that title*
Agricultural Credits. *See* Credits
Agricultural education 2869
Agricultural exports, 1904. *See also* Imports and Exports
Agricultural fairs. *See also* Exhibitions
Horse-racing, 726, 750
Agricultural Instruction Act, 3315. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Grant 607
Renewal of, qu. 490
Agricultural lands, 1344. *See also* Immigration; Lands
Agricultural loans. *See* Credits
Agricultural products 1857, 2716
Beans, 2981
Distribution, 1852, 2868

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Products—*Con.*
Duties on, qu. 1992
Comparison with United States, 2958
Reduction by order in council 2650
United States tariff against 2649, 2650
Exports, 1390, 1838, 3061. *See also* Imports and Exports
Freight rates, 3195. *See also that title*
French treaty, 1978, 2006, 2247. *See also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports, 445, qu. 617, 2708, 2917, 2958, *See also* Imports and Exports; United States
United States from, 1249
Markets, 1410, 1414, 2869, 3066, 4027. *See also* Markets; Treaties, French Treaty
Competitive, 1804
Disorganized, 2861
France, 2235
Great Britain, 1905, 2714
Marketing agent in, 4675
Home market fallacy, 2849
Marketing and quality, live stock, 2862 *See also* Live Stock.
Prices, 1168, 2731, 2748, 2861, 2928, 3018, 3069. *See also* Prices
Europe in, 1052
Manufactured products and, 1083, 1407, 1851, 1885, 1907
Production cost, 1858
United States, 2810, 2910. *See also that title*
Agricultural representative in Great Britain, 3291
Agriculture and Colonization Committee
Changes in personnel, 2926, 3261
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3266
Reports
First, 666, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Assistance to, 2947, 3237. *See also* Bounties
Bacon production. *See* Bacon
Bacteriology, 462
Bad farming, 1887, 2809, 2810, 2812
Banking system and, 4014. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill; Banks and Banking; Credits; speeches on Budget
Bee-keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Biological laboratories, 580
Bonus, 3239
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Agriculture—*Con.*
British Columbia, increased production, 1432
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Canadian Council of. *See that title*
Cereals, milling and baking test, 463
Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
Combines and, 2786, 2787. *See also* Combines
Commissioner. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See under this title,* Agriculture and Colonization
Conditions. *See under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Co-operation, 1400, 1852, 2869. *See also* Co-operation; Markets
Dairying Industry. *See that title*
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Department
Commissioner of. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Cook, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
Deputy Minister, 2065
Salary, 611, 4669
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Dryden, Mr. W. A., qu. 384
Trip to South America, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705
Employees, 815
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3303, 3988, 4074
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See that title.*
Officials attending fairs, 285
Salaries and contingencies 610, 3303
Seed branch, 4621
Staff, 2756
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179
Depression in, 1083, 1889. *See also* Immigration, and *under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Destructive Insect and Pest Act
Administration, 595, 3988. *See also,* Insect Pests
Diseases of Animals. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Economic organization, 1857, 1858, 1863
Eggs. *See that title*
Entomological branch 3988
Forest destruction by insects, qu. 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Experimental and illustration farms, 456, 3237
Agassiz, 457
Botany, division, forest destruction, 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Brandon, 457, 459
British Columbia, 458

Agriculture—*Con.*
Experimental Farms—*Con.*
Buildings, 4629
Cap Rouge, 459
Central, Ottawa, 456, 465, 485, 2869
Buildings, 4631
Charlottetown, 460, 470
Fredericton, 460, 471
Grain, new varieties, 483
Harrow, 466
Indian Head, 459, 472
Irrigation, Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
Kapuskasing, 459
Kentville, 460
Lacombe, 458, 471
La Ferme, Quebec, 471
Lennoxville, 460
Lethbridge, 458
Livestock, 460-485. *See also that title*
Nappan, 457, 460
Dairy herd, experiment with, 2863
Morden, 459
M. (Mr. Leader) to reduce appropriation, neg. 486
Overlapping, 4633
Publicity, 463, 470
Rosthern, 460
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, 460, qu. 1028
Scott, 458
Summerland, 464
Swift Current, 458
Farm credits, 1088, 2869, *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm homes, 1215. *See also* Housing
Farm labour, 1166 ,1174, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Immigration; Labour
Competition with protected industries, 2731
Demand for, 1168
Immigration of, 1100
Farm loans and mortgages, 170-1, 2763, 2962, 4041. *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm products. *See under this title* Agricultural Products
Farm women, 1844
Farmers. *See also that title*
City man and, 2869
Earnings, 2813, 3023
In parliament, 2787. *See also* Progressive party
National policy, 2917
Feeding Stuffs, adulteration. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Fertilizers. *See that title*
Field crops, 1889, 2861
Competitions, 600, 602
Production of, 2846
Value, 2845, 2934

Agriculture—*Con.*
Forage plants, 463
Free land available for settlement, 1087
French treaty, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Fruit. *See that title*
Grain-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grants to provinces, qu. 490
Grasshoppers, 2774. *See also under this title,* Destructive Insects; Insect pests
Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock
Hudson Bay region, possibilities of, 1065
Immigration and, 1186, 1228. *See also* Immigration
Income tax. *See also* Taxation
Agricultural forms, 4498
Payments by farmers, qu. 1259
Insect pests and fungus diseases, 2774. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Insect Pests
Interest rates in western Canada, 1088. *See also* Bank Act; Budget speeches; Credits
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Land. *See also* Dominion Lands; Lands
Along national railways, price, 1087
Sale of in western provinces. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Live stock. *See that title*
Maritime provinces, conditions in, 1132
Markets. *See under this title* Agricultural Products; *also* Markets
Methods, 3071
Mixed farming, 2747, 2772, 2862, 2953
National policy and, 2786
Needs of, 3065
Noble Foundation farm, 2813
Noxious weeds, 1887, 1888, 2305. *See also* Seed
Organizations, 2976
Plant pathology, 463
"Plutocrats and profiteers," burden of, 1417-18
Poor farming, allegation of. *See under this title* Bad farming
Potatoes. *See* Vegetables
Production, cost of, 640, 1190, 1410
Profitable lines of, 2862
Publications. *See* Government Publications
Review of. *See under this title* Experimental Farms
Sacrifices, 3065
Seed. *See that title*
Seed testing. *See* Seed
Single-crop farming, 2862
Specialized, 2763
Stability, 3068

Agriculture—*Con.*
Tariff and, 1355. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Two ministers of, 3313
Votes for, 3237
Wages of farm labourers. *See* Labour
Weed menace, 1887, 1888, 2305
Wheat-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Air Board, annual report, 4510

Air Force. *See* National Defence

Air Service. *See also* Canadian Air Force, under National Defence
Destructive insects and pests, control of, 597
Forest patrol. *See* Forests and Forestry

Aird, Sir John
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Prices, agricultural implements and farm products, 1409

Alaskan, steamship, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330

Alberta. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 1435, 1438, 2766. *See also* Agriculture; Freight Rates; Immigration
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045, 4048
Bituminous sands, 3198
Butter shipments to China, 1840
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal, 790, 1262, 1265, 1275, 1281, 1282, 4692. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Consumption in Ontario, 1276
Freight rates on, 1280, 2781, 2828
Mines, 3424
Crown lands, revenue from, qu. 2515
Dairying industry, 1839, 1851, 2766
Production 1921, 2774
Destitution, 1440
Dominion forest reserves, 1256, 2061
Dredging, 1012
Farms, abandoned, 67
Freight rates, 1957, 1958. *See also that title*
Grain production, 1435
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Hemp production, 2780. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Highways. *See* Canada Highways bill;
Immigration, 1476. *See also that title*
Indians, 2145
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Iron ore, 2512
Irrigation, 1436, 3428
Liberal Convention, 2995

Alberta—*Con.*
Mixed farming, 2772
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Oil, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling, 2508
Prospecting and developing, 780
Political patronage, 522
Privy Council decision, 2559
Public buildings, 1023
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1155
Settlers' relief, 3447
Tax sales, 4062
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tourist traffic, 3438
United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 1440
Vermilion, town lots, qu. 489, 1307, 2417

Alcohol, denatured. *See* Inland Revenue

Alderson Claim. *See* Live Stock

Alfred peat plant. *See* Fuel Supply.

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Naturalization Act Amdt.
Convicted, deportation of, 2123
Enemies.
Citizenship, 1380
Immigration, restriction of, 1128. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Property, 2499. *See also* War Claims
Claim of Canada against United States, 2496, 3823
Custodian of, qu. 1486
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointed as Commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Securities held by United States custodian, 2496

Alliances, Political. *See also* speeches on Budget; Political Parties
Liberals and Conservatives on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245

Alpine Club grant, 3414, 3444, 3954

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminium Company of America, Massena plant, 659

Ambassador, British, at Washington. *See* British Ambassador; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Ambassador to United States. *See* Canadian Representation

Amendments. *See* House of Commons

American Bank Note Company, postage stamps, printing, 1818

Americanization. *See* Magazines and Periodicals

Amery, Colonel L. C., 1328
Economic conditions in Great Britain, 1205
West Indies steamship service, 3392

Ammunition. *See* National Defence

Ampthill, Lord, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Analyst, certificate of. *See* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Anchor-Donaldson Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Anderson, Captain, report on Hudson bay, 1042

Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1823

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant hospital, closing of, 1995
Budget, 2837. Colourless budget drafted for political effect, 2837; Right Hon. Mr. Fielding; reciprocity; free trader in opposition, protectionist in power; tariff record of Liberal party; the tariff; average rate of duty; National policy, adoption by minister, 2838; Minister of Agriculture convert to protection; revenue tariff and incidental protection; excise and customs duty; cost of living; Minister of Interior convert to protection; tariff a tax; who pays? excise taxation, 2839; sales tax and cost of living; collection of tax on domestic and foreign goods; sales tax increase in and revenue; question as to origin of finished articles, 2740; turnover tax; automobile industry; customs duty and sales tax 52 per cent; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; reported statement of Minister of Finance on North Essex election; tariff stability, 2841; economy; balanced budget; public debt; cost of government; expenditure, rapid increase of; reciprocity; Treaty of 1854, 2842; depression following abrogation; Fordney-McCumber tariff; time inopportune for negotiations; lines of transportation; interprovincial and world trade; trade with British Empire; imports and exports; trade lines running East and West; wheat, market for, 2843; immigration, reported statement of Sir Henry Thornton; Bishop Lloyd, 2844; amendment; a political gesture; Progressive platform; attitude of opposition towards budget; western provinces, conditions in; rural income tax-payers, bank stock shareholder; field crops, value by provinces, 2845

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 534
Customs officials, Halton county, 914
Dundas street highway, qu. 708
Duties on farm and animal products, qu. 1992
Elevators, Ontario, 2037
French treaty, 455
Highways, grant to Ontario, qu. 620
North Oakville post office, 914
Pensions
Disability entitling to, 679
European war and active militia, 3726
Private abattoirs, 185-6
Proportional representation, M. (Mr Good) 394, 429
Return, inquiry for, 2008
Sales tax on automobiles, qu. 1993, 2841
Soldier Settlement, 2029
Trade and Commerce dept. staff, 2035

Anglo-Canadian commerce. *See* British Preference; Trade

Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449. *See also* Japan.
Restriction of provincial rights 1453

Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426

Angouleme, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Animal Contagious Diseases. *See* Dairying Industry; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
(Compensation for slaughter, reduction of)
Res., 666, 2647; 1r., 2r., com., 2048; com., 2131; 3r., 2138
Sections and subjects discussed:
Abortion infective, 2867
Glanders, 2868
Hog cholera, 2867

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Internal parasites, 2867
Research work, 2867
Tuberculin test 2867
Tuberculosis, 2867
Immunization from, 2866
Watson Dr., chief bacteriologist, 2866

Animals. *See also* Live Stock
Inspection of. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.
Products, duties on, qu. 1992
Wild. *See* National Parks and Reservations
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 597

Annapolis Royal, wharf, 941

Annual Drill. *See* National Defence

Annuities, Old age. *See* Labour; Pensions

Anti-Combines bill. *See* Combines bill

Anti-Dumping. *See* Customs and Excise

Appeal Boards. *See* Pension Act Amdt bill; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Appeals
Attorney-General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2521
Canada Grain Act 781, 2045
From convictions, inquiry, 4250
Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136
Right of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Yukon Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appointments. See Civil Service

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 103 (Interim Supply—for $44,725,058.25 for 1923-24) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1539
2. Bill No. 202 (Interim Supply—for $46,558,391.58 for 1923-24) Res. 3705; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3706
3. Bill No. 252 (for $18,202,105.66 for 1922-23 and $196,870,229.79 for 1923-24) Res. 4735; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4736

Appropriations set forth in Estimates. *See* Canadian National Railway bills; Estimates

Arbitrators. *See* Judges

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4099
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1503
Belgian Exposition, 496
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Budget, 2879. Income tax, 2879; proposed changes; exemption on account of children; community of property; earned and unearned incomes, 2880; income derived from (a) inheritance, (b) accumulated capital, (c) profession or trade; revenue; dividends, 2881
Business of the House
Questions, as orders for returns, 939
Inquiry for, 3507
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Disposal of scrap material, etc., qu. 1138
Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 528, 567
Civil Service, temporary employees made permanent, qu. 814, 1385
Code Napoleon, 1526, 1558
Contrecœur, wharf, 952
France, reconstruction, 2012
French treaty, 445, 2009, 2262
Grand Trunk, list of shareholders, 940
Greece, loan to, 2010
Imperial conference, 4653
Income tax, exemption for children, M. 1382, 2128, 2880, 4502
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4502
Levis dry dock, 1261
Liberal platform, taxation of luxuries, 2011
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2086, 2640
Return, inquiry for, 3507
Montreal post office
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Political patronage, 528
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Rhineland occupation, qu. 2696
Roumania, loan to, 2010
Trade commissioners, 856

Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290

Architects. *See* Parliament Buildings; Public Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Expeditions, 4012
Correspondence, 814
New ship, purchase of, 4702
Publication of reports, 3360
Wireless stations. *See* Yukon

Argentine Republic, Senate, 1373

Arichat, wharf, qu. 2180

Armouries. *See* National Defence

Army. *See* National Defence

Army and Navy Veterans, petition, 4536

Army Officers, settlement in Canada, 1432

Aronovici, Mr. A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris offices

Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Arsenault, Mr. H. P. *See* House of Commons, Staff

Arthur Young Company. *See* Civil Service

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4509
Budget, 3033. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff platform of 1921; failure to implement; agricultural implement duty; boots and shoes; tariff changes offset by increased sales tax, 3033; cheque and receipt taxes inconvenient and discriminatory; net increase in duties under budget of 1922; budget of 1923 disappointing; British preference; direct importation through Canadian ports; hardship to the woollen industry; sugar duty; raisins and dried currants; scrap iron; paint ingredients, 3034; potato duty; Fordney-McCumber tariff; crude petroleum bounty; cost of living; French treaty; reductions of duties on luxuries, wines and spirits; favoured nation; prohibitionists and wine duty; 3035; sales tax; pyramiding; freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement; railway receipts reduced by $20,000,000; reduction made at expense of shipper; rates on lumber, pulpwood and ties; immigration policy; Canada Colonization Association; differences of opinion amongst Liberal and Progressive members, 3036; "blue ruin" speeches; immigrants from Stornoway; northern Ontario and Quebec; agricultural and business conditions, 3037
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 2179
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4673
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 329
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4560
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2429
Mail carriage by subsidized steamships, 2172
Military hospitals, neurological cases, 696
Murray Stewart, vessel, purchase, 3355
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Pensions commission, report, 2128
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Public buildings, new, 4614
Sales tax, 3033-36, 4181
Soldier Settlement Board, loans, qu. 2207
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Terrebonne public building, 4614
Unemployment relief, 690
Vetcraft shops, 696
Vocational loans, 687
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3355

Artificial Silk. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Textiles, Silk

Artillery. *See* National Defence

Artisans. *See* Immigration; Labour

Arts
Academy of. *See* Royal Academy of Arts
Recognition. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Ascension Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ash Wednesday, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatics. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries; Immigration

Assassination. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Assay Office. *See* Mines and Minerals

Assessors. *See* Judges

Assignments. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Assiniboine River
Encroachments of, 999
Expenditure on dyking, etc., qu. 3264
Floods, 993, 998, 3041

Assisted Passages. *See* Immigration

Astrophysical Observatory, Victoria, 3242

Athabasca, Lake, discovery of iron ore, 2512

Athletics. *See* National Defence, Cadet training; Olympic Games

Atlanta Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Atlantic Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Atlantic Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Halifax; Ports; St. John

Attendance of Members. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2521

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Board of. *See* Board of Audit Act

Auditing. *See* Bank Act; Canadian National Railways

Auditor General. *See also* Board of Audit
Appointment, qu. 2298, 2710, 3307, 3987, 4355, 4512
Payments to temporary postmasters, 1823
Report
Referred to Public Accounts Committee, 434
Tabled, 8
Salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy. *See under this title,* Appointment

Australia
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
British immigration, preference for, 2932
Budget, 2984
Chinese immigration, 2313
Dairying industry, 3297
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Hughes, Premier, statement at Imperial Conference of 1921, 4663
Immigration policy, 1882
Land settlement, 1389
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis
Pearce, Hon. Senator, 1849
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Raisins and currants, duty, 2990, 3017, 3069, 3474
Senate, constitution of, 1370
Tariff shutting out Fiji Islands fruit, 1848
Trade treaty with, 36, 245, 1848, 2815, 2964, 2990, 3069, 3474, 3476
Visit of Minister of Trade and Commerce to, 1849. *See also* Robb
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Austria
Bean-growing industry, 2982
Senate, constitution of, 1371
West Ukrainian Republic. *See that title*

Authors. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill.

Automobiles
Accidents, 3958

Automobiles—*Con.*
Admission fee to national parks, 3942, 3943
Automobile industry, protection, 2841
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Civil servants, and, 1772
Customs and sales taxes, 2841
Duty on, 2908, 3075
Farmers, and, 100, 2812, 2874
Ford car, farmers and, 1466
Ford Motor Company
Organization and efficiency, 2544
Prices, fixing of, 2525
French treaty, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Gasoline
Price, 2547
Short measure, 810
Highways. *See* Canada Highways
Immigration of United States garage owners, 1416
India, shipments to, 508
Insurance, 3147, 3977
Ottawa, in, 2874
Purchase of by instalments, 2874
Railways and, 1619
Sales tax on, qu. 1993, 2841
Saskatchewan in, 82, 148
Taxation, 52%, 2841
Western provinces, 1889

Autonomy. *See* Canada's participation in War; Imperial Conference

Aviation. *See* Air Service

Aylesworth, Sir Allen, decisions. *See* Disallowance

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Bacon. *See also* Live Stock
Bacon industry, 2864
British market, 2864
Canadian, selling price in Great Britain, 1905
Corn-fed, 2865
Danish, 2864, 2865
Grades, 590.
Hog grading, 590
Imports and exports, 938
Pork products, and, 1978
Price of, 2585, 2933
Salty, 3301
Wiltshire sides, 2864

Bait. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Baker, the Late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to
Special Committee, report, 435, 730, 1256, 1991

Balance of Trade. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Annual training, 875

Baldwin, Mr. W. K.—*Con.*
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1822
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1054
Immigration policy, 1247
Labour, demand for, 1248
Military expenditure, 875
Rural mail service
Carriers, remuneration, 1822
Spur lines, 1826
Tariff protection, 1249
Taxation, increase of, 1822
Woollen industry, 3470

Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824

Baldwin Tinplate Industry, 2819. *See* also Tinplate

Balfour, Colonel N. H. *See* Canadian National Railways

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Roumania

Bamfield, B.C., public building, 1024

Bananas
Production in Fiji Islands, 1848
Trust, 2979

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Address in reply, 99. Mr. Carroll and prosperity of the western farmer, 99-100; farmers and automobiles, 100; condition of the West, 100-101; causes of emigration; mixed farming, 101
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035
Budget, 2736. Liberal tariff policy; amendments moved when in opposition; high cost of living; duties upon necessaries of life; reciprocity; tariff plank chief issue in last election, 2736; rejection of Conservative policy by western provinces; low tariff sentiment; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks almost identical; mandate clear and unmistakable; Tory reactionaries in garb of official Liberalism; tariff; protection responsible for immigration; high prices; reduced purchasing power, 2737; United States largest free trade area in world; per capita customs tax; United States and Canada; prices, comparison of United States and Canada; mail order catalogues, 2738; clothing; sewing machines; paints; agricultural implements; harness, 2739; nails; wire fencing and poultry netting; washing machines; dairy supplies; tools; rubber boots safety razors; prosperity impossible with present production costs; barriers obstructing development of natural industries, 2740
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, 3251
Drawbacks on steel, coal and woollen goods, qu., 1994
Dredging, Grassy Narrows, 1013
Emerson public building, 4628
Grain for exhibition purposes, 1455
Highways, federal grant, 519
Homesteads, improvements, 3251
Indian Affairs, department, salaries, 2165
Indians
Manitoba, 2153
St. Peter's reserve, 2153
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4283
Lake Manitoba, flooding, 999
Masters and mates, 2610
Parliament buildings, Commons chamber, lighting, 1728
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Penitentiaries, 771
Privilege—titles—amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1308
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Royal military college, expenditure, 4628
Rural credit system, 4035
St. Andrew's dam, fishway, 1000
Selkirk wharf, 1000
Shipping combines, 4283
Soldier settlement, 2021
Steamship services, 2173, 2174
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655

Banff National Park, 3434
Calgary Power Company and, 3442, 3750, 3938
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electric plant, 3949
Hotel, 3435
Power privileges, 496, 3750
Water powers, 3420

Banff-Windermere Highway, opening, 3584

Bank Act. *See* also Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Credit; Finance
Revision, 26, 70, 77, 170, 496, 634, 638, 644, 858, 4014, 4035. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget
Alberta legislature, res., 2084
Canadian Council of Agriculture, 255, 4016, 4041, 4045
Proposed extension of charters for twelve months M. (Mr. Spencer) 683, ruled out of order, 643

Bank Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Bank Act; Banks and Banking
Res., 1167, 1310; 1r., 2r., 1314; ref. to

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Com., 1314; com., 4013, 4014, 4077, 4133; 3r., 4162; Senate amdts. 4058
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agency, 4093-8
Agreement of sale, 4138
Amendments to Bank Act, 4052, 4056
Antagonism of financiers and farmers, 4044
Assets, sale to another bank, 4134
Audit, chartered accountants, 1311. *See also under this bill,* Shareholders
Australian Commonwealth bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars, 4014
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) extending charters for one year 4017, neg. 4075
Amdt. (Mr. Good) to M. for 3r., 4141, neg. 4147
Bank circulation redemption fund continued
Amdt. (Mr. Coote) interest on, neg. 4093
Bank loans, approval by directors, 4098
Bank may sell assets to another bank, 4134
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Bank statements, 4020, 4030, 4047, 4085, 4139
Banking and Commerce Committee
Evidence, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Banking monopoly, 4045, 4047, 4050, 4087 4103, 4157, 4166
Banking system, 4016, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Business and powers of the bank, 4093
Amdt, agency (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4093; withdrawn, 4094
Amdt., insurance, agents for (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4094, neg. 4098
Canadian Bankers' Association, representation before Com. 4058
Cash reserves in Dominion notes, 4091
Centralization, 4079
Circulation, 4092
Security of, 1312
Co-operative banking, 4067
Criticism of the banks, 4039
Currency, 4072
Depreciated, 4027
National, 4048
Definitions, 4014
Delay in 1909, 1910 and 1911, 4033, 4035

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Directors, 1313, 4084
Amdt. (Mr. Good) 4084 neg. 4084
Attendance at meetings, 1313
Qualifications of, 4077
Discount, 4509
Discussion, opportunity for, 4063, 4225
Dividends, 4039, 4121, 4124
Division between East and West, 4040
Divisions
Bank charters, renewal of, amdt. (Mr. Good), 4141, 4147
Interest rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest rate, maximum, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Right of association of officers, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Failures, 1312, 4037
"Fantastic" schemes, 4038
Federal reserve system, 4069
Financial system, re-adjustment of, 4053, 4057
First lien upon seed grain and crop, 4102
First meeting of subscribers, 4075
Gold standard, 4021, 4027, 4047, 4093
Government audit, 4020, 4030, 4087
Government inspection, 1310
"Gramophones" 4058
Hicks, Mr. T., and Merchants Bank, 4059
Industrial conditions, 4054
Insurance, agency, 4093, 4509
Interest at 7 per cent may be charged, 4103
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4105, neg. 4119
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4125, neg. 4131; 4149; neg. 4149
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. on div. 4148
Interest rates, 4119, 4020, 4028, 4047, 4050, 4062, 4065, 4509
Locality and security, 4120
Interlocking directorates, 4022, 4157
Investment bankers, 4157
Liberal and Conservative union, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245
Loans
Live stock, 4103
Officials, to, 1313
Wholesale dealers, 4101
Merchants' Bank investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. on div. 4161
Mergers, 1311, 4031, 4050, 4071, 4072, 4080, 4134

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Money
Nature and function, 4020, 4055
Purchasing power, 4067
Trust, 4026
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4125, 4142
Mortgages and hypothecs of realty and agreement of sale, 4099
Property exempt from seizure, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4099, withdrawn, 4133
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Com. not debatable
Ruling (Mr. Speaker), 4013
National currency, 4048
Notes, issue of, 4092, 4122
Officers
Appointment of, 4048
Right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4084, neg. 4085; 4161, neg. on div. 4161
One vote for each share, 4085
Particulars of act of incorporation, 4075
Pension fund, 1313
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
Price level, stabilization of, 4069
Prices, control of, 4047
Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor, 4103
Prior liens, 1312
Private bankers, licensing of, 1314
Production and consumption, 4054
Profits, 4121, 4124
Property, 1313
To be sold within certain time, 4101
Protection of the public, 1312
Questionaire and answers, 4062, 4128
Re-discount system, 4081
Returns of interest rates charged, 4119
Revision, postponement of. *See* Bank Act
Rural credits, 4015, 4028, 4035, 4037, 4039, 4041, 4066. *See also* Credits
Shareholders' audit, 1311, 4037, 4087
Auditors to report to Minister, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4090, neg. 4091
Government audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 4090
Short title, 4014
Small banks, 4077
Stability, 4078
Statement of liabilities, assets, etc., 4085
Stock, allotment of, 1312
Taxes, refusal to pay, 4099
"Unholy alliance," 4031
United Farmers of Ontario, co-operative stores, 4068
Unpaid vendor, 4509
Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, 4101
Weyburn Security bank, 4509. *See also* Banks and Banking

Banking and Commerce Committee
Bank Act, proceedings, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Inquiry by, 2937
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Members in attendance at, 2167, 2171
Personnel, 2639, 2926, 3261
Reports
Inquiry, 2612
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Rural credits, 2929. *See also* Credits
Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Bankruptcy
Farmers, 1412. *See also* Credits
Number of failures, 648

Bankruptcy Act. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.
Administration, 780
Amendment or abrogation, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1490, withdrawn 1528
Assignments
Preliminary expense, 1412
Since 1916, 1495
Galipeault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Girouard, Judge, law of 1864, 1497
Perrault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Taschereau, Hon. L. A. 1499
Assignments, 1916-1922, qu. 937

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Trustees; custodian; sales of property; landlord's privileges; examination of debtor; composition; discharge of trustees; claim of wife; examination of relatives; distribution between assignment and composition; doubt as to interpretation)
1r., 2252-2253; 2r., 3085-3091; com. 3091, 3209; 3r., 3222; Senate amendments, 4201
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Abstract of receipts and disbursements, 3116
Application by trustee for discharge, 3116
Assignment
Authorized, 3106
For general benefit of creditors, 3110

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Assignment—*Con.*
Form of, 3110
Bankruptcy proceedings, cost of, 3090
British North America Act, 3095
Canadian Credit Men's Association, 3088, 3093
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 3093
Commencement of act, 3127
Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement, 3110, 3209
Debtor
Conditional discharge, powers of court, 3125
Description of property, 3115
Discharge of, 3086
Examination of, 3124
Examination of bankrupt by official receiver, 3121
Farmers, 3211
Claims of, 3214
Fees of attorney and trustees, 3087, 3090
Hypothecated immovable property, sales of, 3114
Jurisdiction, 3095
Landlords, claim of, 3086
Marriage settlement, 3087
Married woman, claim, 3087, 3121
Meetings of creditors, 3117
Objections to, statement, 3098
Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, 3126, 3220
Official receivers, 3087
Petitioning creditor secured, 3108
Priority of claim, 3214
Proof of debt, 3119
Publication of notice, etc., 3110
Quebec, sales in, 3114
Release of security, 3116
Remedy of creditor against property, 3109
Repeal of, 3091
Right of manufacture, 3114
Secured creditor to value security, 3119
Security to be furnished by trustee, 3111
Short title, 3091
Stay of proceedings, 3109
Tariff of costs and fees, 3126
Trustees, 1412, 3088, 3113, 3210
Remuneration of, 3116
Vestment of property in, 3109
Voting by proxy, 3119
Wife's claim, 3087, 3121
Banks and Banking. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Advances to chartered banks, 4249, 4408. *See also* Finance Act Amdt. bill
Agricultural credits. *See* Credits, Rural
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Bank Note Act, 4093
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank of Commerce
Aird, Sir John, 1407
Domestic debts, 1343
Overgovernment and taxation, 1391
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1409
Bank clearings, increase of, 3055
Bank directors dominating industrial and commercial affairs, 4022
Bank draft tax, 3925
Bank notes
Bank Note Act, 4093
Issues, 4408
Substitution for national notes, 4408
Bank returns
False, 4030
M. (Mr. Coote) 3264
Bank robberies, 776
Bank statements, 4020, 4047
Banking system, 634, 4016, 4017, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Borrowings, 4030
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Capital, control of, 4026. *See also* capital
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739, 4406
Circulation
"Bank specials" 1739
Security of, 1312
Combinations, 2578, 4083
Commission on banking and credit, 2929
Cost of living and, 1409
Credits. *See also that title*
Control, 631, 2725
Financial machinery, control of, 2725
Monopoly, 2725
System, 1252
Dividends, 4121, 4124
Dollar, stabilizing of, 4666
Dominion Bank, statement as to economic conditions, 1394
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Employees, married, 4084
Farmers' bank, 4034
Farmers
Credits. *See* Credits
Pressure on, 1202
Shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Treatment of, 2929
Federal jurisdiction, 2592
Federal reserve bank, 4067
Financial influence in parliament, 2733
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Gold, percentage of national wealth, 2720

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Government audit, 4020
Hail insurance, 4509
Immigration and, 1133, 4042
Interest rates, 635, 2812, 2962, 4020
Western Canada, 1088, 1440
Interlocking directorates, 636, 4022, 4157
Legislation, 3060. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Lobbyists, 4029
Merchants' Bank, 70, 1310, 3990, 4020, 4025, 4028, 4029, 4031, 4034, 4036, 4042, 4047, 4049, 4057, 4058, 4066, 4087, 4139, 4145, 4150, 4297
Government action, 2576
Investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Proposed resolution, 4068, 4069
Merger with Bank of Montreal, 4031
Mergers, 1311, 4019, 4031, 4134. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Money. *See also* Credits; Money
Nature and function, 4020
Origin and meaning of exchange, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 4666
Monopoly, 636, 4018
Montreal, Bank of
Directorships, 4022-25
Merchants' Bank merger, 4031
Statement of agricultural exports, 1390
National City bank, bulletin on potatoes, 2820
National Land bank, 4366
Nationalization of banking system, 2728
Northern Crown bank, 4080
Note issues, 4405. *See also under this title,* Bank notes
Nova Scotia, Bank of, 4079
Officers, right to organize, 4084, 4161
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Ottawa, Bank of, 4081
Payments in bank notes instead of gold, 4249
Penny Bank of Toronto. *See that title*
Profits, 1209, 4121, 4124. *See also under this title,* Dividends
Promissory notes, taxation, 3923
Quebec savings bank, 4183, 4392, 4405
Rural bank shareholders, 2846
Rural credits. *See* Credit
Salaries and wages, 4084
Savings deposits, increase of, 3055
Security market and, 4157
Small banks, establishment of, 4019

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Toronto, Bank of
Gooderham, President, debt, aggregate and per capita, 2721
Union Bank, position of, 4225, 4250, 4272
M. (Mr. Forke) to adjourn the House to consider, 4296; withdrawn, 4300
United States Federal Reserve bank, 3059, 4106, 4407
Universities and educational institutions, 4025, 4073
Vancouver, Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Weyburn Security bank, 2813, 4081, 4122, 4509
Widows and orphans, stockholders, 2743

Banting, Dr. F. G., discoverer of insulin, 703, 1285-1287
Annuity, 4645, 4676
Expression of nation's gratitude, 4437
Patenting of insulin, 2077

Barnardo, Dr., child immigration. *See* Immigration, Child

Barnhill, Mr., 60

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D. *See* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry

Barrow, Hon. E. D., Asiatic immigration, 1900

Bartlett, Captain, Hudson Bay railway, 1017

Basic Industries. *See* Industries

Battlefields Memorials. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic sites; Martell; Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge Memorial

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 132. Necessity for economizing time of session, 132; Mr. Hoey's speech, 133; government ownership of railways, 133-134; Sir Henry Thornton, 134; national railways and political patronage; regional administration of Canadian National Railways, 135; Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136; sectionalism; potato-growers and grain growers, 136; freight rates on potatoes, 137-138; lumber rates on; Canadian ports, development, 139; the Conservative party in Quebec, 140; achievements of government; Near East crisis; Imperial centralization, 141; League of Nations; amdt. and sub-amdt.; amdt. of Mr. Fielding in 1921, 142; standard of living, 143; waste of time in legislating, 144
Automobiles, insurance, 3977

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-3127, 3220
Banks, federal jurisdiction, 2592
Belle River harbour, 4607
Board of Commerce Act, 2590
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3500
Boulay, Mlle., postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750
British North America Act, amendment of, 2592
British preference, limitation to Canadian ports, 1757, 2678
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act amdt. bill, 3973
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3377
Canadian National Railways
Advances
Additional amount, 3376
$73,000,000, 3629
Branch lines construction bill, 4304
Express and electric lines bill, 2481
Management, responsibility and powers, 3638, 3697
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 3197
Paris offices, 3637, 3697
Providence, R. I., building, 1755
St. John
Station, 3645
Train shed, 3188
Terminals
Atlantic division, qu. 1363
Maritime regions, qu. 1662
United States, 1755
Toronto office building, 3629
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3955, 3960
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Combines bill, 2589
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2590
Privy Council decisions, 2590
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4210-4217
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Criminal Code, combines clause, 2592
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2362
Distressed seamen, 3974
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Exchequer Court, judgeship, 2499
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4350
False Creek bridge, 3375
Freight rates, Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136, 3239
French Treaty bill, 2243
Fuel supply, 803

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Government publications, waste, 1734
Grain and grain trade
Shipments from Portland, St. John and Halifax, qu. 1484
Shipping rates on, 2517
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick wharves transferred to Dominion govt. 947
Nova Scotia, 942, 4566
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Historic sites, 3407
Hoppe leases, 3128
Hudson Bay railway, construction vote, 4683, 4685
Immigration
Maritime provinces and, 1131
Policy, 1130-32
Immigration Act Amdt, bill, 2430
Exclusion, 2436
Ship's crews, 2435
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4497
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt, bill, 3977
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Lake Grain Rates inquiry, 247
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4173, 4178
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Lumber, sales tax, 3181, 4418
Marine dept. salaries, 3373
Maritime provinces, secession, 1757, 2245
Martello tower, St. John, 3444
Matapedia bridge, repairs, qu. 4184
Motion, increasing taxation, 3936
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2110, 2196, 2437 2462, 3984
British system, 2438
Consolidation of the law, 2437
Judges, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Negro Point breakwater, 4587
Official report of debates, abolition of, 1734
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Penitentiaries, 774
Petition of Right Act Amdt bill, 3128
Pilots, pensions, 3359
Preston, W. T. R., Mr., qu. 206, 247
Printing bureau new building, 1733, 1737
Public buildings, renting or building, 1734
Public ownership, 3640
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4350
Railway Commission, 3188
Railways, surveys and inspections, 3648

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Registration of ships purchased from foreigners, 3973
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. John
Harbour improvements, 2676
Station and train shed, 3188, 3645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4418
Salmon river protection work, 946
Secession, Nova Scotia 1757, 2245
Shipping combines, statement in Toronto Globe qu. 1362
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3374
Steamship services, 3397
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies, 3390
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Wheat board, 2592

Bay of Fundy, icebreakers, 2615

Bayfield, Ont., pier, 981

Bean-Growing Industry, competition from abroad, 2981

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of the C.P.R.
Appointment as President, 373
Bank director, 4024
Immigration 1337-8

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Assiniboine river, flooding 998
Auditor General, appointment, qu. 2298
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2414
Drainage, 3257
Grain dockage, 783
Grand Trunk arbitration, payments to Hon. Howard G. Taft, qu. 1157
Immigration
Empire settlement scheme, 1461
Policy, 1461
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1092
Indians, St. Pie reserve, fencing, 2154
Lake Grain Rates bill 4285
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 299, 305
Political patronage, 3348
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Public Works expenditure, Manitoba, 998
Sawdust pollution of rivers and streams, 3364
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655
Wheat, grading of, 305

Beck, Sir Adam. *See* Hydro Electric Power.

Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, qu. 283, 816

Bee-Keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675

Beef. *See* Live stock; Meats

Beer. *See* Liquor.

Beet Sugar. *See* Sugar.

Behring Sea Fisheries. *See* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 704, 4438
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Business of the House, 3750
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates, time of presentation, 4703
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4565
Health, Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2170
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 2168
St. John, 4614
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Leprosy, treatment of, 702
Pharmaceutical preparations, 3261
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Venereal diseases, 705
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Insulin treatment for diabetes, 704
Maple products industry, 1810
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Medical advisory boards, 677, 697
Medical inspection of immigrants, 702
Meighen, Right Hon., alleged speech in North Essex, 670, 708
Military hospitals, 670
Mental cases, 671
Neurological cases, 696
Nursing hospitals, 686
Motions, opportunity to speak to, 3583
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 1136, 2114, 2116, 2124
Deportation of convicted alien, 2123

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 698, 3149. *See also under this title,* Narcotic Drugs
Prosecutions, 698
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401, 3748, 3848-85
District appeal boards, 4703
Senate amdts. 4744
Pension regulations, review of, 3851
Pensions
Appeal boards, 677, 681, 697, 4703
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166 3706, 3718, 3735
Fenian raid and Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, Board of
Interpretation of act, 2640
Report, 4736
Salaries, etc., 2168, 3742
Royal Commission, 288
Recommendations, legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 2983, 3400
Reports
First, interim, on second part of investigation, 1631, 2166, 2167, 2926
Printing, 1992, 2128, 2983
Opportunity for discussion, 674
Printing, 3401
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Printing bureau, new building, M. to reduce item, 1730
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Public buildings, new, departmental, 1729
Redistribution committee report, 4736
Returned soldiers, emigration to United States, 691
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3582, 3743, 3892, 4734, 4751
St. John river, pollution of, 701
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Department
Estimates, 668, 2166, 2168
Expenditure, 3893
Reduction of, 2032
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Vancouver employees, 3085, 3822
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Hospitals, Brant House and Euclid Hall, closing, 1995, 4075
Interest on war service gratuity, 689
Operating expenses, etc., 690
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment relief, 690, 695
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3648, 3745, 3892, 4750
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4727

Belanger, Mr. U., agent at St. Moise, 1489

Belgium. *See also* Germany Reparations
Belgian exposition, 496
Butter, export to, 2217
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration from, 1085, 1096, 1173. *See also* Immigration
Imports and exports, 1977
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with, 246

Bell, the late Dr. Alexander Graham, contributions to scientific knowledge, 1287

Bell, Major Graham A. *See* Railways and Canals

Bell, the late Dr. Robert, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Belle River Harbour, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610

Belleville harbour commissioners, qu. 490

Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, European situation, 1231

Benoit, Mr. A. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, Mr. H. Milburn, qu. 1138
Grand Trunk arbitration
Doherty, Right Hon. Charles J., pension, qu. 1029
Purchase, arbitrators, fees, profit and loss, qu. 1257
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029; qu. 1661
Introduction of, 3
Judges
Pensions, qu. 492
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Metric system, qu. 914
Welland canal, towing, qu. 4132

Bernasconi, Mr., report of, 4723

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Patents of Invention bill

Bernier, Captain. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Berry Containers. *See* Fruit

Best, Mr. C. H., associate of Dr. Banting, 703, 4439

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Betting
Tax on in Great Britain, 2824

Beverages, tax on, 2979, 3046. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206

Big Bay Point, wharf, 981

Big Interests. *See also* Combines bill
Political parties and, 2856, 3070

Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C. *See* Canadian National Railways

Bill of Exchange. *See* Taxation

Bill of Rights. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills, *See* their individual titles
For Private Bills. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Bilodeau, Mr. Jean, qu. 1487

Binder Twine, 2780
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Duty removal of, 2965, 4379
Imports and exports, 2965
Industry
Discrimination, 2964
History of, 2965
Manufacture, amendment of act respecting, 3231
Prices and abolition of duty, 2965, 4379
Production in Canada, 2780

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Bindings. *See* Books; Public Libraries

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Hawkesbury government offices, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Judges' salaries, qu. 491
Ottawa river, Pointe Fortune water power, qu. 1974.
Peat investigation at Alfred, qu. 1487

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Biological Board Act Amdt. Bill (Representation of Marine and Fisheries department and fishing industries)
Res., 1r., 3820; 2r., com., 3974; 3r., 3974

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Agricultural conditions, 1861
Agriculture, economic organization, 1863

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4029, 4150
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. 4150, neg. 4161
Point of order, interruptions, 4064
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, 4013
Bright, John, free trade in Great Britain, 3051
Budget, 2787. Minister of Agriculture and Moose Jaw election; speech of Mr. Raymond; tariff stability, 2787; taxation, experiments in perpetuation of crude methods; income tax, costly and inequitably graduated; well-to-do not bearing fair share; unearned and earned incomes; war profits; inheritance tax, 2788; business profits tax; sales tax; luxury tax; taxation, indirect; taxing the consumer; necessities of life, taxation of; apportionment of taxes in Great Britain, 2789; emigration to the United States; Winnipeg *Free Press,* statement of; Minister of Agriculture and Free Press; Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, reported statement as to emigration in New York *Tribune,* 2790; taxation and immigration; agriculture pushed into background by industrialism; governmental neglect of the farmer; world organization of farmers; National Farmers' Union of Great Britain; Farmers' Bloc in United States; Progressive Party in Canada, 2791; future of farmers' organizations; principle of protection; no difference between Tory and Liberal budgets; tariff variation not over two and a half per cent; 2792; the Big-endians and the Little-endians, two parties but one policy; total of tariff taxation for 50 years; tribute to Minister of Finance; violation of pledges by Liberal party; Progressive party, policy, 2793; political ideals; patriotism and love of country, a transformed country-side; Mr. Fielding's budget speeches past and future, 2794
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4688
Civil Service, deputy ministers, 368
Combines bill, 2625
Crowsnest pass agreement, Progressives and, 2855
Drainage of agricultural lands, 3257
Emigration to the United States
Meighen, Mr., reported statement in New York Tribune, 2790
Winnipeg, from, 1975

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Great Britain, free trade and protection, 1862, 3051
Hemp bounty bill, 4388
Homesteaders, relinquishment of holdings, 3257
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Construction vote, 4688
M. (Mr. Knox) 1037
Income tax, total assessment, qu. 2393
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Merchants' Bank merger, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4050, 4061
Napoleonic wars, problems after, 1233
Non-confidence, M., (Mr. Irvine) 225
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3567, 4387
Political parties and big interests, 2856
Progressive party, economic not political, 1863
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 760
Rules of the House, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1303
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Taxation, luxury taxes, collections, qu. 2393
West and protected industries, 1222-3

Bird Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations bill

Birmingham, Bishop of, on immigration, 1205

Birth Rate, 1197. *See also* Population
Decline in, 1195

Bituminous Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Bituminous Sands, Alberta, 3198

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Address in reply, 85. Visit of their Excellencies to the Yukon, 85; the Yukon territory, its history, and mineral wealth, 85-89
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3112
Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1557
Liquor law, administration of, 2419
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2419, 2428
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3683
Chinese Immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service list, publication, qu. 3134
Contracts with newspapers and printing companies, 1974, 2394, 2614
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155

Black, Mr. George—*Con.*
Customs and Excise dept. legal work, 856
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, qu. 938
Farmers, shareholders in banks, qu. 1486
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Income tax, farmers paying, qu. 1486
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Mining fees, Yukon, 1636
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2467
Judges, Yukon Territory, 2458
Secretary of State, administration, 2458, 2467
Northwest territories
Administration, 3949
Wireless telegraph service, 3945
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 2927
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3544
Pension Act Amdt. bill
District review board
Appeals, amdt., 3875, neg. 3881
Appointments to, amdt. 3875, neg. 3875
Pensions
Commuted, qu. 4132
European war and active militia, 3732
Royal commission, qu. 207
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Quartz-mining claims, Yukon territory, 249
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1143
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Vancouver, Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 767, 4247
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516
Minerals, exhibit at British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Quartz-mining claims, 249
Telegraphs, qu. 1662, qu. 2206, 3945
Revenue from, qu. 2417

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4034
Bayfield harbour, 981
Customs and excise taxes and collections, qu. 814
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Income tax collection, cost, qu. 733
Merchants' bank case, 4034
Toronto seed branch building, 4623

Black, Mr. W. J. *See* Immigration

Black Point, N.S., breakwater, 941

Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M.P., references to, 4, 6, 8, 102

Blackfeet Indians. *See* Indians

Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856

Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513

Blind. *See* Canadian National Institute; Soldiers

Blind River wharf, 981

Blondin, Mr. Charles E., Pierreville postmaster, qu. 4511

"Blue Ruin" speeches. *See* Immigration

Board of Audit Act (Inquiry into auditing and accounting system) Res., 4249; 4355; 1r., 2r., com., 4356; com., 3r., 4369; Senate amdts., 4733

Board of Commerce. *See also* Combines
Repeal of Act, 2521
"Wooden gun" 2564

Board of Grain Commissioners. *See* Grain

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boats. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine and Fisheries; Vessels

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Indemnity of members, 4008, 4236
Joint Committee on legislation, report, 3887, 4007
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Members, attendance of, 4008
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-46
Deduction for non-attendance, 4244

Bolshevism
Bolshevists, socialists, communists and anarchists, 2744
Children of Russian and Polish parents at Welland, 2844
Discontent and, 2982
Farmers, 4045
Oriental immigration, 505
Russia, example of, 2744
Trade unions bulwark against, 2887

Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138

Bonaventure
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Railway facilities, 4186

Bonded Warehouses. *See* Liquor

Bonds. *See* Canadian National Railways; Finance; Loans

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-Making. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Books. *See also* Copyright Act
Purchase of. *See* Library of Parliament
Sales tax on, 1870

Bootlegging. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.; Liquor; Tobacco

Boots and Shoes. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Duty, 2849, 3033
French treaty, 1990, 2240
Prices, increased, 2873
Sales tax, 2999
United States markets, free entry to, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499

Borden, Camp. *See* Camp Borden

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Administration, 2815
Canada, constitutional development, 4465
National debt, diminution of, 2920
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Treaties, signing of, 4465

Border States. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Botany Yarn. *See* Textiles, Silk

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Agriculture department, employees, 815
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3562
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere experimental farm, qu. 1028

Boucher, Mr. Aime (Yamaska)
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1510

Boucher, Mrs., postmistress, Pierreville, qu. 4511

Boudreau, the late Mr. Rodolphe, 1805

Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613

Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750

Boulay, Mr. Hermengilde, Sayabec post office, 3750

Boundaries. *See* International Boundaries; Surveys
Forest areas. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves

Boundary Waters, Pollution of, 700, 3362

Bounties, 2948. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Advances to be repayable, 4369, 4376
Agricultural and manufactured products, 1196
Agriculture and, 3237
Artificial silk, 2931
Binder twine, 4369
Copper bars or rods, 2646, 2709, 2734, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 2944, 2958, 3017, 3031, 3035, 3069, 3231, 4369, 4376
Cordage, 4369
Fishing, report on, 911
Hemp, 2647, 2709, 2778, 2780, 2823, 2827, 2931, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3017, 3031, 3911, 3963, 4376
Extension of time, 3911
Resolutions, 3911
Increased, demand for, 3076
Iron and steel, 4371, 4381
Linen thread, 2647, 2897
Loans, repayable, 4369, 4376
Manila fibre, 2657, 3231, 3242, 4369
News, 3062
Oil. *See under this head,* Petroleum
Permanent when established, 2957
Petroleum, 2648, 2657, 2949, qu. 3262, 3914, 3963, 4392
Administration of, 780
Protection and, 2778
Wheat, on, 1196
Wool, 2866

Bounties on Copper Bars or Rods, Act Respecting Res. 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4369; 3r., 4376
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4369, neg., 4376

Bounties on Manila Fibre, Repeal Bill Res. 2657, 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 3r., 4369

Bourassa, Mr. Henri, Nationalist party, 2924

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis county postmasters, qu. 519
Nolin, Mrs. J., postmistress, St. David, 1489
Quarantine station, Levis, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Boville, Mr. T. C., service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Bowder, Mr. W. R. *See* Immigration

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Grain surveys, qu. 4131

Boy Scouts Association, 114, 879

Boyer, Dr. G. F., appointment, qu. 2418

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Ammunition, 887
Received from England, 1741
Annual training, 874
Annuities, old age, 1640
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Cost of at various ages, 1641
Postmasters as agents, 1642
Atherley bridge, 3648
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1506, 1513
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3085-3127
Big Bay point wharf, 981
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 1162
Empire day adjournment, 2795
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Gazette, printing, 1709
Canada-West Indies Steamship service, 3384
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden, 1749, 4565
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Canadian National railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4327
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620
Paris offices, 3630
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Canadian Press, Limited, 1464
Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031
Combines bill, 2621-37
Commissioners, appointment of, 2629
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2144
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2053
Debates, official report, omission of undiscussed item in supply, 1638
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740
Evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, bill, 2053
Excise taxes, use of postage stamps, 1820-1
Exhibitions, 1465
Federal printing company, 1623
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church), amdt. (Mr. Carroll) 1281

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Grain elevators, Montreal, qu. 1663
Harbours and rivers
Nova Scotia, 4564
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 969
Highways
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Hamilton-Brantford, 2493
Statement of, 3174
Hopper barge construction, 3351
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1323
Agreement, 1104
McRae, General, salary, 1324
Policy, 1095
Income tax, unearned income, 2882
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1629, 1655, 1706, 2062.
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3147
Labour
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Department
Estimates, 1621
Staff, reduction, 1671
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, printing, 1622-1625, 1709
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Lindsay arsenal, 883
L'Islet wharf, 970
Lunenberg harbour, dredging, 4578
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Matane harbour improvements, 970
Meaford-Clarksburg highway, 4565
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater, claim; 4574
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden 1749, 1777, 4565
Militia payments, qu. 205, qu. 344, 386
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184, 2193
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Old age annuities, 1640, 1683. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Ontario government savings office, interest rate, 1697
Parliament buildings, 1719
Committee on, 1724
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723, 1726
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2075, 2079, 2086, 2099, 2129
Peat, experiments, 3199
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
European war and active militia, 3739

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Widows, 681
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, new building, 1733
Quebec wharves, 977
Railway lands, purchases or sales, 1739
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744
Revenue and postage stamps, 1820-1
Rural mail service.
Carriers, remuneration, 1780, 1785
Spur lines, 1822, 1826
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506
Steamer Murray Stewart, purchase, 3356
Steamship services, 2173
Canada-West Indies, 3384
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Toronto union station, 4326
Trade Mark and Designs bill, 2063
Trent canal, qu. 205, 3648
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Unemployment relief, 690, 1655, 2169
Vocational loans, 687

Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, on immigration, 1123

Bran and Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Branch Lines. *See* Canadian National Railways

Brandeis, Judge Louis, on banking, 4022

Brandon, Man., damage by flood, 999.

Brandy. *See* Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Brant Military Hospital, closing, 677, 1995, 4075

Brantford binder twine industry. *See* Binder Twine; Hemp Bounties bill

Brazil, constitution of Senate, 1373

Breadner, Mr. R. W. *See* Taxation, Commissioner of

"Breezes Blowing in Mulberry Trees." *See* Secession

Brenner, Meyer, release on parole, 1975

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herd system, 577, 586, 3303
Bacon, salting, 3301
Cheese grading, 3295
Experimental farms, 483

Brethen, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Grain, new varieties, introduction, 483
Health of animals, 586
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Potatoes, prices, 2821
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 751
Shire horses, gift from Great Britain, 2253
Weights and Measures inspector, qu. 492

Breweries. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Liquor

Brick. *See* Building

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Atherley, 3648
Buffalo and Fort Erie, 1834
Burlington channel, 2682
Burrard inlet, 4709
Calumet-Bryson, 1014
Clair, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 4590
Edmundston, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 1014, 2342, 4589
False Creek, 3375, 4708
Fredericton, 3645, 4310
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Grand Etang, 4589
Hawkesbury, 4589
International, 2342, 3647
Interprovincial and, 2342
Isle Perrot, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Kingston, 2682
Lachine canal, Montreal, 2299
McAdam-Vanceboro, 2342
Matapedia, Restigouche river, 1014
Repairs, qu. 4184
Michigan Central at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Montreal-Longueuil, 2086, 2615, 2640
Report of harbour commissioners, 3507
Orleans island, 3646
Ottawa-Hull, 1015, 4590
Roads and bridges, 1014
St. Croix river, 2342
St. John and Quebec railway, 3644
St. John river, 2342
Second Narrows, Vancouver, qu. 1258, 4708
Trent Valley canal, qu. 205
Vancouver-North Vancouver, 1008

Bright, John
British free trade movement, 3050
Repeal of Corn Laws, 3013

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Patents of Invention bill, 2096, 2103
Postmasters, appointment of, 1828-9
Woodbridge postmaster, 1828

Britain. *See* Great Britain

British Admiralty, war claims. *See* War Claims

British Ambassador at Washington. *See also* Treaties
Signature of treaties, 2403
Halibut Fishery Treaty, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664

British and Foreign News Service, 4712

British Columbia
Aerial forest patrol, 1776
Agricultural conditions, 2769
Agriculture, increased production, 1432
Associated boards of trade, letter of Hon. Mr. Carvell, 1915
Bootlegging, 2419. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Attorney General and, 2407
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Columbia Prohibition Association, 2408
Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Bill, 2284
Correspondence, 1032, 1307
Canadian air force, 1748, 1776
Canadian Northern railway guarantee, 1946
Canadian Pacific railway, construction, 1916
Chilliwack reclamation project, 3431
Chinese immigration. *See that title*
Civil Service appointments in, 372
Claims against federal government, 708
Coal
Competition of fuel oil with, 1245
Deposits, investigation, 3198, 3202
Production, 1244
Copper bounty, 2734
Creosoting industry, 1245
Creosoted piling, use in, qu. 1137
Debt, per capita, 2941
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061
Dredging, 1014, 4590
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Experimental farms, 457
Fisheries
Commission, 1453, 1540, 3372
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540
Japanese engaged in, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Forests, fungus and insect control, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1003
Freight rates
Discrimination, 1936
Equalization of, 1911, 1914
Fruit-growing industry, 2942
Fuel oil, importation, 1245
Geological survey explorations, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 1002, 2671

British Columbia—*Con.*
Highways, 2341, 2941, 3186. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Hindu franchise and, 4640-4651
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1096, 1112, 1327
Indian army officers, settlement in, 1096
Indians, 2152, 2163
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Schools, 2164
Iron ore deposits, 2505
Japanese fishermen, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Kootenay flats reclamation scheme, 3431
Labour conditions, 1125
Legislation, disallowance of, 1261
Life-saving appliances, 1659
Liquor
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
Exportation of, qu. 1260
Importation, 2404. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Liquor laws, administration, 2419, 2423
Corruption, charge of, 2412-13
Ottawa Citizen, editorial, 2412
Public accounts com. investigation, 2410-13
Purchases, 2410
Warehouses, qu. 1974
Bonded, qu. 1260, qu. 1971, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866
Lumber industry, 1245
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Oil companies, 2505
Oliver, Hon. John, freight rates, 1915, 2505
Correspondence, 1307
Orientals
Business interests of, 1896, 1901-03
Correspondence, 1307
Fishery licenses, 1541. *See also under this title,* Japanese
Immigration, 1217. *See also* Chinese Immigration; Immigration, Oriental
Restriction, 1453
Steveston fishing industry, 1901
Public buildings, 1024
Railway grades, 1917
Resources, 2940
Salmon-canning industry, 1540
Steamship services, 4003
Sumas lake reclamation project, 3431
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2683, 3946
Terms of union, 1916
Trade with Britain via Panama canal, 3053
Unemployment, 1678
Relief, discontinuance of Federal aid, 1658

British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1453, 3372
Salmon-canning licenses, 1540

British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, licenses, 1541

British Constitution. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

British Dominions, Senates, constitution of, 1370, 1375

British Empire Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

British Empire Settlement Board. *See* Immigration, Empire Settlement

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1391. *See also* Labour, Strikes
Letters from Messrs. McNeil and McLachlan to Prime Minister, 1704
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704

British Goods, importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty. *See* Japan

British Market. *See* British Preference; Grain; Live Stock, Cattle Trade

British National Labour Party. *See* Labour

British North America Act
Amendment of, 2592, 4660
Bankruptcy legislation, 3095
Constitution, control over, 2895
Intercolonial railway and, 1765
International labour conference, 1645
Labour organizations, jurisdiction, 2891, 2892
Readjustment of representation. *See* Redistribution bill
Right to revise, 1378, 3059
Unemployment relief, responsibility, 1680

British Preference, 2734, 2948, 3082. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty
Australia, 1850
British goods free, 3039
Canadian industry penalized, 2957
Cattle embargo and, 3053. *See also this title under* Live Stock
Clothing, 3032
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 1757, 1772, 2645, 2678, 2734, 2898, 2948, 3015, 3039, 3053, 3068, 3082, 3454, 3895
Goods via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454, 3895
Transhipment at port in British colony, 3895

British Preference—*Con.*
Discount of 10 per cent, 2645, 2650
French treaty and. *See that title under* Treaties
Hudson Bay railway and, 2878
Increase, 453, 2243, 2713, 2741, 2832, 2854, 2898, 2907, 2937, 2989, 3034, 3039, 3053, 3454, 3487
Benefit to maritime provinces, 2968
Fifty per cent of general tariff, 2718, 2928, 3039, 3048
Knitting industry, 2958
Petition against, 2958
Woollen industry affected, 2958
Introduction of, 2832, 3009
Liberal policy and, 3007
Limitation to Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Progressive party and, 2776, 2777
Rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809
Sugar, 2651
Ways and Means committee, 3454
Woollen industry, 2989, 3034, 3458

British Shipping Board, loss of Llandovery Castle, 1745

British Subjects, definition. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill

British War Medals. *See* War, Medals

British Wars, participation in. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Near East Crisis

Broadcasting Stations. *See* Radiotelegraphy

Bronze Powder industry. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 47. Inheritance and pride in family traditions, William Lyon Mackenzie, 47; conditions in the West; lake grain rates; cattle embargo, 48; inquiry into grain trade; the British Empire, 49; national obligations, 49-50
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Annuities, advertising, 1642
Breweries and export liquor houses, Licenses, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, 1866
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3691
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 566
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1009
Elevators, overages, 2043

Brown, Mr. J. L.—*Con.*
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Conference, 606
Fishing schooner race, 115
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1934
French treaty bill, 2223
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 194
Health of animals, 576
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway, 3784
Iron ore discovery, Lake Athabaska, 2513
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill (value of citizenship) 2441
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Proportional representation, 402
Public buildings, New Brunswick, 4613
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 716, 743
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3783
School lands, unpaid balances, 1385, 4203
Seed inspection, 196,198
Steamship services, 2172
Toronto seed branch building, 4621, 4623
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Vocational training, 687
Welland canal construction, 3783

Brown, Mr. M. A., Medicine Hat. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Browntail Moth. *See* Insect Pests

Bruce County pioneering conditions, 2870

Brussels Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Bryant's Landing, wharf, 950.

Bryce, Lord, proportional representation, 390

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Alterations in budget of 1922 and results, 2988
Amendment (Mr. Forke) 2717, 2755, 2776, 2787, 2803, 2809, 2817, 2820, 2822, 2837, 2845, 2854, 2861, 2884, 2932, 2944, 2947, 2955, 2966, 2973, 2976, 3010, 3014, 3015, 3023, 3039, 3051, 3073, 3077; neg. on division, 3082
Planks of Liberal platform included in 2861
Balanced, 2986, 3005, 3078. *See also* speeches on Budget
Changes, 3082
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469,
Debate on, 2701, 2741, 2795, 2837, 2898, 2928, 2984, 3046
Precedence, 2694

Budget—*Con.*
Deficits, 2784
Divisions
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com. agreed to, 3084
Finance Minister
Record established by, 2852
Seventeeth budget, 2657, 2852
Speeches, 2701, 3074
Liberal and Conservative, no difference between, 2792
McMaster, Mr., attitude on budget, references, 3013, 3022, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 3055, 4393
Presentation, form of, 2818, 2984, 3001, 3077
Record established by Minister of Finance, 2657, 2852
Resolutions, 2650, 3084, 3229, 3454, 3895, 3963, 4369, 4392, 4408, 4409. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Amended, 3046
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to necessity for M. for Ways and Means, 2640
Speakers in debate: Messrs. Anderson, 2837; Archambault, 2879; Arthurs, 3033; Bancroft, 2736; Bird, 2787; Church, 2817; Denis (St. Denis), 3038; Drayton, Sir Henry, 2657; Drummond, 2973; Evans, 3067; Euler, 2852; Fielding, 2701, 3074; Findlay, 2883; Fontaine, 2814; Forke, 2711, amdt. 2717; neg. on div., 3082; Gould, 2951; Grimmer, 2898; Harris, 2804; Hopkins, 2980; Hudson, 3060; Hughes, 2919; Humphrey, 2940; Kellner, 2809; King, Mackenzie, 3046; King (Huron), 2908; Leader, 3039; Lovett, 2944; Lovie, 2871; Maclaren, 2948; Maclean (Prince), 2967; Maclean (Halifax), 3000; Maclean (York), 3055; McBride, 3031; McKillop, 2981; McMaster, 3012; Manion, 2746; Marler, 3022; Martell, 2904; Meighen, 2984; Morrison, 2928; Motherwell, 2756; Pritchard, 2730; Raymond, 2741; Reed, 2830; Robichaud, 2935; Ross (Kingston), 2832; Ryckman, 2912; Senn, 2957; Sexsmith, 2784; Spence, 2976; Stansell, 3062; Steedsman, 2835; Stewart (Argenteuil), 2795; Stork, 2733; Tolmie, 2861; Ward, 2959; White, 2964; Woods, 2846; Woodsworth, 2718
Statements omitted, 2860, 2926
Inquiry, 2898
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion on, 2771, 2853. 2946

Buffalo
Elk island park, 3435
Lamont park, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 3941, 4702
Tuberculosis, 3439
Wainwright herd, 2773, 3941

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company. *See* Bridges; Private Bills

Building. *See also* Housing; Labour
Bricklayers' wages, $12 per day, 2165, 3017
Building materials
Brick 3017
Cement, free admission, United States, 3017
Firebrick duty, 3481. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Freight rates, 1961, 3036
French treaty, 1982
Prices, 2164, 3004
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Farm homes, 1178. *See also* Housing
Fuel supply and house construction, 3203
Increase of, 3055
United States, activity in, 3004, 3017. *See also* Emigration to United States
Wages, building trades, 2165, 3017. *See also* Labour, Wages

Building Stone, Hudson bay region, 1073

Building Trades. *See* Labour.

Bukowina. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Bunyan, John, imprisonment, 3157

Burdis, Mr. W. D., salmon canners, 1541

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4101, 4136
Officers and employees, right to organize, 4162
Beckett, Matt C., dismissal, 816
Bonded liquor houses, New Brunswick, 1212
British preference, Canadian ports, 3457
Building trades, 1812
Business of the House
Estimates, method of discussion, 4615-6
Legislation pending, 3265
M. to increase taxation, 3937
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Cadet services, 877, 879
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4306
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canned salmon shipment, Panama canal to Halifax, 2615, 3272

Bureau, Hon. Jacques—*Con.*
Cheque tax, 3926, 3929
Civil service, political partisanship, 286
Customs and Excise
Department, estimates, 3272
Duty on goods from one Canadian port to another, 2615, 3272
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3928
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 3273
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Experimental farms, 471
Hamilton customs house, 3278
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Certificate of analyst) 3749, 3969, 4131, 4207, 4528
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1810
Marking Act, 931
Masters and mates, 2610
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Inspection bill, 3969, 4248, 4276
Pilot boats, 3358
Postage stamps, for revenue purposes, 1815, 3298
Post Office
Postmasters, appointment, 1830
St. Baranabe Nord, Mr. Gelinas, 1830
Superintendent of Mail Contracts, 1814
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4680
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, 3280
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Reciprocity. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4429
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 245, 923
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-4246
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3345, 3374
Special War Revenue Act, M. (Mr. Stevens) 245, 923
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3863, 4207
Toronto
Customs building, 3278, 3282
Viaduct, 4441
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 931, 936

Bureau of Standards, 788

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burke, Edmund
Function of Parliament, 3018
Relation of member to constituent, 3022

Burne, Mr. Joseph, Immigration department, qu. 3141

Burns, Mr. Pat, price of live stock, 1101

Business Depression, 2798. *See* Address; Budget; Immigration

Business of the House. *See* House of Commons

Business Profits Tax. *See* Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, Amdt. Bill (Removal of restrictions as to liability for)
Res. 4440, 4489; 1r., 2r., 4491; com., 3r., 4492

Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act; Dairying Industry

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* Governor General; reference to in address

Cabinet. *See* Government

Cables. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Cabot Strait, ice obstruction, 2614

Cadet Services. *See* National Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Belle River harbour, 4600
Business profits tax, 4490
Canadian exhibition in France, 4711
Canadian Press Limited
Bill, 1464
Subsidy, 4727
Combines bill, 2628
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1133
Empire settlement scheme, 1132
Policy, 1132
Reference to speech on, 1209
St. John immigration building, 1460
Newspaper combine, 4728

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Paternalism, excess of, 1133
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4513
Railways, Canals & Telegraph lines Com., report, 2252
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4490
Rural depopulation, causes of, 1133
Supply, relevancy, 4719
Tariff, immigration and, 1133

Calcium Carbide, free admission to United States, 3017

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Accredited herd system, 577, 582, 585, 626
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Agricultural publications, 598
Agriculture department, salaries, 610
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2048, 2133, 2136
Annual drill, 4637
Audibility of debates, 976
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4115
Bonded warehouses, New Brunswick, 1212
Business of the House
Private members' days, 574
Prorogation, postponement of, 4754
Questions, as orders for returns, 938, 1386
Butter, British market for, 3298
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill 3973
Coasting regulations, 4276
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4311
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4401
Rejection by Senate, 4698
Capital punishment, 768
Civil government estimates, form of, 610
Dairying industry, 609, 1845
Destructive insects and pests, 596
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads), 4365
Duties, revenue loss and smuggling, 3231
Emigration to the United States, 1845
Execution in Carleton county, 778
Exhibitions, 1465
Experimental farms, 484
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4273, 4541
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Fertilizers, duty on, 3486
Fisheries
Fishways in Salmon river, 3362
Pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 819
Fox-breeding industry, 588
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 810
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grand Falls railway, 4311
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of Animals, 582, 586, 3989. *See also under this title,* Accredited herds; Animal contagious diseases
Hector celebration, 4637
Highways, 3188
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business
Acoustics, 1722
Members' rooms, lighting and ventilation, 1728
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Child, 1470
Indians
Tobique reserve, 2154-55
Victoria reserve, roads, 2153
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3231
Intercolonial, employees' pensions, 3196
Interest rate, 4115
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Judges' Act. Amdt. bill, 3265
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
Lake Grain rates bill, 4232
Live stock, 587, 588
Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken) 835
Manitoba Plup and Paper Company, 3256
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 308
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3271
Parliament buildings, 1718
Acoustics, 1721
Reconstruction committee, 1724
Patents of Invention bill, 2077, 3154
Penitentiaries, earnings of inmates, 772
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-3884
Widow who marries after disability appears, amdt. 3882, agreed to, 3884
Pensions, royal commission, 674, 681
Recommendations, 2394
Point of order (Mr. Carroll) 3267
Potatoes
Duty, 2707
Grading, 598
Growing and marketing, 308
Wharfage tolls, 975
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Privilege (Mr. Carroll) 3268, 3270
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Root vegetables bill, 937

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
St. John and Quebec railway
Connection with Eastern Maine railway, 4311
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John river, pollution of, 701, 3362
St. John-Westfield branch line, 4312
Seed inspection, 197
Soldier settlement, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 669
Salaries and contingencies, 669
Soldiers, venereal diseases, 705
Spruce bud worm, 596
Steamship services, 2171
St. John-Digby, 2176
Taxes, unpaid, 3258
Testing dairy cattle, 1307
Vancouver harbour bill, 332
Wharfage tolls, 974

Calgary
Customs examining warehouse, 1023
Post office, 629, 1024
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679, 1683

Calgary Power Company, 3442
Banff national park, power rights, 3750, 3939

Calves, inspection of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Camp Borden. *See* National Defence, Canadian Air Force

Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections; Senate and House of Commons bill

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways

Campbell, Commander, report, St. Andrew's harbour, 2900

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Agricultural conditions, 1402
Agricultural implements, standardizing, 805
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
Bank Act Amdt. bill, interest rate, 4118
Binder twine duty, removal, 4387
Canada-West Indies service, 3379, 3386
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3798
Advance, 3824
Shipping combines, 3845
West Indies service, 3379, 3386

Campbell, Mr. Milton N.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Advance of $73,000,000, 3651
Capitalization and fixed charges, qu. 3323, 3680
Paris offices, 3197
Transcontinental, condition of, 3680
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1406
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Cheque tax, 3934
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads) 3982
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 3240, 4631
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1406
Fort Churchill townsite, qu. 284
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 3194
Fuel supply, 806
Governor General, expenditure, 4628
Grain-growing and freight rates, 3194
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4387
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Land, qu. 283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1070
Immigration
Land settlement, 1406, 1883
Policy, 1402
Soldier settlement board, 1406
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interest rate, 4118
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-34
Land settlement policy, 1406, 1883
National Gallery, 1018
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3983
Northover, Major H. R., claim, 4635
Passports, issuing of, 3988
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4750
Prices, farm and manufactured products, 1403
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Public archives, 3985
Quebec elevator, grain shipment, 4233
Rural depopulation, 1406
Taxation, burden of, 1403
West Ukrainian republic, M. 651, 657
Western provinces, conditions in, 1402
Wheat board, 2857

Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626

Campbellton wharf, 945

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill; Petawawa

Canada Colonization Association. *See this title under* Immigration.

Canada-France Convention of Commerce. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Canada Gazette, 1707

Canada Grain Act. *See* Grain

Canada Highways Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Highways, (Time for earning and receiving payment of grant extended for two years.)
Res. 2253, 2338; 1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2469; 3r., 2470

Canada, Status of, 40, 165. *See also* British North America Act; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties, Halibut treaty

Canada's Claims. *See* Germany, Reparations

Canada's Constitutional Development, 4455-80. *See also* Treaties, Halibut

Canada's Participation in War, 4655. *See also* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis
M. (Mr. Power) 1529

Canada Shipping Act. *See also* Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Announcement of legislation on lake freight rates, 3507. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Certificates to masters and mates; pilotage
Res. 2418; 2668; 1r., 2668; 2r., com., 3r., 3146
2. Distressed seamen; certificate of registration; certificate of inspection
Res. 574, 3969; 1r., 2r., com., 3973; 3r., 4207
3. Restoration of ships purchased from foreign subjects; loading of grain cargoes; port wardens; returns by surveyors
Res. 3749, 3961, 4235; 1r., 4236; 2r., com., 3r., 4276

Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Capitalization, 1391
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 3208
Shipping combine, 4278
Sifton, Sir Clifford, director, 4285
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Traffic, exchange, 2983, 3208

Canada Steamship Lines Limited—*Con.*
War claims, qu. 3142

Canada Temperance Act, 2942. *See also* Liquor
Administration, 2495
Plebiscites under, 2495

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill (Importation into prohibition province prohibited)
Res. 574, 767; 1r., 767; 2r., 2284; com., 2284; 2404, 2419; 3r., 2428; Senate amendments, 4732
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. McQuarrie) 2414-15, neg. 2428
Amdt. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 2419, agreed to, 2428
Blending, 2408, 2419
Brewers, 2404
British Columbia
Administration of law, 2404-13
Correspondence with, 1032, 1307
Exportation, 2404
Government control, 2406
Importation prohibited, 2404, 2419. Exceptions, 2404, 2419
Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney General of British Columbia, 2412
Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C., opinion of, 2408

Canadian Air Force. *See* National Defence

Canadian Ambassador at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

Canadian Athletic Team at Olympic Games, 4706

Canadian Authors Association. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998. *See also* Treaties, French

Canadian Citizenship. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Canadian Council of Agriculture
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Res. respecting, 255

Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307

Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876

Canadian Credit Men's Association. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Canadian Domicile. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Canadian Economic Conference, Sir Charles Gordon, 4023

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Forestry Association, 3409. *See also* Forests and Forestry

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 110, 2172. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Freight Rates; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
- Advances to, 2641, 3830
  - $1,700,000, 3376
  - $1,500,000, 3798, 3824
- Assets and liabilities, 3804
- Atlantic combines, qu. 2613
- Cattle shipments, 2758, 2807, 3040, 3811
- Coal cargoes, 3807, 3814, 3826
- Committee, 2474
- Construction, 3780
  - Cost per ton, 957
  - Without tender and contract, 957
- Deficit, 2928, 3006, 3038, 3072, 3377, 3798, 3802, 3843
- Directors, 3811
- Expenditure, 3802
  - Earnings and, 1868
- Flour, discrimination against Canadian, 2761
- Freight rates, regulation of, 3806
- Grain trade, 2828, 3263, 3812, 4234
- Insurance, 1568
- Lake grain-carrying trade, 3776, 4223, 4284. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates bill
- Lease of freighters to Great Lakes Transportation Company, 3848
- Loan to, 113-114. *See also* under this title, Advances
- Management, 3637
- Mediterranean service, qu. 1488, 1636
- Milburn, Mr. H., qu. 1138
- Negotiations for sale of 27 ships, 1975. *See also under this title,* Vessels, sale of
- New York pool, 3806
- North Atlantic Conference, 2127, 2761
- Ocean rates, 2760
- Policy, 3798, 3827, 3830
  - Unemployment, 3828, 3846
- Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, 4708
- Public ownership, 3798
- Return cargoes, absence of, 2928
- St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, service on, qu. 2613
- Sailings, qu. 4511
  - Arrangements for 1924, qu. 4751
- Scrap metal and material, qu. 1138
- Shipping combines, 1395, 2127, 2760, 3848, 4223
- Ships, sale of. *See under this title,* Vessels
- Subsidized steamship services, competition, 3378
- Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
- Thornton, Sir Henry, 3811
  - Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
  - Utilization of boats for cattle, 3040
  - West Indies service, 3379
- Trade with Fiji Islands, 1848
- Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
- Transportation combine. *See under this title* Shipping Combines
- Vessels
  - Earnings, etc., 3324, 3399
  - Laid up, 3379, 3386
  - Sale of, 1975, 2518, qu. 2613, 2828, 3385-6, 3705, 3813, 3822, 3846
- Vote under closure 4598
- West Indies and South American trade, 3378, 3808, 3835, 3840

Canadian Government Railways. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Canadian Magazines, Encouragement of. *See* Magazines

Canadian Manufacturers Association. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
- Bankruptcy, 3093
- Canada Colonization Association, disbursements to, 1164, 1171
- Canadian Trade Index, 2217
- Copyright, 2142, 2289
- French treaty, 1997, 2001, 2209, 2229
- Greater production campaign, 2725
- Shaw, Mr. J. B., fuel policy, 1265
- Trade Mark and Designs Act bill, 2293

Canadian National Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 693

Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, 3406, 3432. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Administration, 66
Automobiles, admission fee, 3942
Banff National park
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electrical equipment, 3434, 3949
Springs and cave, 496
Waterpowers, 496, 3420, 3750
Power rights, Calgary Power Company, 3750, 3442, 3939
Buffalo in. *See* Buffalo
Commissioner, location in Western Canada, 3436
Elk Island buffalo park, 3435
Expenditure, 3941
Further amount, 4702
Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406, 3432, 3435
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Historic sites commission, 3406
Golf course, Jasper park, 3435
Minette Hot springs, 3949
Moose mountains pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal government in, 3436
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Nova Scotia historical society, 3406
Quebec battlefields commission, 3406, 3432
Playgrounds, 3432
Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Preservation of, 3249
Roads and bridges, 1014
Supplementary vote, 3948
Timber wolves, destruction by, 597
Tourist traffic, 3435
Revenue, 3942
Wainwright, slaughter of buffalo, 4702
Waterton lakes park, 3435

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways and Canals;
Accounting, 4328. *See also* Board of Audit
Unification of, 3196
Acquisition, history of, 55
Advances, 2641
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650, 3676
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681, neg. 3701
Statement of appropriations, 1922-23, 1923-4, 3789
Additional
$1,550,000, 4692
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 1764, 3376
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 56, 61, 2471

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Amalgamation—*Con.*
Causes of delay, 56
Economies resulting from, 1616
Orders in council effecting, 34, 53, 3620
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Appointments, 2472
Balfour, Col. H. N., reported, 2794, 2828
From outside Canada, 2827
Promotion, principle of, 3621
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported, 2794, 2828
Appropriations, statement of, 2898, 2926, 3789
Atlantic division, boundaries, qu. 1363, 1754-62, 1770-72
Atlantic ports, 1754. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports; Terminals
Audit staff, Moncton, removal, 574, 1756
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Betterments, 1562
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors.
Board of management. *See under this title,* Directors; Management
Branch lines, 1568, 3626, 4688. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bills
Advances, 4329
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain, 4189, 4197
Bruederheim, 4199, 4316
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie, 4699
Construction of, 1185, 3625
Cost per mile, 4327
Dunblane-Aylesbury, 4308, 4333
Dunlane-Mawer line, 4201
Eston branch, 4201
Expenditure
Appropriations, 4303, 4329, 4337
Authorization by Parliament, 4515
Financing, 4304, 4319, 4329
Grand Falls, 4310
Grande Fresniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312, 4326
Grande Prairie, 1185, 4200
Halifax-Musquodobit, 4317
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 4321
Hanna-Warden-Loverna, 4308, 4322, qu. 4436
Inverness railway, 4198
Inverness and Richmond, 4324
Kamloops-Okanagan, 4314
Kent Northern, 4189, 4197
Lockeport railway, 4326
Long Lac-Nakina, 3224, 4194, 4310, 4326
Meductic-International boundary, 4309, 4311
Melfort, 4319
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls, 4189, 4197

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Branch lines—*Con.*
Okanagan, 4314
Oliver-St. Paul, 4323
Paddockwood, 4319
Peace River, 4324
Peebles-Lampman, 4325
Prince George to Peace River, construction, 1434, 4701
Purchase of, 3646
St. John and Quebec, 4305
St. John and Westfield, 4312
St. Peter's-Louisburg, 4319, 4324
Sunny Brae-Guysborough, 4316, 4320, 4321
Thunderhill, 4311, 4315, 4322
Waterous-Swift Current, 4308
Windsor-Chester, 4333
Yorktown-Willowbrook, 4308
British mails, delay in, 2695
British preference and, 3053
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business cars, 489, 4527
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Exchange of traffic, 2983, 3208
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian government railways
Advances, 1565
Audit office, transfer, Moncton to Montreal, 574, 1756
Deficit, 1560
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Canadian National Safety League, 3956
Canadian National telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Canadian Northern, 1760. *See also under this title,* Annual Statement of Minister
Acquisition of, 56-57, 1937
Advances, 1565
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Amalgamation, causes of delay, 56-58
Arbitration, 56
British Columbia guarantee, 1946
Embezzlement of funds, 381
Fixed charges, 1565, qu. 3323
Gratuities to directors and officials, disclosure of, 2962
Insurance, 1568
Manitoba, agreement with, 1932, 1939
Securities, 1564
System, 55-56
Canadian Northern Express Company. *See under this title,* Express

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian ports, 3454. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports, Terminals
Capital expenditure, control of, 2827
Capitalization, 3192
Fixed charges and, qu. 3323
Reduction of, 3058
Car shortage, 62
Champlain market station, 4446
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760-1770
Coal. *See also that title*
Freight rates on, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Purchases, 1277, 1561, qu. 4303, 4708, qu. 4752
Alberta coal, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Maccan and river Hébert, mines, 1027
United States, in, 1277, 3493, qu. 4511
Transportation, 1264
Commitments, 18-19
Committee on, 2473
Construction, new, 1562, 1922
Co-ordination, 18, 28, 34, 53, 56, 61, 1616, 2471, 3620
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Cost of taking over, 92
Courtesy, 2859, 2971
Debt, 2802
Deficits, 1613, 2658, 2802, 2827, 2831, 3006, 3024, 3038, 3078, 3610, 3620, 3651, 4190. *See also* speeches on Budget; Supply
Taxation and, 3006
Directors, 36, 60, 62, qu. 1973, 2833
Additional, for Quebec, 34. *See also this head,* Talbot
Address and occupation, qu. 1973
British Columbia appointment, 373
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3811
Cattle shipments, 2758
Dawson, Mr. F. G., 373, qu. 1973
Gratuities to, 1687, 2962
Inspection trip, qu. 489
Labour, representation of, 1652, 1656, 3636
M. (Mr. Lapointe) 1653-56
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1654
New board of, 13
New Brunswick representation, qu. 282
Private cars, qu. 489
Removal of late board, correspondence, 3962
Responsibilities and powers, 2478, 3610, 3653. *See also under this title,* Management
Retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Sinclair, Mr. John A. statement, qu. 1363

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Directors—*Con.*
Special train, qu. 489
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258, 2004
Doctors, qu. 814
Dominion Express Company. *See also under this title,* Express
Dorchester employees, qu. 2086
Earnings, 3620, 3651
Eastern division
Brown, Mr. L. S., superintendent, 2971
Improved situation, 2971
Moncton headquarters, 2971
Eastern Land Company, purchase of land at Capreol, 626, 1635
Efficiency, 2859
Electric lines, sale of to municipalities, 2475. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203, 3422, 3425
Employees, 55, 3621
Pensions, 14, 288. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Equipment, 1561, 4692
Orders, 2701
Estimates, 1566, 1619, 1764
Expenditure, 2987, 3078, 3620, 4305
Authorization by Parliament, 3615-40, 4304, 4397, 4515
Express. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Canadian Express Company, 2470
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Canadian Northern Express, 2470
Dominion Express Company, termination of contract with, 2473
Intercolonial Express Company, 2470
Rates, 2876
Fish, on, 3365
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Finance
Advances by government, 1565
Consolidated income figures, 1564
Financial statement, inquiry, 666
Financing in 1922, 1564
Securities, approval of, 4402. *See also under this title,* Securities
Fixed charges, qu. 708, qu. 814, 1565
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633
Fredericton bridge, 3645, 4310
Freight cars, 4692
Interchange with United States, 4697
Purchase of in United States, 4692
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Coal, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
General conditions, 1559
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Grades, 1965
British Columbia, 1917
Grain shipments, qu. 1484. *See also* Grain
Canadian and United States ports, 1756
Diversion to American ports, 2899
Portland, 1756
St. John, 1768
Grand Trunk, 1562
Additions and betterments, 1564
Advances, 1565
Amalgamation, delay in, 18, 56
Arbitration, 59, 1154, 1307
Arbitrators, fees, etc., qu. 624, qu. 1257
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029, qu. 1661, 2813
Assets, disposal of, 1665
Atwater, Mr. A. R., gratuity, qu. 1632
Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C., gratuity, qu. 1632
Central Vermont
Deficits, 1563
Operating results, 1613
Transportation Company, 1564
Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company, 1563
Coal purchases, 1564
Commitments, qu. 206, qu. 207
Crowsnest pass agreement, rates, 1563
Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deer, Mr. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deficits, 1563
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203
Elevator, Montreal, qu. 1974
Equipment, all lines, 1564
Galloway, Mr. D. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Grades, 1965
Gratuities to retiring directors and officials, 1664-68
British board of directors, qu. 1632
Disclosure of, 2962
Payments out of insurance, 1632, 1665
Progressive party and, 1687
Refund, 1667
Royal commission, 1665
Congdon, Mr. F. T., appointment, 2297, 2710, qu. 3131
Order in Council, tabled, 2347
Inquiry, 1976, 2297
Income account, 1563
Insurance, 1568
Insurance fund, payment of gratuities out of, 1632, 1665
International bridge company, 1563

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Grand Trunk—*Con.*
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Logan, Mr. R. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Management, personnel, 1612. *See also under this title,* Directors; Management
Martin, Mr. H. G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Montreal and Southern Counties Railway, 1564
Montreal Warehousing Company, 1564
Norman, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Ocean ports, 1758. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Providence, 1755, 1762
Operating results, 1560-3
Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, 1564
Pensioners, annual passes, qu. 2418
Pension rights of employees, 14
Preference and common shareholders, representations, 3960
President, retiring allowance, 2785
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664
Profit and loss, qu. 1257
Pullen, Mr., 2472
Purchase price, qu. 1257
Robb, Mr. W. D., gratuity, qu. 1632
Rosevear, Mr. J. M., gratuity, qu. 1632
Scott, Mr. Frank, gratuity, qu. 1632
Separately-owned companies, 1563
Shareholders, list of, 939
Stock, 61
Terminal Warehousing Company, 1564
Terminals in United States, 815
Portland, 1755, 1758, 1768, 2898
Providence, 1755, 1762
Thousand Island railway, 1564
Ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Traffic, 1563
Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59, 152, 1761
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Bell, Mr. G. T., gratuity, qu. 1632
Construction, cost of, 1918
Debenture holders, representation, 3507, 3581
Fixed charges, 1565
Hansard, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Hinton, Mr. W. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Loan of $15,000,000, 2920
Porter, Mr. S. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Gratuities. *See under this title,* Grand Trunk
Refund of, 1667
"Greatest railway in the world," 3056
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Halifax terminals, qu. 4518. *See also under this title* Terminals

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1612, 2050
Director, Canadian Steamship Lines, 3208
Retirement, 1666
Gratuity, qu. 1632
Hayes, Mr. 2471
Headquarters, 62, 3224. *See also under this title,* Moncton
Divisional, 63
Montreal, 1757
Hotel Scribe. *See under this title,* Paris Offices
Hotels, 938, qu. 1257
Deficits, 2976
Manager, qu. 1257
Hudson Bay railway and. *See that title*
Immigration, 1121
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Conference, 1193
Income account, 1559
Inquiry into, 19
Insurance, 1567, 1616. *See also* Canadian National Railways bill, Insurance
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Mitchell, Mr. A. J., interests in, 2050
Mortgaged premises. *See this title under* Canadian National Railway bills
Rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 135, 1756, 1760, 1765
Atlantic ports, 1754-62
British North America Act and, 1765
Express. *See under this title,* Express
Moncton headquarters, 13
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Pensioners, annual pass, qu. 2418
Pensions, 3195
Kelley, Mr. Howard, 1612, qu. 1632
Labour, representation, 1561. *See under this title, also,* Directors; Moore
Land
Contiguous to, 1880
Purchases or sales, 1739
Legislation, qu. 4300. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Management, 1616, 2832, 3041, 3623. *See also under this title,* Directors
Details of, 2472
Liberal resolution of 1921, 3685, 3688
Non-interference with, 2473, 3670
Personnel, 3058
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3620, 3623, 3653, 3811. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices; Thornton
Capital investments. *See under this*

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
title, Paris Offices
Maritime provinces in, 126-130
Maritime region, 1754, 1757
Mileage, 55, 1765, 3197
Cost, and, 914
Operated, 1558
Traffic and, comparison, 2949
Minister, acting, statement by, 55-63
Minister's annual statement, 1558; operated mileage, 1558; general conditions, 1559; income account, 1559; net operating deficit, 1560; decreased operating expenses, 1560; operating ratio, 1560; traffic results, steam lines, 1561; operating expenses, 1561; labour, 1561; locomotive coal purchases, 1561; equipment, 1561; betterments, 1562; new construction, 1922, 1562; Grand Trunk, 1562; income account, 1563; Grand Trunk traffic, 1563; separately-owned companies, 1563; employees and compensation, 1564; equipment, Grand Trunk, all lines, 1564; coal, 1564; additions and betterments, 1564; finance; consolidated income figures, 1564; financing in 1922, 1564; advances by government, 1565; fixed charges, 1565; estimates, 1566; reorganization, Sir Henry Thornton, 1566; insurance, 1567; tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Mitchell, Mr. A. J.,
Insurance, interest in, 2050
Petiring gratuity, qu. 1632, 1667
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Montford railway, 4199
Moore, Mr. Tom
Labour representative, directors, 1652, 1654, 3636
Statement on immigration, 1167
Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257
National Transcontinental. *See under this title,* Transcontinental
Net operating deficits, 1560
New positions and salaries, 2701
Niagara and St. Catharines railway, 2475
Niagara Central railway, 2480
No politics order, 3623
Ocean ports and terminals, 1754, 1757-1762, 1767, 1768, 2898, 2899, 2937, 3454. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Official cars, 3621
Officials, retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Operation
Costs, 1919
Deficits, 3701
Expenses, decreased, 1560, 1561

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Ratio, 1560
Orders in council, 815
Over-capitalization, 2860
Ownership, 3192, 3224
Page, Supt., alleged statement, 4514
Paris offices, purchase of Hotel Scribe, 3197, 3208, 3224, 3279, 3610, 3610-46, 3650-76, 3676-3708, 3811, 3813, 3838, 4514
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 3664, ruled out of order, 3667
Aronovici, Mr. A., 3612, 3652
Peace river
Branch lines, 1434, 4324, 4701
Survey, 4898
Policy, 1764, 3620
Pre-audit, 3701
Preferential treatment of localities, 1762
President, appointment of, 2827
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Prince Rupert, 2734
Printing, 1623
Contracts, 3144
Winnipeg, qu. 3323
Private cars, 489, 4527
Property, purchases and sales, 1739, 2518, 3324
Prospects of success, 2830
Providence, Rhode Island, building, 1755
Public ownership, 1614, 1618, 1770, 2859, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Quebec terminals, 446
Railway Commission and, 666
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rates. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Real estate, 1739, 2518, 3324
Regional areas, 135, 3621
Regulations, 496
Reorganization, Thornton, Sir Henry, 1566
Report, 3223
Retirement fund, 1667
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1483. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Revaluation, 2859
Earning power, 2860
Replacement, 2860
Revenue, detailed, 2898
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Robb, Mr., qu. 1632, 2471
Rolling stock and equipment, 61, 1561, 3962
St. Croix, 2899
St. John and Quebec railway, 3403
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John terminal, 3645. *See also* St. John, *and under this title,* Terminals
St. Malo repair shops, 4447

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Scarfe Varnish Works, purchases, qu. 1485
Service, improved, 2859, 3041
Settlement along, 1185
Shannon, Mr. L. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Combine, 2127
Steel, lifting of, 1664
Strategic advantages, 3057
Superannuation fund, qu. 2418
Tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore. *See under this title,* Directors
Teakle, Mr. R. B. letter as to cattle shipments, 2758
Telegraph service, Canadian Press, 4728
Terminals. *See also under this title* Ocean ports
Atlantic division, qu. 1363, 1771
Halifax, 1756, 1759, 1768, 4713, qu. 4751
Maritime region, qu. 1662
Ocean. *See also under this title,* Ocean
Winter ports, 2902
Portland, Maine, 1755, 1768
Providence, 1755, 1762
St. John, 1756, 1759, 1768
Thornton, Sir Henry, 13, 52, 1566, 1612, 2833. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices
Appointment, 2828
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Assistants, reported appointment of Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, 2794, 2828
Atlantic division, 1771
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Cattle shipments, 2758
Coal transportation, 1264
Criticism of, 3640
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1966
Financial statement, 666
Freight rates on Alberta coal, 1268
Immigration, 1167, 2795, 2840
Maritime boards of trade, conference, 1755, 1771
Ocean ports, 1758-69
Operating costs, 1919
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3615, 3653
Radial railways, sale of, 2476
Rate discrimination, 1914
Sale of 27 ships, 2828
Speeches, 3637
Ties, purchase of, qu. 516
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4447
Connection between lines, 3224

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Toronto—*Con.*
Level crossings, 2477
Office building, qu. 814, qu. 1663, 2481
King and Yonge Streets property, qu. 1994, 2518, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 517, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442
Toronto Eastern railway, 2475
Toronto Suburban railway, 2181, 2475
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Traffic, 3041
Results, steam lines, 1561
Staff, removal from Truro to Halifax, 4708
Train to carry troops to Sydney, qu. 624
Transcontinental, 1760
Branch line to Montreal, qu. 2393
Cattle shipments, 2807
Development of northern Ontario and Quebec, 2833
Fortin & Moffat claim, 3646
Freight rates, 3680
Operating results, 1560
Strategic advantages, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix projected route, 2898
Transportation combine, 1395. *See also* Freight rates
Truro subway, 4454
Unification of system, 1615, 1666, 3196, 3223
Union stockyards, 2762
United States
Lines, 3197
Terminals, 1755, 1762, 1768
Value of property, 55
Wages, reduction, qu. 1363. *See also* Labour
Waterways, 3057

Canadian National Railways Bills
1. Insurance of mortgaged premises
Res. 1635, 2048; 1r., 2050; 2r., com., 2105; 3r., 2107
2. Express business and sale of electric lines; radial railways
1r., 2392; 2r., com., 2470; 3r., 2481
3. Construction of branch lines
Res. 3961, 4185; 1r., 4201; 2r., 4303-4308; com., 4308; 3r., on div. 4397, 4401
Sections and subjects discussed:
Advances for government railway lines, 4329
Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities, 4344
Amdts. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile, 4339
Lines connecting with Canadian government railways and constructed by company, 4327

Canadian National Railways Bills—*Con.*
Construction of branch lines—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Nature and form of securities, 4339
Power to construct described in schedule, 4308
Rejection by Senate, 4753, 4688, 4689, 4694, 4695
4. Securities, approval of
Res, 4012, 4402; lr., 4405; 2r., com., 4515; m. for 3r., amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to refer back neg., 4732; 3r., 4732
Senate amendments, 4754
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4527, neg. 4528
Form, term and amount of securities to be approved, 4515

Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953

Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Assets, obligations, etc., qu. 625
Attitude towards Canadian National Railways, 3056
Banff hotel, 3435
British Columbia, qu. 626, 1916
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Pacific "party", 3056
Cattle shipments, 3043
Chinese sailors, 2334
Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company, 3235
Construction, 1880, 1916, 1918
Crowsnest pass agreemet, 1620. *See also that title.*
Dividends, 1203, 1392, 1406, 3190
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Earnings, 1919
Net, 1130
Surplus, 1130
Efficient service, 127
Express charges, 2876
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Freight Rates. *See also that title*
Copper bounty and, 3239
Dividends, and, 1134
Ocean, 2127

Canadian Pacific Railway—*Con.*
Grades, 1965
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Conference, 1193
Russia, 1340
Labour, shopmen, resolution of, 1338
Land, 3704
Sale contracts, revision of, 2930
Lanigan, Mr., freight rates, 1918
Operation, cost of, 1918
Quebec terminals, 815
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1458
Shares, transfer under Treaty of Versailles, 2496
Steamship lines, British mails, 2695
Telegraph service, Canadian press, 4728
Toronto, level crossings, 2477
Union stockyards, 2762

Canadian Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Ports; Treaties, French and Italian

Canadian Press Limited. *See Press*

Canadian Representation in the United States, 65, 2735, 3016, 3085, 4001, 4664. *See also* Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Delay, 3085

Canadian Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Canadian Trade Index, 2217

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Wheat Board

Canadians
Distressed, relief of, 1456
Emigrating. *See* Emigration
Repatriation of. *See* Immigration

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence Waterway
Canadian National railways, and, 3057
Cornwall, employees, political partisanship, qu. 3135
Freight rates, water transportation, 1914
Georgian Bay construction, 2816
Grain shipments and, 2808. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Lake Grain Rates
Improvement of, 1619
Isle Perrot bridge, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Panama. *See that title*
Rideau
Improvements, 4691
Water powers, qu. 622

Canals—*Con.*
St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Trent
Bridges, qu. 205
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Expenditure, qu. 4301
Improvements, 3647, 4691
Traffic, qu. 4301
Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Welland
Construction, 3760
Contracts, qu. 1489
Deepening, 2979
Expenditure, 3073, qu. 3820
Inquiry into, 3006
Request for, 3073, 3766, 3772, 3773
Grain shipments, 2808
Grenville by-election, 4606
Hudson Bay railway, 1054, 1068, *See also that title*
Importations of lumber for, qu. 1867
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Towing, qu. 4132

Canned Goods and Fish, freight rates, 1915

Canned Meats Act, inspection, 2202

Canning Licenses. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3090-3105
Business of the House, closure, 3668
Business profits and income taxes, qu. 1157
Canadian National railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3623
Dorchester county employees, qu. 2086
Management, 3623
Details of, Liberal res. of 1921, 3685
Responsibility and powers, 3623, 3684
Paris offices, 3684
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), ruling, 3667
Civil Service
Dismissals after 1911 election, 3347
Quebec city and district, 387
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern, 1933
Grondines wharf, 964
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 981
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3560
Point of order, letter reflecting on House, 4060
Portage la Prairie sewage system, 996
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 754
St. John immigration building, 1461
Toronto Harbour improvements, 985
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Votes of parliament and pledges, 3536

Canso, N. S. wharf, 941

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 950

Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 1763, 2469

Cape Breton Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Capital. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance
Attraction of, 2802, 3050
Basic industries, and, 3239
Canadian National railways, ownership of, 3192, 3224
Capital levy to pay war debt, 2728, 2743, 2909
Capitalistic system
Control of educational agencies, 2725
Defence of, 2743
Failure of, 2722
Government, influence over, 2726
Labour organization and, 2895
Political parties and, 2810
Capitalists, position of, 2583
Carvell, Hon. F. B., and, 3191
Centralization of, 4047
Control of interlocking directorates, 4026
Definition of, 3068
Diverted by income tax to tax-free bonds, 2914
Domination of, 4026
Farmers, 4045. *See also that title*
Investment in production, 2720
Investment, knowledge as to conditions, 2966
Natural resources, development of, 3027
Rights of, Abraham Lincoln on, 2967
Tariff and, 3025
Taxation of, 2801, 2879, 3010

Capital and Labour. *See also* Labour
Royal commission on industrial relations, report, 2890

Capital Investment, power to make. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris Offices

Capital Punishment
Abolition of, 487. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carleton county execution, 768

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, qu. 204, 1258, 2938, 2939

Carbonic Acid Gas. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Carleton Point, Que., lightkeeper, qu. 285

Carleton County, N.B., execution in, 768

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Annual training, 868
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 255, 4110
Butter factories in new districts, 3284
Canadian National parks, automobile admission fee, 3942
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4201
Cheque tax, 3932
Divorces granted, qu. 622
Dominion Lands Act, school lands, 4202
Eston branch railway, 4201
Grain Commission, salaries, 787
Indians, 2153
Interest rates, 4110
Military hospitals, 672
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2123
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 699
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2113
Penitentiaries, 770
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 735
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
School lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4202
Seed grain advances, 3444
Vancouver harbour bill, 260

Carnegie, Colonel, 1648

Carney, Stephen P., conviction, qu. 3582

Caron, Mr. E., postmaster, Tadoussac, qu. 3139

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Address in reply, 80; unemployment decrease; anti-combine legislation, 80; immigration, desirable types; United Farmers of Alberta and immigration 81; prosperity of western farmers; Soldier Settlement board as an aid to immigration, 82; amendments; Vancouver harbour expenditure, 83; coal resources of Canada, 83-84; strikes, 84; the farmers and larger markets; question of tariff reduction, 85
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3088-3121
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie railway, 4700
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Chinese immigration bill, 4537
"Merchants" definition of, 2483
Civil Service appointments, postmasters, 377
Coal
Eastern and Western Canada, 3204
Freight rates, 3204
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4231
Cold storage warehouses, 189
Combines bill, 2529, 2626

Carroll, Mr. William F.—*Con.*
Dairy Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Notice of M. for 2r., 3402
Renovated butter, 4262
Estimates, method of discussion, 4616
Fuel supply, 3203. *See under this title,* Mines and Minerals
M. (Mr. Church)
Amdt. proposing reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Grain shipments, 4230
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs., detention at border, 3157
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2428
Record of immigrants, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4643
Inverness-Richmond railway, extension, 4324
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Mines and Minerals Committee
First report, 1384
Third report, 4436, 4592, 4743
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2462
Repatriation, M. 1379
Oleomargarine, 4263
Committee on Agriculture, discussion, 3266
M. to permit manufacture, importation and sale, 1382, 3399, 3508, 3573
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3327
Peace river railway, 4324, 4700
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3850-3881, 4747
Pensions
Appeal board, Ottawa, 3731
Royal commission on, opportunity for discussion of report, 674
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128
Privilege, Com. on Agriculture, 3266
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Railway Commission, criticism of judgment, 1916
Registration of ships, 3973
Renovated butter, 4262
St. Peter's Louisburg railway, 4324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Taxation, 2837
Wheat board, Manitoba legislature, 2836

Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See* Labour, International Labour Conference

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Eastern Lands Development Company, 1635
Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Cartwright, Right Hon. Sir Richard, on protection, 3070

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4189
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102, 4509
Bankruptcy Act
Amdt. or abrogation, M., 1490, 1528
Repeal of, 1158
Business of the House
Audibility, 4594
Private members' day, 1158
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4189
Chairman, ruling:
Comittee report not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Combines bill, 2549, 2618, 2627
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4189
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) point of order, 3570
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Senate and House of Commons, bill, 4244

Cattle. *See this title,* under Live Stock

Cattle Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases, Live Stock, Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo. *See* Live Stock

Caucus, Party. *See* Lack of Confidence

Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031

Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture, adjournment, 1685

Cedar Rapids power, Aluminium Company of America, 659
Cement, French Treaty, 1984

Central Research Institute, 788

Census. *See* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics

Central Supply Association, decision, 2593

Chair, Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker

Champlain Dock. *See* Quebec (port)

Champoux, Mr. J. E., Sorel postmaster, qu. 1487

Chanak Affair. *See* Near East Crisis

Chapel Cove, N.S., breakwater, 941

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Apple-grading, 194
Artificial silk, duty, 3489, 3491
Atlanta exhibition, 1465
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, 1171
Canadian National railways
Express and electric lines bill, 2480
Grand Trunk, gratuities, 1667
Toronto office building, 2481
Civil government estimates, form of, 611
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054, 2060
Cold storage companies, 186
Experimental farms, 480
Firebrick, duty, 3481
French treaty, 453, 1977, 1995
Analysis of, 1978
Bronze powder, 1979, 2217
Customs index, 2269-70
Butter, 2273
Cobalt products, 2263
Cotton, 2263
Silks, 448
Wines, 442
Government elevators, 2036
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu., 813
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 945
Nova Scotia, 4566
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 968
Highway, Canboro-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Contributions of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1164, 1171
Policy, 1171
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty bill, 2401
Labour department
Staff, 1672, 1678, 1699, 1701
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Technical education, director of, 1674
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Little Anse breakwater, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4573
Macdonald, Sir John A., reciprocity, 2922
Maritime provinces, dredging, 4569
Military properties, maintenance, 889
National defence
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 884, 1741, 1744
Estimates, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 902
Niagara Central railway, 2480
Patents of Invention bill, 2073

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, 774
Point of order, Mr. Caldwell, 3267
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, 1710
Quebec
Arsenal, 884, 1741, 1744
Wharves, 978
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Seed grain advances, 3446
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269
Wedge, Mr. George, qu. 2697

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlottetown public building, 4614

Charlottetown-Pictou steamship service, 2171

Chartered Accountants Association of Canada. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Bank. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Immigrants
Overcharging at Quebec, 3324
Supplies, 496
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1993
Scarfe Varnish works, qu. 1485

Chateau Laurier. *See* Canadian National Railways, Hotels

Chatham, Ont., wharf, 982

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemical Industries, Canadian Society, 2069

Chemicals
Freight rates, 1920
French treaty, 1985

Cheque Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 362, 546, 554, 556
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal of, qu. 4512
Ottawa government workshops, 4619

Chicago
Chicago Drainage Canal, 2993
Diversion of water, qu. 3821
Exhibition, 1454, 1466

Chicago—*Con.*
Fat Stock Show, 1398

Chicoutimi wharf, 950

Chicoutimi-Saguenay county
Postmasters, qu. 3138
Telegraph lines, qu., 3138
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, qu. 3148

Chidley, Cape. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Chief Electoral Officer, salaries and contingencies, 4001

Children
Chinese, born in Canada. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Deaths through fuel shortage, 751, 1657
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Income tax exemptions for, 1382, 2128, 3038, 4502
Mortality of, 1179
Oleomargarine, effect on health. *See* Oleomargarine
Playgrounds, 3407, 3432

Chili, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Chimes. *See* Parliament Buildings, Tower

Chimney Corner, N.S., wharf, 941

China
Bandits in, 2932
Butter shipments to, 1840, 1853
Canadian trade commissioner, 1840
Cheese shipments to, 1853
Chinese Consul General, immigration 1488
Civilization of, 2486
Conditions in, 2316
Immigration from. *See* Chinese Immigration; Immigration
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in, 2695, 2795
Political disturbances, 2325
Trade relations with, 2313, 2316, 2320

Chinese Immigration. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Bill (Entry limited to diplomatic corps; Chinese children born in Canada; merchants and students) 1r., 768; 2r., com., 2308, com., 2481; 3r., 2489; Senate amendments, 4536
Sections and subjects discussed:
Admission for specified period, 2329
Agreement with China, 2317
Appeal to Minister, 2331
Arrest and deportation, 2334
Canadian officers in China, 2308
Chief controller, Department of Immigration, 2308, 2482

Chinese Immigration Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Chinese
Children, 2484
En route, admission, 2488
Landing in violation of act, 2336
Not to leave ship without permit, 2333
Sailors on Canadian vessels, 2334
To register within 12 months, 2333
Women, 2310, 2318, 2484
Representations from British Columbia, 2310
Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried, 2333
Definition, 2308
Deportation, 2488
Entry and landing, 2309
Vancouver and Victoria only, 2327
Evasions, 2315, 2324
Exclusion, 2324, 2482
Head tax, 2312
Identification and registration: certificates, 2331
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Jurisdiction of courts, 2337
Labourers, 2310, 2316
Liability of transportation companies, 2334
Merchants
Definition of, 2317, 2319, 2487
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2320
Students and, 2310
Evasions, 2324
Wives, 2318
Nationality, 2309
Number carried on ship limited, 2333
Offences and penalties, 2488
Officer in China, 2322
Officers in other countries, 2308, 2482
Organizing, unlawful courts, 2337
Passports, 2325
Powers of Governor in council, 2308
Prohibited classes, 2327
Re-entry, 2333
Registered person, 2488
Status, substantiation of, 2487
Students, 2310, 2316, 2324
Violation of act or fraud, 2488
Violation of act, order or regulation, 2337
Wives, 2484. *See also under this title,* Chinese, Women; Merchants

Chisby, Captain, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Eastern harbour improvements, 4569
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743

Chisholm, Hon. C. P. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Abbott's harbour, breakwater, 4563
Address, legislation referred to, in, qu. 2612
Agricultural Conditions, report, qu. 2612
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4068
Banking and Commerce Com. report, qu. 2612
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 703, 4439
Basic industries, assistance, 2822, 3238
Best, Mr. C. H., recognition of, 703
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Board of Commerce, 2583
Budget, 2817; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2817; delay in bringing down budget; tariff not political but economic question; Liberal-Conservative party always protectionist; National policy made Canada great, 2818; protection budget introduced by Minister of Finance; home market; Ontario farmers and protection; Progressive party plank; amendment; industrial conditions preceding adoption of protective policy; tariff stability; Baldwin tinplate industry; loss of due to tariff uncertainty, 2819; government, change of policy; tariff proposals high protection; amendment, Mr. Forke; national policy should be brought up to date; conservation of industries and markets; free trade in potatoes; prices, 2820; eggs, importation from United States; butter; western provinces, conditions in, 2821; houses for harvesters; tendency from free trade and towards protection; industrial conditions in Great Britain; strikes of agricultural labourers; adequate protection of basic industries; unemployment; emigration to United States; industrial possibilities, 2822; wool-combing; hemp industry; skilled workmen going to United States; tariff not responsible for exodus; climate and high taxation; causes of depression; world conditions; high taxation and prices; United States not free trade country; Fordney-McCumber tariff; thirty-five per cent duty on wheat; economy, preaching and practising; deficit in Canada, surplus in Great Britain, France and United States, 2823; Drury government and economy plank; United Farmers of

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Ontario; Ontario, increase of expenditure and debt; British budget, reduction in taxation and expenditure; taxation, increase in Canada, reduction in Great Britain and United States; taxation of luxuries and necessities; "free breakfast table;" coal and food prices; postal rates, reduction of, 2824; public debt; inheritance and income tax; income tax, federal and municipal; cigarette duty; sugar duty, 2825; receipt tax; evasion of; cheque tax; provincial amusement tax, 2826; copper bounty; hemp bounty; wool-combing industry; old age pensions; public health; mother's pensions; railway deficit; Canadian National Railways; capital expenditure; President, appointment of; Col. H. N. Balfour and Mr. A. J. Thomas, appointment of, 2827; principle of promotion; Sir Henry Thornton; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of ships; shipping combine; rates; grain-carrying trade; export tax on pulpwood; water powers, export of electrical energy; Canadian coal, freight rate on, 2828; agricultural conditions; Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; agricultural conditions in United States; rural credits; rural depopulation; prices, spread between producer and consumer; reciprocity, 2829
Business of the House
Committees, reports, qu. 2612
Private members' day, 1160
Progress of, 2469
Sessional programme, 2469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Returns, 3399
Sale of ships, qu. 2613, 2828, 2518, 3846
Shipping combines, 3846
Canadian National railways, 2828
Advance $73,000,000, 3619
Management, 3620
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Rates, 1761
Securities, 4526
Toronto office building, qu. 1663, 2518
Canadian Press Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games, 4707
Capital and labour, 2583
Chicago drainage canal, diversion, qu. 3821
Civil service, underpaid, 4672
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel Supply

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Freight rate, 2828
Imports, qu. 516
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2583
Combines bill, 2583, 2634
Combines, prosecutions of, qu. 1662
Copper bounty bill, 3238
Cost of living inquiry, qu. 3703
Deputy ministers salaries, 4672
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Elevators
Edmonton, 4721
Ontario, 2038, 4719, 4721
Emigration to United States, 2822
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Euclid hall and Brant house, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Expenditure on wharves, 4568
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4742
Freight rates
Operating costs and, 1761
Railway rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1969
Shipping, Railway Commission control, qu. 2611
Fuel supply
Freight rates, 1268, 2828
M. for a national fuel policy, 1262
Nova Scotia coal, 1269
Special committee, appointment, qu. 617
Transportation, 3200
Grain shipments, 3775
Grand Trunk. *See also under this title.* Canadian National railways
Commitments, qu. 207
Electrification, qu. 283
Halifax elevator, 4721
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4562
Historic sites, preservation of, 3249, 4707
Housing, legislation, qu. 2517, 2822
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4681
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement of, 2774
Hydro electric, power supply, 1266, 1270, 2828
Imperial conference, 4661
Income War Tax Act Amdt, bill, 4493
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Judges serving on royal commissions, 3604
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Military hospitals, 696, 4075, 4303
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 4743
Moose Jaw election, 2774
National fuel policy, M., 1262
Near East Crisis, 1266
Newsprint, export duty, 1267

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Ontario grain elevators, 2038, 4719, 4721
Old age pensions, legislation, qu. 2517, 2827
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3873, 4749
Pensions
British Expeditionary force, 3885
Fenian raid, 3873
Royal commission, report, qu. 2516
South African war, 3873
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779, 2824
Post office salaries, 1780
Prices, high, 2583, 2820, 2822
Proportional representation, 424
Public ownership, 2475, 3622, 3847
Pulpwod, export duty on, 2828
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Railway excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Redistribution Committee report, qu. 2612
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3773
Power development, qu. 490
United States, negotiations, 3208, 3705, 4513
Shipping combines, 2828, 3846, 3848
Soldiers, destitute, burial of, 695
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, 3507
Steamship services
Extension to Great Lakes, 2175
Rates, control of, 2174
St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, ships, qu. 2613
Taxation
High, 2583, 2823
"Taxed to death," 4493
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 3282, 4621, 4624
Postal receipts, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Post office building, 1780
Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506
Union station, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 4011, 4441, 4442
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Unemployment relief, 690
United Farmers of Ontario, 2824
Co-operative stores, 4068
Platform, 4661
Water powers
Electrical energy, export, 2828
National policy, development, 1270
Welland canal construction
Expenditure, qu. 3820
Request for, 3774

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Woollen industry, legislation to assist, 2823, 2827, qu. 4184
Churches, capitalistic system and, 2725
Churchill, Fort. *See* Hudson Bay Railway
Cigars and Cigarettes. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Inland Revenue bill; Taxation; Tobacco
Civil Rights. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Labour, right to organize; Woodsworth
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power); Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references, generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Act. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence
Appointments, 208. *See also under this title,* Commission
After 1911 election, 2920
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Local committee and, 2816
Postal, 1800. *See also* Post Office
Postmasters. *See* Post Office
Promotions and, 330
Returned soldiers, 386, 1797, 1799
Services and, unnecessary, 2969
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, qu. 2297
Temporary employees made permanent, qu. 4814
Year 1922, 3324
Arthur Young Company, cost of, qu. 1137
Bonus, qu. 204, 1664, 1812, 3352
Employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Dependents, non-resident, 1811
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, employees, 1751, 1752, 1772
Interim supply bill, 3705
Salaries and, qu. 2179
Vote, 1811
Calder Act, 2926, 3266. *See* also Public Service Retirement Act
Statement of, 3402
Civil service list, publication of, qu. 3134
Classification. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Commission.
Abolition, proposed. *See* Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power)
Advice by local committees, 2816
Agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, 4675
"A joke; a farce," 3347
Alleged partisanship, 3347
Anderson, Mr., 1821

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Annual report tabled, 3887
Appointments
British Columbia in, 372
Combines, staff, 2661
Delay in making, 1086, 3292
Fruit inspectors, 3150
Immigration Department
Black, Mr. W. J., 2664
Immigration agents, 1188, 2663
Bowder, Mr., 1199
Chinese immigration officials, 2308, 2482
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085-6
May, Mr., 2663
Indian affairs
Agents, 2151
Doctors, 2160
Live stock Act, inspectors, 3150
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3284, 3290, 3303. *See also* Marshall
Montreal post office, qu. 1361
Postmasters, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1823. *See also* Post Office.
Clementsport, N.S., 1795
Disregarded, 1821-22
Returned soldiers as, 1799
St. Peter's N.S., 1795
Soldier advisers, 3747
Temporary, 2663
Without regard to politics, 3345
Civil Service Act, withdrawal of positions from 561, 914
Commissioners, appointment of, 3348
Cost of, 370, 525, 530
In 1917-1922, qu. 1137
Employees, number of, 370, 3986
And cost, 2970
Temporary, 1385
Employment service, director of, 1676
Examination, 366, 2816, 3986
Exceptions, 1821
House of Commons staff, 2691
Jurisdiction
Positions exempted from, 561, 914
Removal of certain classes from, qu. 278. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Technical officers, removal of, 519
Lightkeepers, 3351
Political patronage, 3347
Postmasters, appointments and dismissals. *See* Post Office
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2502
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Report, 812
Roche, Hon. Dr., 354, 3348

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Staff, number of, See under this title Employes
Unconstitutionality of, 2816
Committee of the House. *See* Civil Service Act
Cost, 2756, 3076
Deputy ministers
Committee, report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Powers of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Salaries, 4557, 4667
Dismissals, 856
Appointments and, after 1911 election, 2817, 2920, 3344, 3345, 3349
In 1922, 3324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, employees, 3252
Economy in. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Employees, number of, 2970, 3264
And salaries, 1912 and 1922, 2712
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Examinations, 366, 2816, 3986
Exemptions, 354, 367
Expenditure, 2785, 2915, 2987, 3027
Reduction in England, 1803
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Cost of, qu. 1137
Verrett, Mr. Hector, 1826
History of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Hours, 1427
Holidays and, 24
Inside service, employees, 911
Interim supply bill, 3705
"Lady who rides to work in automobile" 1772
List, publication of, qu. 3134
Merit system. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Murray, Sir George, report, 3343
Offensive partisanship, dismissals for, 285, 3344
Political patronage, 2816, 3344. *See also* Civil Service Act
Positions excluded from Act, 1156
Post Office department
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Postmasters, dismissals. *See* Post Office
Public Service retirement. *See that title*
Quebec and district employees, 387

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 39-40, 409
Reorganization, 24. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826, 2817
Responsibility, 368
Retiring allowances, Printing Bureau, 3949
Returned soldiers, 1772
Appointments, 386, 1797, 1799
Dismissals, 1772
Salaries, 2805, 3070, 4672. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Bonus and, qu. 2179
Revision,, qu. 204, 1794
Statement by Prime Minister, 1811
Total expenditure, qu. 2086
Seasonal or temporary employment, *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. bill
Statistics, qu. 207
Superannuation, 4593. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Boville, Mr. T. C., qu. 3135
Calder Act, 2926, 3266
Cost of, 2785
Coulter, Dr. R. M., qu. 3135
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, qu. 3135
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 940, 3266
Statement of Prime Minister, 4593
Technical and professional officials, 367, 815
Temporary employees, made permanent, 1385
Underpaid, 4672
Whitley councils, 1654
Women, employment of, 1772
Work outside regular duties, 1675

Civil Service Act. *See also* Civil Service
Abolition of. *See under this title,* M. (Mr. Power)
Alleged violation of, 1794
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 519
Amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for special committee, 534; agreed to on div. 571
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
"Notwithstanding anything in Act" 3276
Special Committee of inquiry, 2970
Appointment of, 936, 986
Membership, change in, 2417
Order of reference, 1256
Pope, Sir Joseph, evidence before, 2970
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4248
M. to concur, withdrawn, 4592-3
Privilege, Mr. Martell, 4363

Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt. Bill
(Seasonal or temporary employment)—Mr. German—1r., 666

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Repeal of clause permitting additions to term of service) 1r., 2896-7; 2r., com., 3146; 3r., 3147

Civilization, evolution of, 1856

Citizen's Liberty League, 715

Citizenship. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3093-3126, 3219
British Columbia
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Fishing licenses, M., 1540
Oriental immigration, 507, 1217, 2310
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Privilege, equalization of rates, 1911
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2404-06
Canadian Air Force, Hudson Bay route, 1748, 1750
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1920, 3274
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-19
Students, 2314
Creosoted lumber and timber
Duties, qu. 813
Use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Vancouver Creosoting Company, limited, 3231
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 1920, 3274
Equalization of railway rates. *See under* this title, Freight Rates
Firebrick, duty, 3896
Freight rates
Railway rates, equalization of, M. 1284, 1490, 1910, 1914, 1956
Original motion, effect of, 1953
Privilege, 1910
Westward from prairie provinces, 1159
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Immigration
Oriental, 507, 1217, 2310-19
Policy, 1217
Liquor
Export, qu. 1260
Warehouse licenses, British Columbia, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Medical staff, 675

Clark, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Military hospitals—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
New York, Canadian customs officer, 1920 3274
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Panama canal, competition, 1920
Pension Act, administration of, 682
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3867-3886
Amdt. death within five years, 3884; agreed to, 3885
Senate amendments, 4745
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3730
Federal appeal board, 4703
Royal commission on, report, 675
Privilege, equalization of railway rates, 1910
Salmon-canning industry, licenses, 1540
Soldiers
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment, 695
Vetcraft shops, 695
Stanley park foreshore protection, 1008
United States army, mental tests, 1219
Vancouver harbour bill, 268
Vancouver income tax offices, qu. 912

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534

Clifford, Mr. L. O. (South Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Orin D., claim, 626

Climate
Emigration and, 2747, 2823
Winter conditions in Canadian Northwest, Nebraska and Iowa, 1423

Closure. *See* House of Commons

Clothing, duty on, 2981. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Textiles

Clyde, The, mechanics from, 1204

Coal. *See also* Freight Rates; Fuel; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Railways
Alberta, 709, 1247, 1262, 1264, 1268, 1275-82, 3424, qu. 4437, 4692
Freight rates on, 1268, 1272, 1275, 1282, 3009, 3781
Suggested rate of $6 per ton, 1276
Heating appliances for, 4629
Shipment
Hudson bay railway, 1055
Ontario, to, 1163
All-British supply, 1268
Anthracite
Duty, 3493
Supply, 1262, 4692
Welsh, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199

Coal—*Con.*
Areas in Canada, 1344
Bituminous, 83
Duty, 1275, 1278
Edmonton Board of Trade, res, 1275
Briquetting, 789, 3206
Brule lake deposits, 4699
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3807, 3814, 3826
Canadian National railways
Purchases, qu. 1363, 1561, 1564, qu. 4303
Alberta, qu. 4437
United States, qu. 4511
Chimney Corner, N.S., 941
Coke, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1273, 3199
Coke ovens, establishment, 788
Cost of. *See* Cost of Living; Price
Deposits, 2750
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994, 2654
Embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Export, 1275
United States, from, 1249, 1265, 1277
Freight rates, 795, 1268, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3621. *See also that title*
Mines and Minerals Committee, 4514
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502, 3128, 3146, 3222
Cancellation, 3146
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supplies, 1263
Hudson bay region, 1073
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Imports, qu. 516, 1266, 2828
And production, qu. 490
From United States, 1249, 1277
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
"Invisible" 1262
Lands, 1344. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Leases, 3424. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Petition of Right Act
Disbursements, repayments, 3129
Hoppe-Isenberg. *See under this title,* Hoppe and Isenberg
Lignite, 789
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206
Duty, 3493
Miners
Importation of from Belgium, 1177
Oriental, 1901
Strikes. *See* Labour, Strikes
Mines, 2785
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Public ownership, 2727, 3205
Mines and Minerals Committee report, 4743
National fuel policy, M. (Mr. Church) 1262
New Brunswick, 804

Coal—*Con.*
Northern Ontario, 1050
Nova Scotia, 83, 800
Freight rates, 3781
Miners' strike, 1627
Ontario, reported discovery, 2512
Peace river district, 1433
Price, 2824, 3198
Production
British Columbia, 1244
Canada, 2780
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Public ownership, 2785, 3205
Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Purchase of in United States, 3493, qu. 4511
Rates on, 1272. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, 1275
Resources, 83, 1264
Scarcity, 254
Substitutes, 3199
Tariff, bituminous coal, 1275, 1278
Transportation, 789, 1264
United States embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Welsh anthracite, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199
Quality of, 1279

Coal Tar Derivatives, French Treaty, 1986

Coast Range Steel Company, 2508

Coastal Regulations. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Freight Rates, Shipping
Suspension of, 4219, 4222, 4231, 4235, 4276, 4290

Cobalt Products. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Cobden, Richard, British Free Trade, 3050

Cobourg, Ont., breakwater, 981

Cochrane, the late Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1033, 1046

Code Napoleon, 1558, 1526

Coke. *See* Coal

Cold Storage. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dairying Industry
Canadian-Australian boats, 1848
Co-operative, 2054
Dairying and, 2764, 2978
Eggs, producer and consumer, 1852
Incorporated companies, 2058
Mechanical, 2056
Montreal, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204, 3289

Cold Storage—*Con.*
Municipal, 2054
Plants, 104
Montreal, qu. 2204, 3289
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2055

Cold Storage Act Amdt. Bill
(Subsidy contracts with co-operative societies or associations and municipalities)
Res. 184; 1r., 191; 2r., 271-276; ref. to Com. on Agriculture 276; com., 2054; 3r., 2086, 2199

Collison, Mr. B. W., Rocky Mountains park, 1739

Colombia, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Colonial Status. *See* Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Colonization. *See* Agriculture; Building; Farm Homes; Immigration, Canada Colonization Association; Labour; Soldier Settlement

Colt Machine Guns. *See* National Defence

Combines, 145, 3072. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Prices; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Transportation
Agriculture and, 2786, 2787
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2521, 2527
Banana trust, 2979
Banking system, 4019, 4047, 4083
Big business, 2603
Big interests, 2559
Great Britain in, 2726
Political parties and, 2855
Binder twine, 4376
British North America Act, amendment, 2592
British Parliamentary Com. on trusts, 2544
British preference, 2989
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canadian Press, Limited, 4727
Coal situation and, 254
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Control, 2725
Co-operative buying and, 3018
Cotton manufacturers, 2534, 3464
Dominion Textile Company, 2563
Duties, reduction of, 2608

Combines—*Con.*
Federal jurisdiction over. *See* speeches on Combines bill
Legislation, 39, 145. *See also* Combines bill
Lumber, 2593
Master Plumbers & Steamfitters' Association, decision, 2593
Milk, 2526, 2559, 2569, 2593
Modern business organization, 2524
Money, 648, 4026
Newspaper, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, qu. 2613
Price-fixing, 2606, 2786
Printing, 1623
Privy Council decisions, 2585
Prosecutions, qu. 1662
Restaurant trust, 2584
Sherman anti-trust law, 2602
Shipping, 1440, 2127, 2174, 2578, 2583, 2584, 2613, 2666, 2828, 2928, 2954, 2960, 3789, 3845, 3848, 4077, 4223, 4226, 4277. *See also* Agricultural Conditions, Special Committee; Freight rates, shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613
Great Lakes, qu. 1362
Statement in Toronto Globe, qu. 1362
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Tariff and, 2714
Transportation, 1395. *See also* Freight Rates
United Farmers of Ontario, 2584
United Shoe Machinery Company, 2557, 2560
Webb, Mr. Sydney, report, 2545, 2551
Wheat Board, 2547, 2616, 2857
Wheat pool, 2526
Wholesale grocers case, decision, 2051, 2521

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2521
Appeal Court of Ontario, decisions, 2527
Privy Council decisions, 2527, 2590

Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Repeal, 2521

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill, (Investigation of alleged combines) Res. 938, 987; 1r., 993; 2r., 2519-2609 on division, 2609; com., 2610, 2615, 2659, 3r., 2701; Senate amendments, 3505
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for investigation, *See under this title* Investigation
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2521, 2527

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Big interests, 2584
Combination no crime, 2527
Combine, definition of, 2520, 2525, 2560, 2595, 2615, 2666
Commissioners, appointment of, 2522, 2626
Competition
Control of, 2526
Lessening of, 2526
Complaints, 2521
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Counsel
Conduct of investigation by, 2632
Representation by, 2618
Division on M. for 2r., 2609
Documents, 2521
Enforcement of, 4229
Experts, employment of, 2631
Inquiry as to, 496
Inquisitorial, 2527, 2608
Investigation
Application for, 2616
Restricted to British subjects, 2617
To be made by six persons, 2617
Grand Jury system of, amdt. (Mr. Church) 2585
Powers of registrar, 2626
Private, 2522
Under Enquiries Act, 2522
No person excused, 2631
Parliament
Jurisdiction, 2521-2609
Right to investigate, 2666
Power to reduce tariff, 3049
Patents, revocation of, 2522
Prices, fixing of, 2520
Privy Council decision, 2559, 2590
Proceedings in private, 2632
Profits, regulation of, 2558, 2585
Publicity, 2522
Registrar, 2522, 2616
Appointments of 2628, 2660
Power to investigate, 2626
Shall cause inquiries, 2618
To report and minister to decide as to further inquiry, 2626
Regulations, 2665
Report, distribution of, 2632-4, 2659
Re-sale price, 2525
Staff, appointment of, 2660
Tariff, reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561
Technicality not to invalidate proceedings, 2665

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Trade unions not affected, 2666
Witnesses, evidence and production of papers, 2631

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade and Commerce

Commercial Agents. *See* Trade

Commercial Intelligence Service. *See* Trade and Commerce

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions, government by. *See* Civil Service Commission; Government

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Prices, 1083, 1851. *See also* speeches on Budget; Prices

Commonwealth Club of California, immigration, 1195

Community Clubs. *See* Immigration

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
1. Mining companies, permission to pay dividends out of capital—Mr. German—1r., 435
2. Private company; shares without nominal or par value; capital, etc.—Mr. Copp—1r., 3261; 2r., com., 4208; 3r., 4218; Senate amendments, 4736

Sections and subjects discussed:
Amount of capital required, 4210
Annual meeting, 4215
Annual returns, 4215
Borrowing powers, 4213
By-laws for increase or decrease of number, 4215
By-law to be sanctioned, 4214
Capital
Increase of, 4213
Reduction of, 4213
Change of name, 4211
Commission for securing subscriptions, 4212
Directors
Powers, 4212
Qualifications, 4215
Dividends payable out of wasting assets, 4214
Issue of shares without nominal or par value, 4208

Companies Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Meetings of creditors, 4216
Private company may become public company, 4212
Prospectus, requirements as to particulars, 4212
Repeal, 4212
Stock of other companies, purchases, 4212
Subscriptions in return, 4215
Summary to be filed, 4216
When company may be created a private company, 4208

Compensation for Cattle. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock

Competitive Examinations. *See* Civil Service

Conciliation and Labour Act. *See* Labour

Concurrence. *See* Interim Supply; Supply

Condensed Milk. *See* Dairying Industry

Confectionery and Beverages Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Confederation. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Charlottetown conference, 1368
Debate, 1367
Intercolonial railway, 1756
Nova Scotia, attitude towards, 1376
Quebec conference, 1368
Senate, nominative or elective, 1366

Conferences, 3411. *See also* Imperial
Disarmament, 2911, 4000
International Labour. *See* Labour

Confidence, Lack of. *See* Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Congdon, Mr. Fred T.
Appointment as commissioner, 2710, qu. 3131. *See also* Canadian National railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Correspondence with Justice dept., 2299

Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183

Connaught Park Jockey Club. *See* Race Track Betting

Connaught Place Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials, Ottawa

Conscription, 2816
"Infamous and anti-Canadian," 3038
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, and, 3015
Men and wealth, of, 2729

Conseil National des Métiers, qu. 3141

Conservative Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Political Parties
Administration, 1911-1921, 3038
Agricultural implements duty, 2974
Alleged understanding on Mr. Shaw's amendment to Address, 987
History of party. *See* Proportional Representation
National policy, 3067
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Pledges, violation of, 2974
Tariff policy, 3063
Tariff resolution of 1922, 2220

Constituencies, Redistribution of. *See* Redistribution Bill

Constitution, right of Canada to make her own, 1378

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Budget; Imperial Conference; Lack of Confidence Vote; Treaties; Halibut

Consular Agents. *See* Trade

Consumer. *See also* Address; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Prices; Purchasing Power; Taxation
French Treaty and, 3049
Italian treaty and, 3049
Oleomargarine, 3534
Prices. *See also that title*
Meat, 2877
Producer and consumer, 2829, 2972, 3029
Purchasing power, 2812
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Relief of, 2718
Renovated butter, 4251
Sales tax increases passed on to, 2859, 2804, 2998
Sugar duty, 2987
Tariff and, 2854, 3054
Taxation, 2789, 2801, 4415
Wheat board, 2857

Consumption Tax. *See* Taxation

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Containers, Fruit. *See* Sale and Inspection

Contrecœur wharf, 950-1008

Conventions, Trade. *See* Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Conversion Loan. *See* Loans

Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179

Co-operation
Agricultural products, distribution, 1852, 2869
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253. *See also* Markets; Prices
Co-operative association and societies, 3073. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt bill
Cold storage, 2054
Failure of, 1419
Co-operative credit associations, 4038
Industrial and financial organizations, 2589
Industrial relations, 2895
Town and country, between, 2972

Co-ordination. *See* National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agricultural and manufactured products, prices, 1851
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Agricultural implements, prices, 1407
Alberta
Oil bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling and prospecting, 781
Assignments in bankruptcy, qu. 937, 1412
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4072, 4077-4146, 4140
Interest
Circulation redemption fund on, amdt. 4093, neg. 4093
Maximum rate, amdt. 4125, neg. 4131; 4149, neg. 4149
Issuing of notes, 4092
Shareholders' audit, auditors to report to Minister, amdt. 4090, neg. 4091
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4145
Banks and Banking
Cost of living, 1409
Returns, 3264
British preference, cotton goods, 3463
Business of the House, bill not printed, 3974
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, grain shipments, qu. 3263
Canadian National parks, leasing, 3442
Canadian National Railways
Directors, address and occupation, qu. 1973
Hotels, 938
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Removal of, 3189
Statements of, 1869
Combines, shipping, 2613
Copper bounty bill, 3236, 3240
Cost of living increase, 1408
Crude petroleum bounties 781
Dairying industry, 1851
Dominion Textiles Company, securities and dividends, 3463
Dry Dock Subsidies bill, 3979

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Eggs, price of, 1851
Emigration to the United States, 1412
Experimental farms, 479
Farmers, purchasing power, 1408
Freight rates, increase, 3190
Geological survey, 2508
Grain and grain trade
Government elevator system, 3264
Grain Act, administration
Dockage, 782, qu. 3141
Grain Commissioners, board of
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Names, etc., qu. 2206
Grain Elevator Commission, qu. 1867
Montreal shipments, qu. 1973, qu. 1974
Shipping rates, M., 2517, 2613
Shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Hansard, subscription rate, 1715
Harbours and rivers, 948
Hemp bounty, 3913
Highwood river, power, 3427
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502
Immigration
Advertising, 1114
Policy, 1407
Immigration Act Amdt. bill 3981
Inflation, inequalities of, 1447
Iron ore, Alberta, 2512
Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpoena, 4145
National Gallery, M. to reduce vote, 1018
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Privilege—correction of press report, 2519
Public Works, expenditures by provinces, qu. 3887
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2494, 2500
Railway Commission, qu. 1973
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., statement of, 3188
Statements of, 1869
Robb, Hon. Mr., visit to Australia, 1850
Rugs, purchase of, qu. 1486
Rural depopulation, 1855
Seed grain advances, 3445
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement, 2030
Amounts due Dominion govt., qu. 814
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139
Vancouver elevator, qu. 1487
Vancouver harbour bill, 265
War claims, 2498

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Water powers, 3427, 3442
Woollen industry, condition of, 3463

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Civil Service
Commission
Annual report, 3887
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Employees, return showing, 911
Civil Service Act Special Com., report, 4248
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3261, 4208, 4217, 4736
Dorchester penitentiary, 770
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 1384, 2107, 2113, 2182, 2199, 2437-54, 3983
Discretion to Secretary of State, 2447
Judges, 2441, 2446
Justice department, opinion of, 2441
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1017
Public Archives, 3985
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2498
Returns, inquiries for, 3324
Secretary of State department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 2503
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500

Copper. *See* Mines and Minerals

Copper Bars or Rods, bounty on, 2703, 2709, 2778, 4369. *See also* Bounties

Copyright. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs
United States, 2289

Copyright Act. *See also* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
M. (Mr. Rinfret) 495

Copyright Act Amendment Bill
(Compliance with British and international copyright acts.) 1r., 487; 2r., com., 2139; com., 2287; 3r., 2436; Senate amendments, 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) licenses and importation of books, 2291, agreed to on div. 2292
Ref. to, 2344
Authors, memorandum on behalf of, 3155
Berne Convention, 2139, 2288, 2343, 3155
Civil servant, alleged communication to Le Droit D'Auteur, 2140

Copyright Act Amendment Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Commencement of act, 2145, 2287
Great Britain and, 2140
Le Droit d'Auteur, 2140, 2343
Legislation, history of, 2343
Licenses, importation, 2139, 2287, 2291, 2344
Piracy, 2287
Song writers, 2287

Cordage and Rope
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp
Production in Canada, 2780

Corless, Dr., Hudson bay district, 1040

Corn Laws. *See* Great Britain

Cornwall Canal employees, qu. 3135

Corporations, profits, 1209. *See also* Combines; Immigration

Corsets, duty, 3048

Cory, Mr. W. W. *See* Interior

Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217

Cossar, Dr. George C., immigration, 1471

Cost of Living, 1394, 1812, 2704, 2736, 2835. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Combines; Consumer; Immigration; Labour, Unemployment; Prices; Taxation
Banks and, 1409
Budget and, 1410, 1812
Canada and Great Britain, 3468, 3472
Canada and United States, comparison, 3073
Canada, one of most expensive countries, 2715
Charts, 1700
Clerical classes, 3534
Coal, cost of, 1345, 1813. *See also* Coal
Combines and, 2599. *See also* Combines
Consumer and, 2585
Curve, formerly descending now ascending, 3000
Customs and excise duties, 2839
Decrease of, 1700, 1907
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3465
Dumping clause and, 2535
Emigration and, 2790. *See also* Emigration
"Free breakfast table" 2824
Freight rates and, 1958
Government investigation, inquiry, qu. 3703
Increase of, 1853
Labour Gazette figures, 1812
Liberal platform, 1410
Living within income, 2959

Cost of Living—*Con.*
Members of Parliament. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Michell, Prof., figures, 1700, 1812
Necessity for lower, 1412, 1437
Oleomargarine, 3508-3580
Prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Producer and consumer, 2713, 2972
Spread between, 2787
Production, cost of, 2815
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
R. G. Dun & Company, figures, 1812
Special Committee on, 2569
Standard of living, 2959
Statistics, 1684
Tariff and, 2737, 2839, 3048
Reductions offset by sales tax, 3033
Taxation, 2839. *See also that title*
Sales tax, 1813, 2839, 2997
Unorganized workers, 3534
Wages, 2890, 2982. *See also* Labour
Workingman, 2982

Cotton. *See* Textiles; Treaties, French

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, Vancouver dry dock, 1002

Coulter, Dr. R. M. *See* Post Office

Courtenay Bay. *See* St. John

Craig, Mr. Charles P., qu. 204

Cranfield, Mr. W. T., publicity agent in London, 2927, 2983, 4707

Crawford, Mr., letter to Minister of Immigration, 1396

Crean, Mr. Frank J. B., resources of northern Saskatchewan, 1060

Creditors. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Credits. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Finance; Housing; Loans; Money
Agricultural. *See under this title,* Rural
Credit and industry, 626, 645, 650
Douglas credit scheme, 631
Economic problem and, 647
Farm. *See under this title,* Rural
Function and relation to industrial problems
M. (Mr. Irvine) for special com., 626
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com. 645, agreed to, 651
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) ruled out of order, 643
Improved system, 1252
Monopoly, 648, 4018, 4045
New York loan, April 1922, 2963
Prices and, 4226

Credits—*Con.*
Rural, 639, 640, 1088, 1438, 1907, 2751, 2836, 2869, 2929, 3024, 3060, 3066, 4014, 4016, 4035, 4039, 4041, 4045, 4046, 4066, 4071, 4130, 4144, 4146, 4298
Interest rates, 2962
United States, 642, 2829, 2930
United States system, 4043
Withheld, 3074

Creelman, Dr. George. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Imports of farm produce, 1426

Creosoting Industry, 1245, 3234
Creosoted piling, use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Lumber and timber, customs duty, qu. 813
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3231

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette)
Banking and Commerce Com., retirement from, 2639
Civil Service statistics, qu. 207
Resignation as leader of Progressive party, 11, 35

Crime. *See* Criminal Code; Justice, Penitentiaries

Criminal Code. *See also* Criminal Code Amdts.
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051
Board of Commerce and, 2521
Combines, 2521, 2527, 2592. *See also* Combines
Enforcement of, 4229
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Labour, right to organize, 2890
Race-track betting, 709

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills
1. Capital punishment abolition of (Mr. Irvine) 1r., 180; 1r., second time by error in order paper, 487; explanation of error, 519; opportunity for consideration, inquiry, 1810
2. Scrip frauds. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 730
3. Registration of declaration of ownership by proprietors of newspapers (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
4. Opium joints; betting information; age of consent; carnal knowledge; illegal use of badge; appeals (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1483; 2r., com., 2281; 3r., 2284; Senate amendments, 4733
5. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 616

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
6. Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1971; 2r., com., 2053; 3r., 2054

Criminal Matters, procedure, qu. 1974

Crops. *See* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade

Cross Benches. *See* McMaster

Cross Point, Que., wharf, 955

Crown Lands. *See* Lands

Crowsnest Pass Agreement, 1563, 1620. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates; Progressive Party
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
Extension, 2741

Crude Oil. *See* Oil; Petroleum

Crude Petroleum. *See* Petroleum

Cuba, trade with, 308. *See also* Steamship Services; West Indies

Cummings Cove, wharf, 945

Cunard Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Curie, Monsieur and Madame, discovery of radium, 1287

Currants. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Depreciated, 2988, 4027. *See* Money; Purchasing Power
Inflation. *See* Germany, Reparations

Currie, General Sir Arthur, directorships, 4025

Curzon, Lord, of Kedleston, signature of Italian treaty, 2403

Custodians. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation; Trade; Treaties
Average tariff rate 2838
Averages and valuation 90
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260. *See also* Liquor
British preference. *See that title*

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Canadian customs officer at New York. *See under this title,* New York
Collections
Cost of, qu. 814
For 1922, 22
Per capita, Canada and United States, 2738
Customs duties. *See also* Customs Tariff
Agricultural and animal products, qu. 1992
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
Automobiles, 2908, 3075
Collections, 1921-22 and 1922-23, 2838
Creosoted lumber and piling, qu. 813
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3272
Goods shipped from Vancouver to Halifax via Panama canal, 2615
Hemp seed, 3474
Lowering, 2221
Nursery stock, 4432
Reduction. *See* British preference; Budget; Treaties, French treaty
Tomato plants, 4432
Wool, 2866
Department
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283, 816
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4669
Employees, 3282
Estimates, 3272
Halton county officials, 914
Legal work, transfer of, 856
Medicine Hat employees, qu. 3505
Officials, salaries, etc., qu. 3892
Salaries and contingencies, 3272
Depreciated currency clause, 2988
Drawbacks, qu. 1484
Antiseptic surgical dressing, 2655
Artificial silk tops and yarns, 3489, 3896
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper in blocks or ingots, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Machinery and parts, 2655
Oil, 2655
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3503
Raw materials, qu. 1864
Imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259
Steel, coal and woollen goods, qu. 1994
Sugar, 2655
Dumping clause, 2646, 3072, 2988
Sugar, 3046
Excise. *See also* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation
Beer, qu. 518

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Beet sugar, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393. *See also* Sugar
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and beverages
Cigarettes, 2706, 2825, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 3229, 4392
Cigars and, consumption, qu. 516
516
Smuggling, 3230
Confectionery and beverage tax, revenue, qu. 624, 2644, 2656, 2707, 2979, 3046
Duties, 3026
Payment by consumer, 2839
Irritating taxes, 2858
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 1820, 2979 3927, 3937, 4435
Revenue, loss of, 1983
Taxation, 3010
Tobacco, duty collected, qu. 1259
Wines, 452, qu. 518, 1977, 2656, 2742, 3036, 3937, 4425
Canadian, 2643, 2710
Hawkesbury, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Inspectors, immigration, 1874
Marking Act, 931, qu. 616, 2988
Montreal
Customs house, and revenue 3280
Newsprint, 3046. *See also* Pulp and Paper
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272
Transfer of goods at, 3272
Printing presses, duty, 2858
Pulpwood, export tax on, 2828. *See also* Export Act
Raw materials, free, 2858
Seizures, qu. 620
Schooner Carrie L. Hirtle, qu. 3323
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 4621
Revenue, 3277
Valuation for duty, 90, 145. *See also under this title,* Customs duties
Customs Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill; Customs Tariff Items; Tariff

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill
Res. 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
Sections and subjects discussed:
British preference, discount of 10 per cent, 2650
Drawbacks, 2655
Reciprocity negotiations with United States, 2650
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Tariff changes, 2654

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
United States, duties against, reduction by order in council, 2650

Customs Tariff Items, 3454, 3895
Antiseptic surgical dressings, 2655
Artificial silk, 2645, 2820, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3069, 3075
Artificial fibre silk fabrics and, 2654, 3492
Manufactures, 2654
Tops and waste or artificial silk fibre tops and waste, 3489
Yarns, 2654, 3035, 3489
Barilla or soda ash, drawback, 2655, 3502
Beverages, 2979. *See also this title under* Customs and Excise
Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake, 2480, 2653, 3895
Boots and shoes, 2999, 3033
Boots, orthopaedic, 2654, 2750
Brass and copper scrap, 2653, 3483
Brass, iron or steel runners, rings, caps, etc. for umbrellas, 3501
Carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Casual donations, 2645, 2654
Cigarettes, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2825, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988
Coal, 2654
Anthracite and lignite, 3493
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental supplies, 2653, 3483
Cotton for manufacturers of pneumatic tires, 2654, 3487
Crude petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481
Cyanamid or lime nitrogen, 2654
Date when changes become effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 2653, 3480
Drawbacks, 3501. *See also this title* under Customs and Excise
Artificial silk tops and waste, 3896
Artificials silk yarn, filaments, etc, 3502
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper for manufacture of wire, 3503
Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Items enumerated in item 236, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Materials used in manufacture of goods enumerated in item 448c, 3503
Oil for manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502
Sugar, 2655, 3502
Dumping clause, 2535
Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony, 2653, 3034, 3481
Emery and carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Firebrick, 2653, 3035, 3481, 3896
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, hatters' tips and sides, 2654, 3500
Hemp seed, 2645, 2651, 3017
Iron or steel scrap, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Linen yarn, 3897
Liquorice in rolls and sticks, 2653, 3480
Liquorice paste, 2653, 3017, 3480
Machinery for conversion of fish waste, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Machinery not made in Canada, 2645, 2653, 2655, 3503
Malt flour, 2645, 2652, 3480
Manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk, 3492
Milk bottles, 3033
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502, 3901
Paper caps for milk bottles, 3033
Petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481. *See also* Bounties; Petroleum
Porcelain for pumps, 3033
Potatoes, 2651, 2707, 2959, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Printing and photographic presses and type-making accessories, 3486
Printing machinery, 2645, 2653, 2858
Prunes and dried plums, 2651, 3474
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 2651, qu. 2699, 2718, 2964, 2989, 3017, 3034, 3068, 3474, 3479
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474, 3479
Reciprocity with United States, 2649. *See also that title*
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Rolled iron and steel and cast steel for milling cutters, 2653, 3484
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Scrap iron, 3034
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Silks, 2645, 3046. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 2653, 3483
Staves of wood, 2654, 3487
Sticks or canes, 2654, 3501
Stumping machines, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Sugar, 2645, 2651, 2744, 2820, 2825, 2968, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3039, 3046, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping duty, 2646
Sulphate of copper, 3895
Typewriters and parts, 2653, 3485
Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, 3501

Customs Tariff Items—*Con.*
Value for home consumption, 2535
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 2645, 2653, 3487

Czecho-Slovakia
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with France, 2219

Dairy Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Accredited herds, Health of Animals

Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. Bills
1. Butter substitutes and re-manufacture of butter. Res. 2518, 3150; 1r., 3154; M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3329, 3449, agreed to, 3451; notice of M. (Mr. Carroll) for 2r., 3399, 3402
Sections and subjects discussed:
Drafting, 3325
Oleomargarine, 3325
M. anticipating, 3326
Parliamentary counsel, 3325, 3449
2. Butter standard; renovated butter; milk or cream containing fat or oil other than that of milk. Res. 3961, 4251, 1r., 4344; 2r., com., 3r., 4510
Sections and subjects discussed:
Definition, 4510
Establishment of guilt for violation of act, 4510
Minimum standard of fat in butter, 4510

Dairying Industry, 609, 1851. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Industry Act; Live Stock; Oleomargarine
Alberta, 1839
Antipodean competition, 2765
Bacteriology, 462
Butter
Adulteration, 3150
British market, in, 2863
China shipments to, 1840, 1853
Compounds, 3152
Disease germs, 3295
Exports to France, 2217, 2273. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates 1961
Fresh, shipment from Enrope, 2273
Grading, 2765, 2864, 3151, 3283, 3297
Imitations of, 3152
Imports 2821, 2959
"Manna" 3152
Oleomargarine and, 386, 3508-81. *See also* Oleomargarine
Pasteurization, 3298
Price, 2821, 3513, 3533
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Butter—*Con.*
Quality 2863
Poor, 3516
Renovated, 3151. *See also* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Restrictions, 3153
Salt, too much, 2863, 3297
Standard of fat. *See* Dairy Industry Act
Substitutes, 3150
Weight, 3151
Certified milk. *See under this title,* Milk
Cheese
Acidity and bacteria, 3297
Bacteriology 462
China, shipment to, 1853
Cold storage, 2055
Disease germs, 3295
Grading, 2765, 3283, 3295
Imports, 2959
Prices, 3295
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Cold storage, 2978. *See also that title*
Co-operative, 2764
Cow-testing, 3284, 3297
Cream
Fermented, 3151
Pasteurizing, 3283
Dairy branch estimates, 609, 3283
Dairy cattle testing, 1307. *See also* Live Stock, Accredited herds
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Finch, combined cheese and butter factory, 3284, 3297
French treaty and, 1984
Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, 457, 2769
Leitch, Prof., evidence before Agricultural Conditions Com., 1843
Losses on cheese and butter, 2934
Markets, 2863
Milk
Certified, 3300
Fat or oil content. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Filled milk, 3152
Fraser Valley Association, 4265
Pasteurizing, 3283
Price of, 2559
Products, imports, qu. 617
Sale of in Toronto, 2731
Supply, monopolies and combines. *See* Combines bill
Modern methods, 2765
Montreal cold storage plant, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage
National Dairy Council of Canada, oleomargarine, 3269

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Products, grading, 2864
Representative in Great Britain, 3297
Research laboratory, 3297
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs., trip to New Zealand, 3283, 3288
Supplies, comparison of prices, 2740
Testing system, extension of, 3284
Unprofitable herds, 2863
Value of, 2863
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, 4266
Whey, disease germs, 3299

Daly Building. *See* Public Buildings, Ottawa

Damage to Mortgaged Premises. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Canada's participation in war, 1536
Canadian National railways,, doctors, 814
Grand Trunk arbitration, 1307
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Newspapers and printing companies, 2298

Dartmouth, N.S. pier and dredging, 4568

Davidson Commission. *See* War

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Canadian National railways branch lines, 4195, 4323
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1051
Oliver-St. Paul branch line railway, 4323
Western provinces, treatment of, 4195
Wheat prices, 1886

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., deputy Governor General, 1809

Dawson, Mr. F. G., Prince Rupert. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Daylight Saving
Farmers and, 1427
Montreal post office, qu. 3143
Ottawa, qu. 2612
Parliament, departments and, qu. 2612

Deadman's Island, qu. 1362

Death Rate, 1197

Debates, Official. *See* House of Commons

Debt. *See also* Public Debt; Taxation
Capital levy, 2743
Domestic, 1343
Farmers and, 2768
Federal, provincial and municipal, per capita, 2720, 2721

Debt—*Con.*
Held in foreign countries, 1406
Immigration and. *See* Immigration
Outside of Canada, estimated, 2720
Pyramiding of, 2728
Readjustment of, 2981

Debtor. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Deceased Husband's Brother, Marriage with, Bill—Mr. McMaster, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Deceased Members, tributes to memory. *See* House of Commons

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3538

Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Deep Waterways. *See* St. Lawrence

Defeat of Government Motion. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Defence. *See* National Defence

Deficits. *See* speeches on Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Deflation. *See* Credit; Finance; Money; Prices; Purchasing Power

Delay in British Mails. *See* Post Office

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Grondines wharf, 968
Valcartier camp ground, qu. 2298

Demers, Mr. Amedee, mail contractor, qu. 1868

Democracy, Senate and. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Budget, 3038; sectional and local interests; tribute to Finance Minister, "the man of the hour"; Liberal and Conservative administrations; Conscription Act; extravagance in the name of freedom and civilization; change of government; improvement in financial situation; railway and shipping deficits; balanced budget; taxation, relief from; sales tax; income tax; exemption for children; taxation of dividends; unity of property; confidence in government; amendment, 3038

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration
Labour and, 1196
Policy, 1196
Montreal post office,
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
Waste paper, disposal, qu. 1028

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1519
Private members' days, 1158
Senate, M. for elective, 1364

Denmark
Bacon competition, 2864, 2865
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3296, 3515
Hog grading, 591
Immigration from, 1096
Land settlement policy, 1406
Oleomargarine, 3515, 3559
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Dennis, Mr. J. S. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Dentists, narcotic drugs for. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act

Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Act. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed mothers

Deportation. *See* Chinese Immigration bill; Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Narcotic Drugs

Depression, causes of, 2747. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration

Deputy Local Judges. *See* Admiralty Act

Deputy Ministers
Appointment of, 1805
Conference and report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Responsibility of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Retirement and superannuation, 891, 1822-5, qu. 3135, 3342
Salaries, increase, 4557, 4667

Deputy Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Rulings and statements. *See also* Marcil; Speaker

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Amendments
Form of, 65-66
Varying nature of grant, 4371
Bills
Amendments
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 3888
Proposed in committee, 4371
General argument not permissible on particular clause, 4063, 4073, 4244
Not printed, proceeding, 3968, 3974, 3976
Reading clauses, marginal notes sufficient, 3974
Relevancy, 3238, 3863, 4371
Chair
Criticism of, 2412, 4720
To be addressed, 897
Committee
Anticipation of clause, 4071
Items declared carried, 4704
Relevancy
General discussion permissible, 2414
Newspapers, reading from, 2412
Speeches in, 2137, 2309, 2342, 2414, 2481, 2482, 2624, 2664, 3239, 4025, 4051, 4054, 4058, 4063, 4074, 4191, 4374, 4534
Special, action not reviewable by Committee of Whole 4074
Conversation 4528, 4572, 4581
Debate
Interruptions, 4064
Mover closes, 657, 2602, 4361, 4363
Reference to matter sub judice, 3371
Relevancy, 1407, 1420, 2137, 4025
Debates, Official Report, 1638
Insertion of documents not read, 3174, 3789
Undiscussed item in supply, omission, 1638, 3285, 3292
Estimates, consideration en bloc, 4559, 4614, 4616
Interruptions, cannot prevent if member speaking does not object, 4192
Language, 4238, 4244
Letter reflecting on proceedings of House, 4060
Matters sub-judice, 3371
Member
May ask question but not make speech, 2774
Must confine remarks to section under discussion, 4244
Reflection on 4239
Speaking, not compelled to answer question, 1125, 4064

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Speaking not to be interrupted, 1420
Motions
Amendments, 245
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 4720
Discussion allowed pending decision, 316
To be in writing, 866
To increase taxation 3935, 3936, 3937
Orders of the day
Explanation in detail not in order, 2255
Reading letters 2254
Questions
Already answered, 3913
Irrelevant 2624, 3863
Supply
General discussion not permissible, 4559
Items
Agricultural Instruction grant, 3285
Classification of, 3287
Consideration en bloc, 4612
Minister not required to give information twice, 3386
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Reconsideration of item by unanimous consent, 609
Relevancy, 486, 594, 608, 778, 888, 898, 1014, 1846, 1902, 2154, 3197, 3250, 3253, 3291, 3293, 3371, 3424, 4558, 4559, 4562, 4566, 4602, 4688, 4699, 4719
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3285, 3292, 3293, 3294
Urgency, 4731

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries, Wrecks

Desbarats, Mr. G. J. *See* National Defence

Descente des femmes, Que. wharf, 955

Descoteaux, Mr. J. F. (Nicolet)
Introduced, 2837

Desertions
Canadian Air Force, 2418
Seamen. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Designs. *See* Trade Marks and Designs Act

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Cedar Rapids power, 659
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 379
Electric power, export of, M., 658
Emigration to the United States, 1241
Gaspe, natural resources, 1242
Immigration
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Domestic servants, 1243
Labour, attitude towards, 1241

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1243
Policy, 1241
United States from, 1243
Labour, unemployment, 1242
Metagen analysis of, qu. 1867
Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912
Montreal
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Public Works, chief architect's branch, qu. 2517
Wheat shipments to Montreal, qu. 385

Despatches. *See* Near East Crisis

Destructive Insects and Pests. *See also* Insect Pests
Administration of Act, 595, 3988

Detroit River, regulation of traffic, 3357

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1546
Canadian products, duty of Canadians to purchase, 1244
Coal production in British Columbia, 1244
Creosoting industry, 1245
Emigration to the United States, 1244
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4353
Free trade, effect of, 1246
Fuel oil importations, 1245
Fuel supply, 1247
Hemp bounty bill, 4390
Hindu franchise, 4661
Immigration
Oriental, 1247
Policy, 1244
Imperial Conference, 4661
Lumber industry of British Columbia, 1245
Nanaimo and Victoria harbours, 1014
Port Renfrew wharf, 1008
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4353
Reciprocity, 1246
Tariff equal to that of United States, 1246
Western provinces, conditions in, 1246

Digby, N.S.
Dredging, 4568
Pier, 942

Direct Importation. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Directory of government offices, qu. 2085

Disability Cases. *See* Pensions

Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. for Supply, 2347, neg, on div. 2391

Disallowance of Provincial Legislation. *See* Jurisdiction; Legislation

Disarmament. *See also* Great Lakes
Conference at Washington, 2911, 4000

Discrimination. *See* Freight Rates; Railway Act Amdt. bill

Diseases. *See* Health
Cattle, of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Dismissals. *See* Civil Service; Post Office,

Distressed Canadians. *See* Relief

Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Marine

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorces
Number granted, qu. 622
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971

Dockages. *See* Grain; Elevators

Doctors. *See also* Health; Military Hospitals; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Canadian National railways, qu. 814
Charges and standards of living, 2813
Indians, medical service, 2160
Medical and scientific discoveries. *See* Banting; Medical Research; Scientific Research
Narcotic drugs. *See that title*

Doherty, Mr Manning, cattle embargo removal, 2871

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization Act, 2447, 2463-65
Payments to, 1154
Pension, qu. 1029

Doherty Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill

Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, Ont., 3433

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants. *See* Immigration; Labour

Dominion Archives. *See* Public Archives

Dominion Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. *See* Interior

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420

Dominion Cotton Mills. *See* Textiles

Dominion Elections Act. *See also* Elections; Proportional Representation
Amendments, inquiry as to, 1027
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways, Express

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See also* Forests and Forestry
(Description of areas 1r., 1256; 2r., com., 2060; 3r., 2086

Dominion Fuel Board. *See* Fuel Supply

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, industrial disputes, 1703

Dominion Lands. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands Act; Dominion Lands and Parks; Lands
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Drainage. *See under this title,* Reclamation
Free land available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Grants to railways, 1353
Grazing lands, 3424
Leases, sale of, 3424
Homesteads. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Patents in event of death or insanity, 3398
Pre-emption and purchases, qu. 1030
Reversion to Dominion government, 3257
Second. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
In southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Valuation and revision of, 3398
Homesteaders, relief, 3447
Hudson Bay railway, land sales, 1053, 1068
Indian title, extinguishment of, 3398
Interest rates on deferred payments, 1088-9
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 1031
Allocation to Hudson Bay railway, 1353, qu. 2393
Reclamation, 3257, 3428, 3430. *See also* Irrigation

Dominion Lands—*Con.*
Reclamation—*Con.*
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Carrot river district, 3431
Kootenay flats, 3431
Lesser Slave lake, 3430
Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Moose range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
Waterhen lake district, 3431, qu. 4303
School lands, 3398, 4202
Balance due on purchase price, 1385, 1389. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.
Reversion of, 3445
Southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Timber, permit to cut, 203, 3398
Unorganized districts, 3258

Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bills
1. Coal lands and mining rights, 1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3149; 3r., 3150
2. Homestead valuations; second homesteads; issue of patents in event of death or insanity; school lands; permits to cut timber; extinguishment of Indian titles. Res. 3398, 3982; 1r., 2r., com., 3983; com., 4201, 4364; 3r., 4369

Sections and subjects discussed
Governor in Council may authorize inquiry, 4206
Issue of patent after death of applicant, 4202
Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane, 4202
No employee to purchase Dominion lands, 4206
Sections set apart as school lands, 4202
Terms of payment for school lands, 4202
Timber limits, areas, 4206
Transfer to another homestead, 4202, 4364

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3938, 4702. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Appointments, 3252
Cloakey, Mr., 3254
May, Mr., 3254
Drainage, 3257
Moose Range, qu, 3144, 3259
Unorganized districts, 3258
Dwight, Mr. T. W., allowance, 4702
Estimates, 3406
Expenditure, 113
Forest reserves, roads and bridges, 1014
Fortier, Mrs. F. T. E., allowance, 4702
Homesteads, 3251
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Outside salaries, 3249
Rocky Mountain park
Claim of Hudson Bay company, qu. 2418
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Dominion Lands and Parks—*Con.*
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Unorganized districts, improvement, 3256
Wainwright buffalo reserve, 3407. *See also* Buffalo

Dominion Marine Association. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Power Board. *See* Water Powers

Dominion Textile Company. *See* Textiles

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B. *See* Public Archives

Douglas Credit Scheme. *See* Credits

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Downie, Mr. Donald. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Drain Tiles. *See* Taxation, Sales Tax

Drainage. *See* Dominion Lands, Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M. *See* Printing Bureau, King's Printer

Drawbacks. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 153. Speech of Mr. Meighen, 153, 154; sales tax; New York loans, 154-155; direct increase of Canada's obligations; surplus of previous years; railway expenditure, 155; Sir Henry Thornton and the railways; National railway board, 156; Intercolonial railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, 157; Lanark election; domestic loan, 158; cost of placing loans in New York, 158-159; commissions on loans; increase in public expenditure, 159-160; Mr. Shaw's amendment, 160
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Department, salaries and contingencies, 610
Annuities, old age, 1696, 1698
Artificial silk industry, 2659, 2703, 2853. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Auditor General, vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4674
Automobile insurance, 3978
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314
Bank draft tax, 3925, 3928
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. 3097-3125, 3209-3222
Beet sugar duty, 2657, 2706, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597 4608
Board of Audit Act, 4355
Botany yarn duty, 3896
British Empire exhibition, 1910, 3949
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3458
Woollen goods, 3459
Budget
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1868 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Protective feature, 3468
Speech, 2657; congratulations to the Minister of Finance; Mr. Fielding's 17th budget; cigarette tax; beet sugar tax; French treaty; raisins and dried currants; tariff stability; United States prosperity, 2657; Canada, condition and prospects; financial situation; railways; debt; deficits; estimates for 1923-24; taxation, 2658; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty, 2659; trade and industry, 2701; comparison with other countries, finances; debt and deficits; budget; tariff, changes in; free trade, 2702; tariff stability; artificial silk industry; copper rods and bars, 2703; hemp bounty; silk; sales tax; cost of living, 2704; receipt tax, 2705; luxuries; cheque tax; income tax; cigarette tax; beet root sugar, 2706; confectionery and beverages; reciprocity with United States; potatoes, duty on; imports and exports, 2707; imports of agricultural products; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2708; copper bounty; hemp bounty; revenue and expenditure; deficits, 2709; French treaty; taxation of necessities instead of luxuries; political budget; government supporters appointed to Senate and Bench; jobs for political supporters; shipping rates; royal commissions, 2710; timber famine; amendment, opportunity for Progressive party to move, 2711
Reference to, 3074
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3439
Business of the House, 3127
Adjournments at 11 p.m., 1360
Bills, principle, on second reading, 3091

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Motion to increase taxation, 3936
Private members' day, 1161
Supply
Calling of, 2295
Undiscussed items not in official report, 3285
Business Profits War Tax bill, 4440, 4489
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada, constitutional development, 4466
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3146
Distressed seamen, 3969
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3814
Advances, 3814, 3824
Coal-carrying trade, 3826
Construction, 3814
Deficit, 3815
Sale of vessels, 3705, 3822
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3817
Canadian National Institute for blind, 694
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3441
Canadian National railways
Advances
$1,550,000, 4692
$73,000,000, 3789
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Col., reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-44
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4329, 4399
Finance, 4319, 4329
Comparison of votes, 1922 and 1923, 3702
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Deficits, 2658
Directors, Talbot, Col. O., 2004, 4525
Grand Trunk
Amalgamation, 56
Ocean ports, 1762
United States terminals, 815
Insurance of mortgaged premises, bill, 2048, 2107
Items, opportunity to discuss, 3703
Management, responsibility and powers, 3616, 3624
Ocean ports, 1759
Operating deficits, 3701
Orders in council, 815
Paris offices, 3611, 3660, 3683, 3701
Pre-audit, 3701
Robb, Mr., 2472
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Securities bill, 4515
Amdt. to refer back, neg. 4732

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Canadian National railways—*Con.*
Summary and allocation of vote, 3798
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, responsibility and powers, 3617, 3624
Toronto
Office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Viaduct and union station, 4445
Canadian ports, use of by United States fishermen, 3906
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Cheque tax, qu. 282, 332, 2706, 3925, 4409, 4423
Amendment, 3933
Enforcement, qu. 492
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Cigarettes
Consumption of, qu. 516
Duty, 2706, 3229, 4393
Civil government estimates, form of, 668
Civil Service, 1811
Bonus, 1811
Commission
Postmasters, appointments, 1821, 1823, 1827
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 350
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement bill, 3146
Combines bill, 2621-38, 2660-65
Civil Service Act appointments, 2662
Commissioners, appointments, 2627
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Coal, reported discovery in Ontario, 2512
Commercial union, 3906
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949, 4670
Confectionery and beverages, tax, qu. 624, 2707
Copper bounty, 2709, 3234, 4375
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287, 2288
Cory, Mr. W. W., Deputy Minister of the Interior, salary, 4667
Cost of living, Prof, Michell, figures, 1700
Credits, function, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 4408
Customs Tariff items
Artificial silk, 3489
Manufactures, 3492
Tops and waste of artificial fibre silk, 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Brass, iron or steel parts for umbrellas, 3501

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff items—*Con.*
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental purposes, 3483
Coverings and containers, 3501
Crude petroleum, 3481
Date when changes became effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Firebrick, 3482
Liquorice paste, 3480
Malt flour duty, 3480
Printing and lithographic presses, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 3477
Rolled iron and steel hoops, etc, 3484
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Wool, botany yarn, 3489
Deputy ministers, salaries
Deputy Minister of Finance, 4670
Increase in, 4667
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3988
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill (Coal lands) 3149
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3249
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dominion Power board, 3427
Dredging by government dredges, 4569, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt., 3980
Electric power, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 662
Emigration to the United States, 691, 2400
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Estimates
Arrangement of, 610, 668, 1468, 3242
Civil government, form of, 668
Discussion en bloc, 4559, 4588
Supplementary, time of presentation, 4554
Exchequer court judgeship, 2501
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927, 3938
Exhibitions, 1455
Collection of exhibits, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Experimental farms, 456
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
External Affairs department, salaries, 3897
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4406

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Finance department, charges of management, 3987
France, exports and imports, 2004. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1960, 2852
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1959
French treaty, 443, 456, 2002, 2255, 2299-2303
Agricultural imports, 445
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Border states, agreements and concessions, 2219, 2273, 2395
Brandies and wines, 444, 3478
French brandy, Scotch and Canadian whiskies, 3478
Bronze powder, 2002, 2006, 2270
Competition with United States, 443
Embroideries, 2008
Favoured nation, 443, 2271
Luxuries, 444
Sales tax, 2279, 2280, 2299
Silks and silk manufactures, 2255, 2264, 2300, 2397
Treaty of 1907, 2004
United States trade with France, 2277
Velvets, velveteens, etc. 3488
Wines, duty, 438, 444, 3478
Wool, 447
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 2105, 3150
Fuel supply, 802
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Government publications, 811, 1712
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Grain inquiry commission, appeal, 1210
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Halifax
Exodus from, 2400
Grain elevator, 4713
Historic events, grants for celebration, 4705
Harbours and rivers
Engineers' reports, 4571
Nova Scotia, 4562
Morrison claim, 4573, 4722
Ontario, 4589
Prince Edward island, 4587
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
"Hector" celebration, 4705
Hemp bounty, 2659, 2704, 2709, 3912
Highways, Ontario, cost of, 2490, 2493
Hoppe leases, 3128
Housing, loans to provinces, 4705
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4686-9
Icebreakers and steamers, 3160

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Immigration
Advertising, qu. 518, 1103
Black, Mr. W. J., 2084
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Salvation army and, 1093
Chinese, 1445, 1447, 2309
Detailed information, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 667, 1096, 1473, 1480
Estimates, arrangement of, 1468
Medical inspection, 702
Ratio of British to foreign, 1105
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement, 2795
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4495
Indians, 2124
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1361
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4393
Cigarettes and beet sugar duties, 3229
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Insulin, patenting of, 2077
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3147, 3978
Interim supply bills, 1482, 3705
Interior department, salaries, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, survey, 3247
International bridge at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2400, 2437
Concessions to border states, 2395
Consideration postponed, 2304
Jugo-Slavia, 2396
Silks, 2397
Johnston, Mr. Alex, salary increase, 4668
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Labour, strikes in, 1922, 495, 815
Lake Grain Rates commission, 4710
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, 3989
Linen yarn duty, 3897
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4576
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Marketing of imported goods, qu. 616, 931
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3317

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Marshall, Mr. Duncan—*Con.*
Salary, 608
Visit to Great Britain, 4675
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, speech in North Essex, 670
Michigan Central bridge, sales tax, qu. 1257
Military hospitals, 670
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975, 3977
Mines and Geological Survey
Estimates, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse, 4573, 4722
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 3149.
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2107, 2437
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3281
Newspaper postage, 4528
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4483
Nova Scotia
Disallowance of provincial legislation, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Miners' strike, 914
Northwest Territories Act, 270
Ontario legal fees, 1155
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2114, 3149
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Parliament buildings, 1716, 1719
Estimates, M. to reduce, 1727
Members' rooms, allocation, 1729
Tower, completion of, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Patents of Invention bill, 2064, 2071, 2083, 2088, 2102
Commissioner, powers of, 2065
Penitentiaries, 706
Pensions
Commissioners, 685
Federal appeal board and district boards of review, 403
Royal commission, expenses, 691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Petroleum bounties, 3921, 4392
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Postage stamps, use for revenue purposes, 1815, 3927, 3938
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Post Office department
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1822
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Postmaster General, illness, absence, 1821
Postmasters, appointment of, 1821-1827

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Post Office department—*Con.*
List of appointments, 1830
Revenue not connected with service, 1815
Rural mail service, Anderson, Mr., 1821
Prince Edward island, terminals claim, 4676
Printing bureau
New building, 1731
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Promissory notes tax, 3925
Provincial rights, bankruptcy, 3097
Public expenditure, 2658
Total $548,750,714, 4554
Public works estimates, 4554
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Purchasing Commission, 3950, 4002, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, 2285, 3337
Railway and shipping strikes, 245
Railway statistics, 207
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2705, 3934, 4423
Revision, 4409
Reciprocity with United States, 2707, 2708
Offer to negotiate, 3906
Redistribution, delay, 2400
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers, emigration, 691
Riordan Company, business tax, 4490
Rural credits, 645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
St. Lawrence river waterway, 663, 3427
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3339
Sales tax, qu. 281, 2704, 4409. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Collections, qu. 938
Exemptions, qu. 491, qu. 708
Imports, 4411
International bridge, Niagara Falls, material, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Jobber and retailer, 4411
Magazines and periodicals, 4416
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 919
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Senate, elective, M. (Mr. Denis) 1369
Shale deposits, maritime provinces, 2513
Silk. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk; Customs Tariff items; French treaty
Industry in Canada, 2397
Prices, 2397-2400
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference, 3012
Soldier Settlement Board; estimates, 1910
Soldiers, vocational training, 686
Spain, trade with, 2397

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4409. *See also under this title,* Sales tax
Steamship services, 4701
Tariff commission evidence, 2296
Tariff weapon, 3477. *See also* French Treaty
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Receipt tax; Sales tax
Direct results, qu. 281
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3963
Tinplate, 2400
Toronto
Canadian National railways office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Customs house, 3278
Harbour improvements, 4610
Union station, 4325, 4450
Viaduct, 4306, 4325, 4445, 4450
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2293
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270, 2301
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Signing of, 4466
With France and Italy, 9. *See also under this title,* French; Italian
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Unemployment relief, 689
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Tariff and emigration, 1092
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3234
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4726
War claims, adjustment, 2495, 2497, 2501
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3761
West Ukrainian republic, 657
Wheat shipments, Quebec, qu. 3820
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Excise tax on, 3937
Woollen imports, 3469
Woollen industry, protection, 931
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4682
Hudson Bay railway, 1062

Dredges and Dredging. *See* Harbours and Rivers; Marine and Fisheries; Public Works

Drugs. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Opium
Importation of. *See* Narcotic Drugs
Metagen, analysis of, qu. 1867
Scopolamin, 4647

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 2973; tariff; marking of woollen goods; protection fundamentally wrong; congratulations to Finance Minister; budget, violation of election pledges, 2973; tariff issue from 1878 to 1896; appropriation of protective policy by Liberals; Mr. Euler's statement on political platforms; political honour in jeopardy; Prime Minister's pre-election promises conditions unchanged and grievances unredressed; Conservative party, violation of pledges; Mr. Meighen on agricultural implement duties, 2974; "ramparts of gold"; duty increased by increase of price; protection and home markets; agricultural implement industry; duty payment of $265.80 per employee, 2975; Canadian National railways hotel deficits; Progressive party a "menacing enemy"; reasons for agricultural organizations, 2976
Sales tax on Union Jack, 4514
Woollen industry, protection, M. 928, 2973

Drury Government, expenditure and debt, 2824

Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 384, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705

Dry Docks
Esquimalt, 2671, 2682
Kingston, 4563
Vancouver and Victoria, 1002

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt Bill
(Ninety per cent of subsidy payable when seventy-five per cent of work completed). Res 3583, 3979; 1r., 2r., com., 3979; 3r., 3981

Dual Citizenship. *See* Naturalization

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address, 108. The late Hon. Mr. Kennedy; necessity for economy, 108; amendments of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hoey; the public debt, expenditure at Halifax and St. John, 109; Quebec and Toronto ports, expenditure; Pacific coast ports; naval expenditure during war, 110; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; immigration and emigration; railway freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement, 111-112; maritime provinces suffering by reason of high freight rates; United States tariff; tariff on fish, 112; national expendi-

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ture, necessity for reduction in militia estimate, 113; loan to Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 113-114; Purchasing Commission; international boat race, 114; votes for agriculture; Hudson Bay railway, 115; Mr. Meighen and the tariff, 116
Agriculture, expenditure on, 115, 117
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4158
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1542
Salmon canner's licenses, 1547
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coasting regulations, 4235
Distressed seamen, 3970
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 111
Advances, 113, 3377, 3799
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3396
Operating deficit, 3843
Sale of vessels, 3813
West Indies, trade, 3387, 3808
Fish and fisheries
French treaty, canned fish, 452
Sardine fishery, 2518
Tariff on fish, 2518
Trout fishing season, 1686
Grondines wharf, 960
Halibut fishery treaty, signing of, 858
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 942
Hudson Bay railway, 115
M. (Mr. Knox) 1042
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4223-34, 4283, 4293
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3352
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Marine and Fisheries
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Deputy minister's salary, 3373
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Naval service, 905
Royal Canadian Volunteer reserve, 2897
Royal Canadian navy, 905
Nova Scotia
Harbours and rivers, 942
Miners' strike, use of troops, 897
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
Steamship services.
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that head under this title*
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3387
Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Thornton, Sir Henry, director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3845
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trout-fishing season, 1686

Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations to, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Dun, R. G. & Co., cost of living, 1812

Duncan, Mr. M. R. (North Grey)
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283
Malone, Late Lieut-Col. W. P., qu. 206
P. C. 1053, qu. 516

Duncan, Mr. Walter, 1140

Dunning, Premier of Saskatchewan
Budget, 2872

Duties. *See* Customs

East, crisis in. *See* Near East Crisis

East Edmonton District
Res. on immigration, 81
United Farmers of Alberta, 107

East Templeton, Que., wharf, 955

Easter adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Galicia. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Eastern Lands Development Company, 626, 1635

Eastern Situation. *See* Near East Crisis

Eaton, T. Company
Comparison of prices with Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, 2739, 2742

Economic Conditions, 1238, 1250, 1393. *See also* Agriculture, Agricultural Conditions; Banks and Banking; speeches on Address, and Budget
Canadian affected by European, 3003
Cost of living and, 1684, 1811-14. *See also that title*
Cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Economic group organizations, 3002
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Immigration and, 1231. *See also that title*
Improvement, 3055
Effected by railways, 1566
Tariff, 3053
Wealth, production of, 1856
Western provinces, 1883. *See also that title*

Economic Conference. *See* Imperial Economic Conference

Economy. *See* Government; Immigration; Public Expenditure

Editorial Committee
Abolition, 1714
Cost, 1669
King's Printer, 1669
Members of, and staff, 1675
Publications, unnecessary duplication, 1714
Saving effected by, 1670
French publications, 1670
Translation and printing, 1489

Edmonton. *See also* East Edmonton
Board of Trade res. on coal duty, 1275
Grain elevator, 4716
Indian school, 2149, 2164-5
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Post Office, theft of $50,000 from, 1142
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506

Edmundston, N.B.
Bridge, 1014, 2342, 4589
Public building, 4613

Education. *See also* Schools; Universities
Capitalistic control of educational agencies, 2725
Cost of, 2732
Foreigners, opportunities, 1885
Indians. *See that title.*
International Scholarships, 878
Jurisdiction, 882, 1884-5
Opportunities, 2831
School lands. *See also* Dominion Lands
Schools closed on account of financial stringency, 1202
Technical Education Act, 1637

Eggs
Egg-grading plants. *See* Live Stock Acts
Freight rates, 1962
French treaty, export, 1978
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
From United States, 2708, 2821
Inspector, Yukon territory, qu. 2516
Prices, 1841, 1851, 1852

Egypt, British policy in, 4662

Eight Hour Day. *See* Labour

Elections. *See also* Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation
By-elections. *See also* House of Commons
Grenville, 4606
Handwriting on the wall, 2981

Elections—*Con.*
By-elections—*Con.*
Lanark, 157
Moose Jaw
Certificate of Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Oleomargarine, 3526
Reported statement, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 1686, 2774, 4683
North Essex, 2013, 2469, 4594, 4606
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2013, 2245
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr.
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2245
Visit to Belle River, 4594
Election of 1896, 3014
Election of 1921. *See also* Liberal Party
King, Right Hon. Mackenzie, speeches, 3047
Policy proclaimed but forgotten, 1426
Statements and prophecies, 1658
Violation of election pledges, 2973, 3189
Multi-member constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation
Ontario. *See also* Ontario
Issue in, 1420
Proportional representation. *See that title*
Revelstoke and Nelson, bribery, 2941

Elective Senate. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Electoral Reforms. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Lines, sale of. See Canadian National Railways

Electric Power. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Exportation to United States, 1266
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 658, withdrawn, 666
Export duty, 2828
Power development, St. Lawrence river. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal

Electricity
Electrical apparatus, import. *See* French Treaty
House heating by, 3425

Electrification. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Elevators. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Elliott, Mr. Preston (Dundas)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3523

Elliott, Mr. William (Waterloo)
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Rural mail carriers, qu. 1259, 1783
Sales tax, 4422
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207

Elmira-Souris railway, 129

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Cattle

Emigration. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration
Doukhobors, 43
Emigration to the United States, 21, 67, 77, 628, 637, 1082, 1093, 1109, 1113, 1128, 1165, 1173, 1178, 1188, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1235, 1241, 1244, 1253, 1319, 1322, 1330, 1338, 1389, 1392, 1403, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1439, 1845, 1888, 1892, 2400, 2650, 2715, 2743, 2822, 2929, 2970, 3191, 4064. *See also* Taxation
American publications, effect on, 831
Canadians returning, 2743
Causes, 2747, 3004
Climate, 2747
Cost of living, 2790. *See also that title*
Economic conditions, 2727
Taxation, 1319, 2709, 2747
Unemployment and, 1657
Figures, 1917-22, 1093
Halifax, exodus from, 2400
Information bureau to ascertain reason for, 2932
Labouring people, 2727. *See also* Labour
Lumber camps from, to New England States, 1125
Montreal, from, 2216, 2790
Returned soldiers, 691
Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1188
Skilled workmen, 2823
Montreal, from, 2790
Tariff and, 2737. *See also* speeches on Budget
University graduates, 2732
Windsor, Canadians crossing border, 1431
Winnipeg, from, 1975
Winnipeg Free Press, statement, 2790
Young men, 2816
Mennonites, 43, 1239, 1341, 1884
Mexico, to, 1229

Empire Day Ajournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Empire Forestry Conference, 3410

Empire Settlement Scheme. *See* Immigration

Employers' Liability Compensation

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Alien Property. *See* Aliens

Enemy Aliens. *See this title under* Aliens

Engineering Standards. *See* Canadian Engineering

England. *See* Great Britain

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Equalization of Railway Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Eskimos, Trial of. *See* Justice

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt
Dry dock, 2671
Graving dock, 2682
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634

Essex By-Election. *See* Elections, North Essex

Estevan Board of Trade, Hudson Bay railway, 1079

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply
For departments, *see their titles*
Appropriations for railway subsidies, 4521
"Appropriations not required" 1656
Arrangement of, 1468
Canadian National railway expenditure, 4304
Civil government, form of, 610, 668, 780
Discussion
En bloc, 4554, 4558, 4612, 4587
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614, 4615
Expenditure provided for, 4554
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations
Maturing, 1753
To be incurred, 1753
One-sixth vote for 1923-4, 1482, 1538
Preparation, 2756, 3242
Supplementary
For 1923-4, 1359, 1659, 4536
Further supplementary, 4392, 4536
Lack of information, 4576, 4577
Time of presentation, 4554, 4577, 4594, 4601, 4703, 4420, 4422
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report, 3284

Euclid Hall. *See* Military Hospitals

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2852. Congratulations to Finance Minister; a unique record; criticism of budget; national viewpoint; Canada a hard country to govern; diversified interests make compromise necessary; Liberal tariff platform of 1919, 2852; little confidence in political platforms; artificial and natural silk industries; taxation of luxuries; speech of Mr. Forke; tariff stability; opinion of Mr. H. W. Wood, Alberta; dependence of industry upon agriculture, 2853; difficulties of manufacturers; free trade not possible; tariff for revenue and protection; effect upon consumer; amendment; free trade with England; British preference; reciprocity; charge that government has done nothing for the farmer; Crowsnest pass agreement 2854; claim of Progressives that they forced concession; the two old parties; "holier than thou" attitude of some members; allegation that parties take orders from big interests, 2855; no election contributions; leader of the Government; speech on budget, in 1921; moderate tariff; lack of markets; United States markets, competition of Canadian manufacturers in; United States tariff against Canadian goods, 2856; revenue; tariff reduction; taxation; Canadian farmer a free trader; United States farmer a protectionist; Wheat Board; free trade in raw materials; importance of tariff question magnified; income and luxury taxes, economy; Civil Service; taxation rescinded; system should be carefully worked out; stamp tax; receipt tax; irritating excise tax; cheque tax, 2858; difficulties of collection; public irritation and inconvenience; basic methods of taxation; tariff, income and turnover; sales tax; Canadian National railways; public ownership; revaluation, 2859
Budget speech, reference to, 3070
Buttons, importation, 2214
Canadian National railways
Fixed charges, qu. 708
Public ownership, 2859
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 373
Eastern Canada, conditions, 1222
Free trade, 2466, 2858

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Immigration
Policy, 1220
Attitude of labour towards, 1224
Labour Gazette, 1627
Liberal platform of 1919, 2852, 3019
Repudiation of, 2994, 3019
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2190, 2444-67
Denaturalization, 2465
Judges, 2466
Nationality, dual, 2444, 2464
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3521
Political platforms, 2853, 2974, 2991
Reference to, 2852, 2974
Sales tax, raw materials, 4421
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4421
Tariff and immigration, 1222
Western provinces, conditions in, 1221

Europe. *See also* Immigration
Agricultural products, inability to buy, 3004
Coal supplies, 1263
Conditions
Chaotic, 2748
Economic, 3003
Unsettled, 3052
Purchasing power, decrease, 1859
Southeastern, immigration from, 1195
Wheat prices, 3004

European War. *See* Pensions; War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address in reply, 144. Agriculture the basis of national prosperity; tariff system, 144; anti-combine legislation; customs, valuation for duty, 145; the Tariff Act; protection on flour, 146; dissatisfaction with economic situation in West; British Columbia apples, handling of, 147; class legislation; embargo on cattle, 148; automobiles in Saskatchewan; Crowsnest pass agreement and freight rates, 149
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4046, 4137
Bounties, principle of, 3242
British preference, direct importation, 3457
Budget, 3067. Trade issue; secession talk, 3067; abandonment of free trade by Liberal party; speech of Prime Minister; tariff stability; taxation, burden of; capital; theory and method; venerable protectionist arguments; prices of manufactured and agricultural products; British preference; Canadian ports; 3068; raisins and currants duty; artificial silk duty; copper

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
bounty; sugar duty; permanent tariff commission; "scientific" tariff protection; class privilege; taxation, passing on; farm products and world conditions; United States farmers and Fordney tariff, 3069; Progressive party, criticism of; discrimination between city and rural dwellers; rural mail carriers remuneration; speech of Mr. Euler; concessions to manufacturers; old parties and big interests; Sir Richard Cartwright on protection; protection, money and moral cost of, 3070; political corruption; legalized robbery; Goldwin Smith; farming methods; paternalism; "Canada for the Canadians;" interest of common people in government, 3071; free trade England; tariff and deficit of Canadian Government Merchant Marine; exodus to other countries; British national debt decreasing, Canadian national debt increasing; bonussed industries; tariff inconsistencies; dumping clause; revenue; combines, 3072; taxation; co-operative purchasing and selling; cost of living; income tax; inheritance tax; luxuries, taxation of; economy; inopportune expenditures; Welland canal; "blind selfishness;" Hudson Bay railway, 3073; Canada hard country to govern; independence not vital; newspaper control; confidence destroyed; class privilege, 3074
Canada Grain Act, administration, 786
Canadian Pacific freight rates and dividends, 1134
Combines bill, 2533
Consumption of intoxicants, qu. 285
Copper bounty, 3069, 3242, 4371
Deportation of British soldier, 2254
Esquimalt navy yard, qu. 1634
Experimental farms, 4632
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4346
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Freight rates, increase, 1134
Geodetic survey, 3245
Grain dockages and screenings, 786
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 941
Hemp bounty bill, 4381, 4384
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Hudson Bay railway lands, qu, 2393
Immigration policy, 1133
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Income tax, 4501
Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Indians, 2145, 2147
Reserves, grain production, qu. 1139
Iron and steel bounties, 4381
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4293
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837, 841
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 295
Oleomargarine, import of materials, qu. 3505
Pulpwood, export of, 4346
Qu'Appelle-Battleford telegraph line, 1017
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 744
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3069, 3476
Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 3070, 3076
Shipping combines, 1134
Steamship service, Canada-West Indies, qu. 937
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2683
Topographical surveys, 3245
Woollen industry, 3461

Everett, Mr. Howard. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization

Evidence in Marriage and Divorce Proceedings. *See* Criminal Code Admt. bill

Ewart, Mr. J. S., K.C., Canada's relations with Empire, 314, 1529

Examinations of Masters and Mates. *See* Marine

Exchange. *See also* Great Britain; Finance
Medium of. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Rate, franc, value of, 2009
Unfavourable, 2912

Exchequer Court of Canada
Alien enemy property, 2499
Audette, Mr. Justice, 2502
Judgeship, 2499
War claims, competency to deal with. *See* War Claims

Excise Taxes. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Excursion Tickets, qu. 1485

Executions, public. *See* Capital Punishment

Exemptions. *See* Civil Service; Income Tax; Taxation

Exhibitions. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade
Agricultural fairs, horse-racing, 726, 750
Atlanta, 1465
Belgian, 496, 1467
British Empire, 463, 1454, 1873, 1910, 3949, 4704
Yukon mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Brussels, 1467
Canadian, travelling in France, 811, 1457, 4711
Chicago, 1454, 1466
Fat Stock Show, 1398
Collection of samples for exhibits, 1468
Commercial, 1467
Des Moines, 1466
Estimates, 1454, 1465
Expenditure in Great Britain and United States, 1465-68
Great Britain, 1467
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1454
Maple products, Beauceville, 1810
Royal Show, 1454
St. Petersburg, 1465
Seattle, 1467
Seed and field competitions, 599
Southern States in, 1465
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1467
Staff and salaries, 1455
Tampa, Florida, 1454, 1465
United States in, 1465

Exhibits. *See* Exhibitions

Exodus to United States. *See* Emigration

Expenditure. *See* Public Expenditure

Experimental Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explorations, Arctic, 3944. *See also* Arctic

Explosives. *See* Mines and Minerals

Export Duty. *See* Customs and Excise

Export Act Amdt. Bill (Pulpwood, prohibition, of export) Res. 4012, 4345; 1r., 4355; 2r., com., 4393; 3r., amdt. (Mr. Power), six months' hoist, 4397, neg. on div., 3r., 4397

Exporters' Association. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Exports. *See* Imports and Exports

Express Charges, 2876. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific

Express Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways

External Affairs, Department of
Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988
Employees and cost, 2970
Pope, Sir Joseph, salary, 3988, 4671
Salaries, 3987

Factory and Shop Acts of British Dominions, 1443

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Eggs, price of, 1852
Geodetic survey, expenditure, qu. 1634
L'Islet wharf, 969
Surveys in prairie provinces, qu. 1866
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865

Failures. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

False Creek Bridge, 3375, 4708

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Crude petroleum bounty, qu. 3262
Customs drawbacks, qu. 1484
Raw materials imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259, qu. 1864
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3358
Oil Springs postmaster, qu. 518

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Products. *See* Agriculture

Farmer, Mayor S. J., Winnipeg. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Farmers. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget; Immigration; Taxation
Advice to, 2953
Allegation that government has done nothing for, 2854
Bank shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Bankruptcy Act Amdt., farmers, 3211
Banks, treatment by, 2929. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Burdens of, 2731
Canadian farmer, free-trader, United States protectionist, 2857
City man and, 2869
Comparison with other countries, 2791
Conditions. *See* Agriculture; Immigration
Debts, 1407, 1412, 2768
Earnings, 2813, 3023
Extravagance, 1888
Farmers' Bloc in United States, 2791
Farmers' movement, 2884
World wide, 2791
Farmers' party. *See* Progressive party
Hard times, 1859
Help for needy, 1404

Farmers—*Con.*
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1419. *See also* Immigration
Improvident methods, 1423
Income tax and, qu. 1259, qu. 1486
Industries dependent on prosperity of, 2853
Labour. *See that title*
Manufacturers and, 2716
Market, lack of, 2856
National Farmers' Union of England, 2791
National Policy, 2917. *See also* speeches on Budget
Non-continuous employment, 1888
Organizations, 2815
Future of, 2792
Parliament, in, 2787
Profits, 2873
Pulpwood, export of, 4513. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Purchasing power, 1408, 1851
Reciprocity and, 2924. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2731, 2916, 3066. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxes, 4224. *See also* Taxation
United Farmers of Ontario, 4608
Work, 1852

Farms
Abandoned, 67. *See also* Address; Immigration; Lands; School.
Credits. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits

Favoured Nation. *See* Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Feathers and Ornaments. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* Jurisdiction; Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Federal Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1621

Federal Representation. *See* Redistribution

Federal Statutes, enforcement, 1142

Federation of Canadian Students. *See* Students

Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill; Grain and Grain Trade
Adulteration, 600, 604
Conference of producers and handlers, 600-4
Control, 599
Milled, mixing with bran and shorts, 600
Screenings, 2039. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill
(Regulation of preparation and sale of milling by-products) Res., 4012, 4270, 4272; 1r., 2r., com., 4276; com., 4538; 3r., 4553

Fenian Raid. *See* Pensions

Fertilizers
Administration of Act, 601
Control, 599
Duty, 3486
Fish waste, manufacture into, 2946
Machinery for, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Nitrate of soda, 2307

Feudal System. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Fiats, Issuing of. *See* Petition of Right Act

Field Crops. *See* Agriculture

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Acknowledgment of congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Address in reply 89. Mr. Meighen on the tariff; valuation of goods for customs duties, 90; causes of increase in national debt, 91; railways, cost of taking over, 91-93; national ownership expensive; increase in obligations to United States, 93; loans and interest; money borrowed cheaper from United States, 94; late government's borrowings from United States; Mr. Meighen on sales tax, 94; amendments moved by Progressives; resolution of Liberals in 1921; downward revision of tariff, 96; French treaty, 97; wise expenditure true economy, 97-98; business of country cannot be carried on without increase in public debt, 98; amendments not acceptable to government, 99
Agricultural conditions, Great Britain, 1861
Annuities, old age, basis of computation, 1698
Artificial silk, duty. *See under this title* Customs Tariff Items
Auditor General
Office, salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Report, 434
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4513
Automobiles
Duty, 3075
Insurance 3147, 3977

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1157, 1310, 4013, 4017, 4075, 4078-4131, 4133-4162
Extension of charters for one year, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Government inspection, 1310
Mortgages or hypothecs, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4133
One vote for each share, 4085
Postponement, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Senate amendments, 4508
Bank Act revision
Inquiry, 255, 496, 644, 858
Res. of Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank draft tax, 3928
Bank mergers, 4134, 4139
Banking and Commerce Com. changes, 2926
Beet sugar excise duty, 2644, 3229, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597
Binder twine, duty and manufacture, 3231, 4388
Board of Audit Act, 4355, 4369, 4733
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference, 3454. *See also under this title,* Budget
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 3454, 3895
Goods via Hong Kong and Suez canal, 3455
Increase in, 3488
Liberal convention of 1919, 454
Woollen industry, 3459, 3472
Budget
Date of
Announcement, 2469
Inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Debate, precedence, 2694
Record established, 2852
Resolutions, changes, notice, 3046, 4163
Speech, 2640. Finances, income and expenditure over ordinary capital and special expenditure, 2640; advances to Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine; public debt, addition to; expenditure and taxation; additions to debt diminishing; increase since 1914, 2641; estimate of revenue and expenditure for 1923-24; loans, tax reductions, 2642; sales tax, complexity of; imposition of six per cent tax at source; exemptions from, additions to list of, 2643; receipt tax; cheque tax; French Treaty; Canadian wines, duty on; French brandy, 2643; income tax;

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
cigarette duty; beet root sugar; raisins and dried currants; petroleum, 2644; iron and steel scrap; boots or other appliances for deformities; casual donations; machinery; hemp seed; machinery for conversion or fish waste; oil-drilling machinery; stumping machinery; malt flour; printing machinery; artificial silk; British preferential tariff; direct importation through Canadian ports; sugar duties; 2645 sugar, increase in price; speculation; reduction in duty; dumping clause; copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646; bounty on hemp; linen thread bounty; manila hemp bounty, 2647; petroleum bounty; forest conservation; pulpwood; prohibition of export, royal commission; tariff stability; finality, 2648; relations with United States; Fordney-McCumber tariff; offer of reciprocity; reduction of duties by order in council, 2649; the outlook; trade revival in United States; labour, unemployment; prospects of a return of prosperity, 2650; tariff resolutions, 2650
Supplementary statement, 3074. Appreciation of personal references; speech of Sir Henry Drayton; estimates; revenue, estimate of; tariff weapon in trade negotiations with foreign countries, 3074; France and United States; "no truck nor trade with the Yankees"; automobiles; potatoes; artificial silk duty, 3075; economy; expenditures suggested by Opposition; militia; naval service; bounties; Toronto harbour; St. Lawrence waterway; rural mail carriers; Progressive members and expenditure; Hudson Bay railway; civil service; public works, 3076; protectionist budget; tariff reductions; amendment; speech of leader of Opposition; budget, form of; brevity, 3077; "jacking-up" tariff; financial difficulty due to war and railways; responsibility for; budget, balancing of; new taxation; sales tax; public debt, additions to; reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3078; possible United States view; reciprocity agreement of 1911; permanency, attitude of United States towards, 3079; position of Conservative party in 1911 and at present time; "no truck or

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
trade with the Yankees", authority for phase, 3080; letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson to United States Secretary of State; clear-cut issue; Conservative party against trade with the United States; Liberal party stands for reciprocity; defeat of reciprocity agreement in 1911; sentiment towards question to-day, 3081; budget proposals; no new taxes; tariff reduction; British preference; sugar duty; Canadian ports; simplification of sales tax; reception of budget by country, 3082
Statements omitted, presented, 2926
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Adjournment, hour of, 3208
Budget resolutions, proceeding with, 4163
M. anticipating matter appointed for consideration 3327
M. to increase taxation, 3934, 3936
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Proceeding, 3127
Questions
Answers to, 343
Framing of, 1386
Passed as orders for returns, 939
Resolutions, unusual to call for explanation, 3583
Returns, inquiries for, 2208, 2254
Cattle embargo correspondence, 4295
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com., 857, 1300
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4076
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1300
Calling of, 2295
Business profits tax
Arrears, 4491
Collections, 1157
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4440, 4489
Canadian National railways
Advance, $13,099,493.34, 1752
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-37
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4337, 4398
Finance, 4329
Ocean ports, 1758
Paris offices, 3614
Securities bill, 4012, 4402, 4516, 4732
Expenditure to be voted by Parliament, amdt. (Mr. Meighen) 4527
Responsibility of government, 4696
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games 4707

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184, 4295
Cheque tax, 332, 2643, 3922, 3925, 3931, 4423
Cigarette duty, 2644, 3229, 4392
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Superannuation, 3402
Calder Act, 3266
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, 2926, 3146
Clair-Fort Kent bridge, 4590
Commercial union, 3909
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Concurrence, 4735
Interim supply, 1482
Confectionery and beverages, tax, 2644, 2656, 3046
Congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4742
Consumer, taxation and, 4415
Copper bounty, 2646
Bill, 4369, 4370, 4374, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4370
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister of Interior, salary, 4667
Credit and Industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 644
Amdt. ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 645
Criticisms of foreign budgets, 2804
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 2650, 3963, 4408
Customs Tariff items, 3895. *See also under this title,* Budget
Artificial silk, 2645, 3075, 3489
Drawback, 3502
Fabrics, 3492
Tops or waste 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493, 3495
Composition and plated metals, 3483
Coverings for goods and machinery, 3501
Crude petroleum, 2648, 2644, 3481
Date when changes effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Hatters sweats, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 3502
Dry red lead, etc. 3480
Fire-brick, 3481, 3896
Hemp seed, 2645, 3474
Liquorice paste, 3480
Machinery for manufacture of fish waste, 2645, 3486

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff—*Con.*
Printing and lithographing presses, 2645, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 3474
Rolled iron and steel, 3484
Silk cloth woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 2645, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Typewriters and parts, 3485
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dredging, government dredges, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates. *See also under this title,* Supply
Civil government, form of, 612
Further supplementary, 1923-4, 3492
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations maturing, 1753
Preparation of, 3244
Supplementary, 1923-24
Tabled, 3492, 4536
Time of presentation, 4554
Time of presentation, 4420, 4597, 4601
Experimental farms, 486
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4345, 4393. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Fertilizers, duty, 3486
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill 255, 4405
Finance dept., charges of management, 3987
Forest protection and conservation, 2648. *See also under this title,* Export Act; Pulpwood
M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
France
Exports to, 1997
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Trade with, 1990, 1995, 1999
French treaty, 331, 436, 456, 1977, 1990, 2815
Brandy, 2302, 3478
Bronze powder 1998, 2016, 2270
Canned salmon and lobster, 453
Concessions to border states, 440, 2273
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Direct importation, 2303
Favoured nation, 448, 2271, 2398
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Luxuries, 446
Machinery and parts, 441
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2260
Sales tax and, 2279, 2280, 2299

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Silks, 448, 2266, 2301, 2398
Tabled, 54
Unfair competition, 2300
United States
Preferential treatment 440, 442
Trade with France, 2277
Wines, 1997, 3937
French treaty bill, 2238, 2255-80, 2299-2304, 2347
M. for 2r., 1910, 1990-95
Grants for historical celebrations, 4705
Halibut fishery treaty, 734, 857
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Hemp bounty, 2647
Bill, 3911, 3963, 4376, 4388
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigrants complaints of, 3598
Income tax, 1157, 2644
Agricultural forms, 4498
Exemption for children, 4503
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1384
Fines, qu. 2180
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4492
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. 2655, 3229, 4392
Cigarettes, 3229
Insurance Act Amdt. 3045, 3147, 3977, 4357
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interim supply bills. *See under this title,* Supply
Italian treaty, 331
Signature, 2403
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2404
Concessions to border states 2395
Consideration postponed 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401
Favoured nation treatment, 2398
Lapointe Mr., visit to Washington, 734, 857
League of Nations
Canada's contribution 3990
Canadian delegation, expenses, 3989
Legislation. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Hasty, 1376
Indemnity, etc., 4674
Liberal platform of 1919, not bound by, 2994, 3020
Library, joint committee, 615
Linen yarn
Bounty, 2648
Duty 3897, 3899
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4575
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4577

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Malt flour, duty, 2645, 3480
Manila fibre bill, 2657, 3231, 4369
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, cattle embargo, 3317
Merchants' Bank. *See also under this title,* Bank Act Amdt.
Failure, 4155
Inquiry, expenses, 3990
Ministers and officials, travels, 343
National Gallery, 1019
Naturalization Act M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4372
North Essex election, 2013
Nova Scotia steel bounties, 4371
Oleomargarine
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials used, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3530, 3561
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3571
Orders in Council, repeal by statute, 3504
Parliamentary restaurant, com., 382
Penny Bank of Toronto, 1739, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866, 4749
Pensions
Old age, inquiry, 733
Pension Board, Colonel Thompson, 4749
Senators, to, 1376
Petroleum Bounties bill, 2657, 3920, 3963, 4392
Postage stamps used for revenue purposes, 3927, 3938
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Promissory notes, 3924
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389
M. (Mr. Good) 413
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, new departmental, 1730
Public debt. *See also under this title,* Budget
Additions to, 2642, 3078
Maturing obligations, 3823
Statement, 2926
Public expenditure, 2641, 4422, 4554
Apportionment of, 4560
Public Service Retirement Act, 3323, 3402
Calder Act, 3977
Public Works estimates, 4554

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Publicity agent in London, Mr. Cranfield, 2927
Pulpwood prohibition of export, 2648, 4012, 4345, 4393
Royal commission, 2648, 4709
Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4183, 4392
Railway subsidies, 4304
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 2644
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474
Receipt tax, 2644, 3935, 4423
Revision of, 4409
Reciprocity with United States
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3075, 3080
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 3454, 3474, 3901, 3903, 3907
Permanency, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 3079, 3905
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, 733
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal commission on lake grain rates, 2927
Rules of the House. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Sales tax, 3078, 4181, 4409, 4419. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Articles used by hospitals, 4432
Complexity of, 2643
Exemptions, 2643, 4431
Imports, 4409
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 919
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Public libraries, 1871
Six per cent, imposition at source, 2643
Union Jack, 4515
Select standing committees, membership, 382, 615, 2252
Senate
Abolition of, 1376
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1375
Senators, pensions to, 1376
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184
Special War Revenue Act 1915 Amdt. bill 2657, 4363, 4409
Cheque tax, 3922
Sales tax, 4181. *See also under this title,* Sales Tax
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Wines, excise tax on, 3937
Sugar duties, 2645, 3082, 3479
Beet root sugar, 2644, 3229, 4393
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4320

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Supply. *See also under this title,* Business of the House; Estimates
Bills, 4735
Interim supply, one-sixth vote, 1482, 1538, 3705
Committee, notice, 179
Concurrence, 4732
Tariff. *See also under this item,* Budget speech; Customs Tariff items
Amendments of 1920 and 1921, 3020
Attitude on, 2838
Changes proposed, 2651, 3462, 3895
Commission, evidence, 2296
Resolutions, 2650, 3963
Stability and finality, 2648
Weapon, 3074, 3477
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement on immigration, 2795
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Trade, 437
Union bank, position of, 4298
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Trade with France, 1991, 1997. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3233
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183, 811
War claims, Vickers company contract, 1746-7
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Ways and Means committee, 2640
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Wheat board legislation, 2928
Wines. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Canadian, duty on, 2643
Tax on, 3937
Woollen industry, 447, 3459, 3472

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1848

Finance. *See also* Bank Act Amdt bill; Banks and Banking; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Credits; Loans; Public Debt; Public Expenditure
Amortization plan, 2930
Bonds
Guaranteeing. *See* Canadian National Railways
Interest rate and income tax, 4494
Tax-free, qu. 342, 2914

Finance—*Con.*
British debt to United States, 2878
Dollar reserve in Canada, 2879
Canadian National Railways, securities, approval, 4402. *See also that title*
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739
Complicated and confused, 2915
Credit control, 631. *See also* Credits
Department
Boville, Mr. T. C., service and retirement. qu. 3135
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4670
Estimates, 3987
Distress in West, 1890. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Dividends
Taxation of, 281
Watered stock, 2956
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Financial and class rule in politics, 2733
Financial conditions, analysis, 2984
Financial control of government, 2812
Industry and, 4053
Interest rate, 2812. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
New York loans, 154, 155, 2963
Saskatchewan debentures, sale of, 2770
Securities, on which advances made to banks, 4405
Shares, issue of. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
World conditions, 2823, 2878

Finance Act 1914 Amdt. Bill, 255
(Advances to banks, bank payments in notes instead of gold or Dominion notes; export of gold, etc.) Res. 4249, 4405, 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4408

Financial Post, statement as to labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125

Financial Situation, 2658. *See* speeches on Address; Bank Act Amdt bill; Budget; Immigration

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2883. Long speeches; a budget Conservatives cannot find fault with; Liberal principles, 2883; tariff proposals; amendment; tariff reduction; disappointed hopes; farmers' movement; return to flesh-pots; member for Muskoka; disappointment with budget; 2884; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of, 2885

Finger Prints, offenders against Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136

Finland, immigration from, 1085

Finn, Mr. Robert E. (Halifax)
Canadian National railways, terminals, 4716
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 4678
Halifax grain elevator, 4715
Introduced, 3
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4678

Fire Brick. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Fire Prevention. *See* Forests and Forestry
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget

Fiset, Sir Eugene. *See* National Defence

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Asiatics engaged in, 1453, 1540-1, 1555, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484-5
Naturalization, 2461
Atlantic fisheries, inquiry into, 2983, 3084, 3365
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Behring sea, 4485
Bounties, report, 911
British Columbia, 3372
Fisheries Commission, 1453
Fishing licenses, 1540
Japanese fishermen, naturalization certificates, 1899, 2443
Canadian ports use of by United States fishermen, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Canned lobster and salmon, French treaty, 452
Canned salmon shipped via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Cold storage, 2056
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 3364, 3365
Express rates, 3365
Fish
Cooking, 3366
Culture, 3367
Demand for, 3364
Inspection Act, enforcement, 3367
Preserved, 1984. *See also* French Treaty
Products, imports, 445, qu. 617
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Russel, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Fishery protection service, 3361
United States steamer captured by Malaspina, 2207

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishing industry, difficulties and handicaps, 2945, 2972, 3002
Fishing interests and reciprocity, 3082
Fishing schooner race, 114, 115, 906
Fishways
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Salmon River, N.B., 3362
White Mud river, 3362
Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent, 1548
Freight rates, 1953, 1964, 2946
French treaty, 1978, 2235
Halibut, 151
Close season, 4480
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries. *See that title*
Treaty, 857, 858, 4132, 4440, 4437, 4664, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Signing of, 734
Hudson Bay, 1064, 1073. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
International Fisheries Commission, 4480
Japanese fishermen, 1453, 1540-1, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484, 4485
Japanese fisheries association, 1453
Licenses, reduction of 40 per cent, 1540-1
Lobster season, extension of, 2983, 3084
Machinery for conversion of fish offal into fertilizer, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine and Fisheries Committee
Reports presented
First, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983
Markets, 2906
Miramichi smelt fishing, qu. 1974
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Moving pictures, 3365
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Orientals engaged in. *See under this title,* Asiatics; Japanese
Pacific coast, 2734
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Publicity, 3364
Reciprocity, 3906. *See also that title*
Rivers and streams, sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Russel, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868
Salmon canners' licenses, 1540. *See also* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill
Salmon fisheries, Fraser river, 4461
Sardine fishery, 2518
Smelt, regulations, qu. 1868, qu. 1974

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Steveston Fishermen's Benovolent Society, 1900
Tariff on fish, 112-113
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Trout-fishing season, 1686
United States
Fishing vessels, licenses, 911
Markets, 2906
Modus vivendi. *See under this title,* Modus Vivendi
Tariff, 2734, 2940
Schooner, capture of, 2207

Fisher, Prof. Irving, purchasing power, 4666

Fisher, the late Hon. Sydney, 2057
Copyright Act, 2140

Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. Bill (Salmon canners' licenses) 1r., 4009; 2r., com., 3r., 4207

Fisheries Commission. *See* British Columbia

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Fishing Schooner Race, 114, 115, 906

Flags, Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Flathead District highway, qu. 2085

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 157, 1612

Flax. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Linen

Fleming, Sir Sandford, port of Shippegan, 2938

Flexner, Dr., discovery of serum for spinal menengitis, 1287

Flour. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade,
Freight rates, 1914, 2127
French treaty, 1978
Malt flour, duty, 3480
Milling in bond, 2960
Ocean rates, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906 2761
Prices in Canada and Great Britain, 1906
Protection, 146-147
Reciprocity in, 2993
Shipments
Canadian and United States ports through, 1767
China, to, 1840
Transportation, earnings of railways, 2960

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Budget, 2814. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public debt; war scandals; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; progress and prosperity, 2814; Borden-Meighen administration; speculation and profiteering; origin of farmers and labour party; democratic policy of present administration; agriculture, condition and encouragement of; French and Italian treaties; Australia, trade agreement with; Turkey, threatened war with; Canada's participation, 2815; financial conditions; economy; European affairs; Canadian policy; immigration policy; emigration to the United States; protection of Canadian labour; Georgian Bay canal; Civil Service Commission, unconstitutionality of; patronage, 2816; dismissals and appointments after 1911; classification; the Griffenhagens; old age pensions; amendment, Mr. Forke; western provinces, contribution of the East to development of; tariff and revenue, 2817
Civil Service Commission, 2816
Old age pensions, 2817

Food. *See* Agriculture; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices

Food and Drugs Act
Administration, 697
Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Henry, Automobile duty, 2908

Fordney-McCumber Tariff. *See* United States

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade; Treaties, French, Italian

Foreign Policy. *See* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis

Foreign Vessels, registration. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Germans in Peace river district, 1184
Naturalization of. *See that title*

Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See* Dominion Forests

Forests and Forestry. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Natural Resources; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1748
Alberta, 1778
British Columbia, 1776
Manitoba, 1778
Nova Scotia, 1778
Ontario and Quebec, 1776, 1778

Forests and Forestry—*Con.*
Aeroplanes used in protection work, 1776
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 821, 2948, 3412, 4348
Campbell, Mr. R. H., Superintendent of Forestry, retirement, 3410
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Conservation, 2648, 2947, 2950, 4349. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Development, 2744
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Forest fires, 816
Conscription of fire-fighters, 3409
Fires started to make employment, 3409
Relief, 4010
Forest products, exports of, 1776. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Forest protection, 1776, qu. 2205, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 816
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 817, qu. 2178, qu. 2697, 3416
Moose mountain reserve, 3453
Spruce bud worm, 596, 2179
White pine blister rust, 595
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Moose mountain forest reserve, 3453
Provincial ownership, jurisdiction and responsibility, 3416
Pulp, paper, forest products, export, 2750. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Reforestation, 3412, 4349
Reserves. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Roads and bridges, 1014
Shelter belts, 459
Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial patrol, 1776
Tree-planting
Associations, 3415
Prairies, on, 3412
Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 34. Thanks to previous speakers for references to himself; congratulations to mover and seconder; resignation of Mr. Crerar as leader of Progressives, 34-35; Canada's position in relation to other countries; trek from country to city, 35; trade treaties; trade expansion 36; co-ordination of National Railways; new board of directors, Sir Henry Thornton, 36; lake freights inquiry; Crowsnest pass agreement, 36-37; immigration; natural resources, 37; farm labourers; tariff and taxation; revision of Bank Act; committee to inquire into agricultural problems, 38; causes of present agricultural depression, 38-39; bill to safeguard interests of consumers and producers; cattle embargo; economy in expenditure, 39; civil service reform, 39-40; redistribution; our national status, recommendations to government, 41
Agriculture
Condition of, 1107, 1852
Co-operation, 1852
Expenditure, 3240
Alberta coal, 794
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Banff national park, power leases, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4044, 4097, 4100, 4107
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 858
Banking and Commerce Com., member of, 2639
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3213
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4438
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Belle River harbour, 4606
Bounties, agriculture, 3240
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3456
Woollen goods, 3460, 3470
Budget
Reported statement on, 2946
Speech on, comment, 2853
Speech, 2711. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; budget disappointing; financial position of country; railway and shipping deficits, 2711; debt; increase in; economy; taxation a billion dollars a year; Britain's example to Canada; limit to tax-paying powers increasing cost of government, 2712; machinery of distribution; parasites between producer and consumer; tariff and tax changes; buying and selling; British preference; trade with Great Britain, 2713; best market for agricultural products, 2714; ocean freight rates; tariff and combines; natural resources; "stability of tariff" Liberal tariff policy; Moose Jaw election, 2714; handwriting on the wall; budget a disappointment to the West; exodus; agricultural and manufactured products, prices; Canada a dear country to live in; high cost of living; manufacturing industries, 2715; production, cost of; taxation of commodities; relations between farmer and manu-

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
facturer; agriculture, position of, 2716; potential wealth of the prairies; immigration, taxation and railway troubles; commercial rivalry; amendment, 2717
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3798, 3833
Canadian National railways
Appointments, 2472
Branch lines construction bill, 4192, 4338, 4399
Management, responsibility and powers, 3640
Minister's annual statement, 1617
Paris offices, 3646, 3672
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., reference to, 3672, 3678
Toronto office building, 3641
Cattle boats, conditions, 2613
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3641
Vessel space, 1868
Cheque tax, amendment, 3934, 3935
Chilled meat, 463
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 361, 565
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3986
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4236, 4290
Combines bill, 2579, 2618-36
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Copper bounty bill, 3240, 4376
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2145, 2346
Cost of living, 1813
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4254
Deceased members, tribute to, 7
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Depression in England, 1854
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Distribution, cost of, 1852
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 3983
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2252
Economic conditions, wealth production, 1856
Eggs, price of, 1852
Emigration to the United States, 1109
Europe, reconstruction, 4654
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1820
Experimental farms, 463
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Fishways, 3363
Free trade, 3024
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1932
Concession forced by Progressives, explanation, 2971
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1933
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1932
French Treaty bill, 2012, 2261, 2267
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 332-3
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Grondines wharf, 968
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1693
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1047
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1407, 1479
Letter not read by Prime Minister, 1333
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1336
Personal explanation, 1105
Detailed estimates, 1464, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 1464
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3593
Policy, 1105-1110
Imperial Conference, 4654
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians
Condition of, 2147
Manitoba, 2125
Sioux, 2159, 2160
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 231
Lake Grain Rates, royal commission, 3507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-32, 4285
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4178
Liberal policy, reversal of, 3007
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lunenburg dredging, 4577
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds 4238
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 845
Merchants' bank, 4297
Moose Jaw by-election, 2714
Delay in return, 2295
Naturalization Acts Amdt. 2187, 2193, 2454
Winnipeg Free Press editorial, 2454
Near East Crisis, 40
Newspapers
Monopoly, 2580
Postage, 4534

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Newspapers—*Con.*
Size of, 4534
North Essex by-election, 4606
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill, 4483
Oleomargarine, inquiry as to legislation, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3524, 3526
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3572
Patents of Invention bill, 2066
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3884, 4534
Postal appointments, 1800
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 2181
Protection and world conditions, 2752
Public buildings, Manitoba, 4629
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Redistribution, intention of government, 4250
References to, 11, 17, 18, 27, 55
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1150
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1790
Sales tax, 4431
Barley flour, 4431
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 920
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 3445
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-42
Shipping combine, 4223
Soldier settlement, 2027
Supplementary estimates, time of bringing down, 4555
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3968
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291
Trade barriers, 2214
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
M. to adjourn House, 4296
Vimy Ridge monument, 182
War, Canada's participation in, 4655
War claims, 2496
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Woollen industry, protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Forrester, Mr. William (South Perth)
Linen yarn duty, 3897

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406

Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2573

Fort William
Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grain shipments, 1114
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 2831. War sacrifices; Liberal party heir to burdensome estate; public debt; Canadian National railways; deficits; economy; improved financial situations; borrowings and interests payments; taxation, reduction of; tariff; downward revision; reciprocity, 2831; resources; British preference; introduction and further increase of; French and Italian treaties; friendly relations between France and Canada; Rodin's statue of France; gift of site for Vimy memorial; Canadian National railways, management; President and board, 2832; western settlement made possible by railway construction; British Columbia; Quebec; Transcontinental railway; development of Abitibi region; contribution of railways to development of country; immigration, 2833; land awaiting settlement; provincial land grants; emigration to the United States; natural increase of population; immigrants, recruiting and selecting; choice of location, 2834; repatriation; the future, 2835
British preference, 2832
Woollen goods, 3458
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canadian National railways, branch lines, 4199
Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power) 548
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Immigration, 2833
Colonization in eastern provinces, 1134
Policy, 1134
Quebec into, 1104
Labelle country development, 4199
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 235
Montford railway, 4199
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3984
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3543
Patents of Invention bill, 2071, 2098
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Ruling as chairman, 4293
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1296

Fortin and Moffatt, Transcontinental railway claim, 3646

Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Foster Homes. *See* Immigration, Child

Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent of Fisheries, 1548

Fox-Breeding Industry, 588, 2763

France. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Agricultural products, 2247
- Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
- Canadian Commissioner General, 4001
- Canadian travelling exhibition in, 811, 4711
- Convention of commerce with. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
- Devastated areas, reconstruction, 2012, 2219
- Exports and imports, 1977, 1997, 2004, 2015, 2210, 2213, 2222
- Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
- Franc, value of, 2009
- Franco-German relations, 4652
- Friendly relations with, 2216
- German reparations, 440. *See also* Germany
- Immigration from, 1085, 1173
- Imports from. *See* Imports and Exports; Treaties, French Treaty
- League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
- Paris agency, 4001
- Peace treaty and. *See* Germany, reparations
- President of, letter from, Vimy Ridge memorial, 1538
- Reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, 3050
- Relations with, 2832
- Rodin's statue, 2832
- Ruhr, invasion of, 2748, 2822
- Senate, constitution of, 1371
- Silks, export to Canada, 2397
- Surplus, 2823
- Tariff against Canadian goods, 1999, 2015
- Trade relations with, 1990, 1995, 2218
- Trade treaties with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Termination of, 1999
- Vimy Ridge, gift of memorial site, 1538, 2832. *See also* Vimy Ridge
- War losses, 2215, 2256
- Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections
- Amendment to Act, inquiry, 3223
- Equality of citizenship between men and women, 3059
- Hindu, 503, 4640. *See also that title*
- Withholding of, 2456
- Women, to, 408
- Orientals to. See Immigration, Orientals; Naturalization

Fraser River
- Fisheries. *See* British Columbia Fisheries
- Improvements, 1003, 1006

Fraud, obtaining fiats by. *See* Petition of Right Bill

Fredericton experimental farm, 460, 471

Free Trade. *See also* Budget; Copper Bounty bill; Export Act Amdt. bill; Hemp Bounty bill
- Advocacy of in western Canada, 2752
- Agriculture, 1858
- Binder twine, 4379
- Difficulties in the way of, 3010
- Effect of in different sections, 1246
- Free list, goods on. *See* Budget; Customs; Reciprocity
- Great Britain, 1858, 2721, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3012, 3050, 3059, 3847
- Liberal party and, 3068
- Necessities of life, 1230
- No cure for Canada's ills, 2982
- Not a practical question, 2745
- Potatoes, 2820
- Progressive party amd, 1196, 2818, 3030
- Protection and, 2806, 2922
- Pulpwood, prohibition of, 4349
- Tariff stability, 2648
- Tendency towards protection, 2822, 3009
- Theory and practice, 3050
- United States, 1113, 2737, 2746

Freight Cars. *See* Canadian National Railways

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canals; Grain and Grain Trade; Hudson Bay Railway; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterways; Transportation
- Adverse. *See* Immigration; Vancouver Harbour bill
- Agriculture and, 1416, 1424
- Alberta, discrimination against, 1957, 1958
- Apples and vegetables, Nova Scotia to Montreal and Toronto, 626
- British Columbia
  - Discrimination against, 1914
  - Equalization, 1911, 1914
- Building materials, 1961, 3036
  - Brick and cement, 3017
- Butter, 1961
- Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. Sir Henry Thornton, 3845
- Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
- Canned goods and fish, 1915
- Cattle export trade, 2127, 2963, 3040

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Cheese, 1961
Chemicals, 1920
Coal, 84, 795, 1264, 1272, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Alberta, 1275, 1282, 3009
Excessive, 1345
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Maritime provinces, 1813
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators' Association, res. 1275
United States railways, 1266
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4290
Consumers and, 1958
Control of, 4226
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1620, 1912, 2741, 2836, 2852, 2854. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill and *under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Charge that Progressives had forced concession, 2854, 2875
Explanation by Mr. Forke, 2971
Discrimination in favour of Western Canada, 3239
Furniture manufacturers, 2855, 2875
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway receipts, decrease of, 3036
Restoration of rates, results, 1620
Saving absorbed by lake shipping companies, 2961
Discrimination, 130, 3195. *See under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization; *see also* Railway Act Amdt.
Downward revision, 3195
Eggs, 1962
Emigration and, 1440
Equalization. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. bill *and under this title,* Railway Rates
Fish, 1953, 1964, 2946
Flour, 1914, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906, 2761
Freight classification, 1618, 2876
Grain, 260, 1914, 1960, 1965, 2854, 3194, 3680
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343
High, 2812
Highways and, 1619
Hudson Bay railway 1035, 3779
Immigration and, 1133, 1181
Increase of, 1134, 3190
Iron and steel, 1964
Lake and river, 3776
Fixing, 4284
Lower, demand for, 3024
Lumber, 1961, 2875
Pulpwood, ties and, 3036

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Manitoba, 1932
Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Maritime provinces, 1963
Mountain scale, 1912
Operating costs and, 1761
Pacific standard tariff, 1914
Potatoes on, 137-138
Prairie scale, 1912, 1915
Railway and shipping, 1051, 1114, 1395, 4226. *See also under this title,* Shipping
Railway Commission
Appeal from, 1912
Hearing, 3190
Railway rates
Attorney General of British Columbia vs. C.P.R. 1916
Equalization of, 1400, 1437, 2868, 3191
British Columbia, terms of union, 1916
Canadian Northern and British Columbia, guarantee, 1917
Control of rates, 1917
Canadian Pacific railway construction of, 1916
Carvell, Hon. F. B., letter to Associated Boards of Trade, 1915
Construction, cost, 1918
Earnings, 1919
Grain, 1921
Long haul, 1920
M. (Mr. Clark) 1284, 1490, 1911, 1914
Ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1284, 1307
Oliver, Hon. John, 1915, 1952, 1955
Operation, cost, 1918
Railway Commission, judgment of June 30th, 1922, 1914
Traffic, density of, 1920
Railway transportation costs committee, evidence, 1919
Railways, qu. 625
Canadian National railways, 3621. *See also that title*
Saving by projected Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2899
Reduction of, 1101, 1400, 2800, 2868, 3194
Rice, 1915
Shipping, 144, 171, qu. 206, 310, 1395, 4077. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Agricultural conditions, Special Com. report, 2127
Armstrong bill, 4284, 4290
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 3848
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613, 3806
Vessels, qu. 3262

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Shipping—*Con.*
Canadian Liner Committee, 2127
Cattle, shipment to Great Britain, 2127, 2963, 3040
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 494, 2959, 4231
Combine, 2578, 2581, 2583, 2667, 2828, 2954, 2960, 4223, 4226, 4277
Control of by Railway Commission, qu. 2611
Discrimination, 4290
Canadian ports, against, 2960
Dominion Marine Association, 2613
Flour, 2127
Freight and passenger, 2174
Grain, 2517, 2828, 4290
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, 14, 36, 48, 52, 68, 206, 247, 302, qu. 2611
Increase of, 2960
Lake and ocean, 3763
Lake grain rates. *See that title*
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 1395, qu. 2611, qu. 2612, 2710, 3960
Personnel, 4231, 4234
Report, 2885, 4277
Legislation, 3265, 3507
Printing, 2927, 3045
Salaries and expenses, 4710
Live stock, 2133, 2758
New York pool, 3806
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, 2760
Ocean, 2127
Flour, Canadian, discrimination, 2761
Livestock rates, 2758. *See also* Livestock
Return cargoes, 2714
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
"Shipping barons", 2960
Standard Shipping Company, 1704, 4278
Steamship combines, 2667
Subsidized steamships, 2714, 4003. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly Liner Committee, 2127
Welland canal, 3762
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704
Wolvin, Messrs, 4285. *See also* Lake Grain Rates Bill
Textiles, 1964
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1915, 3848
Transfer charges, 2876
Transportation cost committee, 1944
United States, 2801
Waterways, 1619
Western Canada and, 1887

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Westward from prairie provinces, M. (Mr. Clark) 1158. *See also under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Wheat, discrimination in favour of, 2946

French-Canadians
Bravery and courage, 165, 2935
Deputy Ministers, 1805
Repatriation, 1462
Settlement in New Ontario, 1401

French Language
Difficulties, 1341
Editorial Committee, elimination of French publications, 1670
Immigration officials, Quebec, qu. 4752
Insurance bill, French version, 3147
Magazines and periodicals, 842
References to, 166
Translation and printing, 1489
Bills, 4435

French River improvement work, qu. 620, 2682

French Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Frenette, Mr. George, postmaster, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698

Fruit. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Treaties, French Treaty
Apples
Imports, qu. 617
New varieties, 2307
Banana trust, 2979
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Combines, 2616
Competition from United States, 2977, 2980
Dehydration of, 4674
Dumping clause, 2988
Estimates, 598
Fiji islands, from, 1848
Foreign
Competition, 2979
Importation, 2979
Taxation of, 2979
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Fruit-growing industry
Annapolis valley, 104, 2763
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Depression, 3002
Niagara district, 104, 2225, 2763, 2765
Fruit union of the Okanagan, 2526
Grading. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers
Grape-growing industry, 2742. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Grapes, export, 2270

Fruit—*Con.*
Grape-growing—*Con.*
Price in Niagara district, 2225
Wine manufacture, 1977
Imports of dried and prepared fruit, 445
Insects and pests, 596
Inspection. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit
Marketing, 463
Mediterranean, importation, 1636
Pears, new varieties, 2307
Plums, new varieties, 2307
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Pre-cooling plant, 464, 2056, 2765. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill
Prunes and dried plums, 3474
Raisins, imports of, qu. 2699
Duty, 2657, 2718, 3474. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff items
Sale and Inspection. *See that title*
Trees, new varieties, 2307

Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Fuel Oil. *See also* Oil
California and Oklahoma, 1245
Importation of, 1245

Fuel Supply, 84, qu. 203. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Oil; Railways
Adams, Dr. Frank D., coal situation, 1265
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4691
Anthracite coal, embargo on, 4394
Bermingham, Mr., President Delaware and Lackawana Railway, evidence, 1279
Camsell, Dr. Charles, Deputy Minister of Mines, 1265
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Central heating plants, 3199
Coal. *See also that title*
Alberta
Freight rate on, 3009
Mines, 3424
Areas in Canada, 1344
Cost, 1700, 3198. *See also* Cost of Living
Duty, 3493
Embargo on United States, 1279
Freight rates, 2828, 2875
Imports, qu. 516, 2828
Production and, qu. 490
Offset by exports of electric energy, 1266
Mines, 2785
Canadian, 1247, 1344
Prices, 3198
Substitutes for, 3199
Welsh, 3199
Coking. *See also* Coal, Coke

Fuel Supply—*Con.*
Coking—*Con.*
Coke-ovens, establishment of, 788
Municipal plants, 3200
Dominion Fuel Board
Salaries and expenses, 3197
Statement of work and suggestions, 3199
Exploitation, 1344
Federal Advisory Fuel Committee, 1274, 3198
Freight rates, 1919, 2855, 2875, 3199, 3200
Fuel testing, 789, 3197
House construction, 3203
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
Investigation, 3427
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509, 2512, 3206
Lignite Utilization Board, 387, 2515
Mines and Minerals Committee
Suggested reference to 1271
Report, 4436, 443
M. (Mr. Church) for a national fuel policy, 1262
Amdt. (Mr. Carroll) for reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Suggested amendment of, 1284
Oil shale deposits, 2513
Peat
Alfred peat plant, qu. 1487
Experiments, 790, 3199
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Public ownership and, 3200, 3205
Pulverized fuel 3199
Resources, 1264
Shortage, deaths of children from, 751, 1657
Sifton, Sir Clifford, on, 1265
Smith, Mr. George Otis, export of coal from United States 1265
Special committee, appointment of, qu. 617. *See also under this title,* Mines and Minerals
Steam, 789
Thornton, Sir Henry, evidence, 1919
Waters powers, 3203

Fundy. *See* Bay of Fundy

Fungus and Insect Diseases. *See* Insect Pests

Furness Withy Company, ocean rates, 2127

Furniture
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855, 2875
French Treaty, 1982, 1989
House of Commons, qu. 1138

Furs
French treaty, 1981
Sales tax, 2742

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Gallipoli Peninsula. *See* Near East Crisis

Gambling. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Gambling
Futures, in, 3058
Staples of life, in, 3058
Stock exchange, 3058

Game. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423

Gaols. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries; Capital punishment at. *See that title*

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Agricultural conditions, 1903
Agricultural exports, 1904
Audibility of debate, 4580
Bacon, Canadian prices, 1905
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4095, 4096
Bank officials, as insurance agents, 4095
Belle River harbour, 4601
Business of the House
Bills, distribution, 4276
Bills not printed, 4185
M. that Committee rise, 4185
Business profits tax, arrears, 4491
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Canada Highways bill, 2342
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4321
Coal leases, 3424
Copper bounty bill 3436
Cost of living, reduction, 1907
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1806
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms 470-486
Exports and imports, 1841
Farm credits, 1907
Farm mortgages 1841
Farmers, competition with world, 3236
Flour, price in Canada and Britain, 1906
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of Canadian grain at United States ports, 3650
Grain commissioners, board of, 787
Grain samples for exhibitions, 1454, 1455
Grazing
Lands, southern Alberta, 3424

Gardiner, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Grazing—*Con.*
Leases, 3426
Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line, 4321
Highways, Alberta, 2342
Hogs, grading, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Expenditure, 1908
Policy, 1903
Indemnity of members, 4237
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4205, 4276
Land valuation, 1878
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192-3
Lunenburg harbour, 4580
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3409
Manitoba, agricultural conditions, 1906
Medicine Hat customs employees, qu. 3505
National parks
Banff, electric light plant, 3435
Water power leases, 3939
Natural resources of western provinces, 3424
Oil
Leases, 3423
Monitor district, 2514
Speculation in claims, 3423
Postal appointments, 1801, 1806
Postmasters, 1809
Railway mail service, 1801
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1791
Saskatoon-Edmonton, 1790
Rural depopulation, 1906
Rural mail delivery, 1801
Seed inspection, weed seeds, 197
Seed Purchasing Commission, 601
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt bill, 4185, 4237-4246
Amdt. six months' hoist, neg. 4246
Settlers
Relief, 3448
Transportation facilities for, 2172
Soldier settlement, 2024
Land valuation, 1878
Salvage cases in Quebec, 2029
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Inspection of, 2178
Stockyards, discrimination, 192
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff, agricultural conditions and, 1907
Tree-planting association, 3415
Water power leases, 3422
Western provinces, conditions in, 1903

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Advisory Fuel Committee, 4691
Agricultural conditions, 1201

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Alberta
Coal resources, 801, 1275, 4692
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Arctic expedition, new ship, 4702
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4069, 4078-4126
Business and powers of banks, amdt., agency, 4093, withdrawn, 4094
Interest rate, 4125
Bank mergers, 4237
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3211
Banks and banking
Pressure on farmers, 1202
Profits, 1209
Buffalo, slaughter of, 4702
Business of the House, private members' day, 1158
Cahill, Mr., speech on immigration, 1209
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, war claims, qu. 3142
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3809
Amdt. to reduce, 3395, neg. 3398
Trade agreement, 3392
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3414
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advance, 3824, 3838
Canadian National railways
Advance of $1,550,000, 4694
Branch lines bill, 4308-22, 4694
Hanna-Warden-Loverna railway, qu. 4436
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1203
Net earnings, 1130
Canned salmon, shipment via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Coal. *See also under this title,* Alberta
Alberta, shipment to Ontario, 1163
Bituminous, duty on, 1275
Combines bill, 2616
Commodity prices, increase in, 1084
Copper bounty bill, 3238, 3241
Credits, function, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 647
Customs duty on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3275
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4253
Dominion Lands and Parks, salaries, 3251
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1011
Emigration to the United States, 1206
Employment service, director of, 1676
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farm buildings, 4630
Exports, agricultural machinery and farm products, 814
Farmers and bankruptcy, 3211
Farming equipment, 1088
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt bill, 4540

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Fish culture, 3371
Fishing schooner race, 115
Fuel and power resources, 801, 3427
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1275
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 327
Government publications, distribution, 1715
Grain, Canadian, adulteration at United States ports, 3649, 3962
Hamilton public building, 4628
Hanna-Warden and Loverna-Warden branch lines, 4308, 4322, 4436
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hector celebration, grant, 4705
M. to reduce, 4706
Historical celebrations, grants for, 4706
Homestead inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenburg leases, cancellation, 3146
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1208
Agreement, signing of, 1976
Empire settlement scheme, 1204, 1205
Immigration, population, natural increase, 1871-1921, 1207
Literature, misrepresentations, 1203
National railways and, 1121
Policy, 1200
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement, 1204
Steamship companies and, 1201
"The Unseen Hand," 1201
Total expenditure on, 1208
Indemnity of members, 4242
Indians
Blackfeet reserve, 2148
British Columbia, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Greater production, 2150
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Interest, 4107, 4125
International boundary, survey and demarcation, 3248
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Land leasing, 1101
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3352
Marine biological board, 3371
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, salary, 3352
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3985
Northwest territories, new ship, 4702
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, monument, 4704
Penitentiaries, 770
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3870
Pickled fish, inspection of, 3367
Plamondon, Alberta, dredging, 1013
Political patronage, 3347

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4678
Printing bureau, 1710
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 4614
Saskatchewan, 4629
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Renovated butter, 4253
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 776
Royal Mail Packet Company's boats, 3390
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3341
Sackville public buildings, 4613
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184, 4242
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Steamship services, 4702
Canada-West Indies, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Subsidies, grants and bonuses, 3414
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Water powers, development of, 3422
Welland canal, lumber imports for, qu, 1867
Western wheat crop and taxes, 1220
West Indies
Steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Trade with, 3395

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Caraquet railway, purchase price, qu. 1258
Coal imports and production, qu. 490
Daylight saving, Ottawa, qu. 2612
Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085
Soldier settlement, farms in Carleton county, qu. 1031

Gasoline. *See also* Oil
Price of, 2547
Short measure, 810

Gaspé Peninsula
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Natural resources, 1242
Railway facilities, 4186, 4197, 4307
Steamship services, 2176

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Wednesday evening sittings, 1163, 1995, 2518
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial pensioners, passes, qu. 2418
Superannuation, qu. 2418
Civil service superannuation, qu. 940, 3266
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Labrador gold rush 1995, qu. 2696
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3351

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Printing, Joint Committee on, Reports
First, 1156
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4009, 4436
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238

Gélinas, Mr. J. N., postmaster, St. Barnabé Nord, 1830

Gendron, Mr R. M. (Wright)
Public Works paymaster, qu. 1257

General Election. *See* Elections, Election of 1921

Geneva, International Labour Conference, 1441, 1539. *See also* Labour

Genoa Conference
Tariffs
Economic warfare, 3053
Stability, 3053

Geodetic Survey
Expenditure, qu. 1634, 3073. *See also* Mines; Surveys
Investigation, etc., 3245

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines; Surveys
British Columbia, 2504
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Expenditure by provinces, 2508
New Brunswick, explorations in, 2504
Overlapping, 2508
Revenue, 2510

George, Little, deportation of, qu. 1704

George, Right Hon. David Lloyd. *See* Lloyd George

Georgetown wharf, 4587

Georgian Bay
Canal. *See* Canals
Ports, grain handling, qu. 620

Georgetown-Montague railway, 128

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt bill (Seasonal or temporary employment) 666
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 435
French treaty, wines, 452, 2225
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184
Redistribution, Welland county, 667
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
Water powers, 3784
Sales tax, 4414, 4427, 4431
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Welland canal construction, 3762, 3784

Germany. *See also* France
Canadian Pacific railway shares, 2496
Franco-German relations, 4652
Franco-Prussian War indemnity, 3070
Immigration from, 1094
Nickle, shipments to during war, 4371
Reichsrat, constitution of, 1372
Reparations, 2498, 4653, 440, 4053
Investigation by Hon. William Pugsley, qu. 4753. *See also* Pugsley
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for withdrawal of of Canada's claims, 280, 311, 330, 332
Rhineland, cost of occupation, qu. 2696
Ruhr valley, occupation by France, 2748, 2822
War claims. *See also that title*
Investigation, qu. 1486, 2946
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Personal explanation, 4249

Gibeau, Mrs., postmistress, Morinville, 1028

Girl Guides, grant, 114, 3954

Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., British tariff reduction 3050

Glanders. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Gold. *See also* Mines and Minerals; Labrador
Export of prohibited 4249, 4405
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Golf Course, Jasper park, 3435

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Acland, Mr. F. A., 1675
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314, 4034, 4063, 4066, 4078-4103, 4141-59
Amdt., bank charters extended for one year, 4141, neg. on div. 4147
Charters, terms of, 1314
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4142
Point of order, 4055
Shareholders' audit, 4088
"Sincerity and integrity" 4067
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4142
Banting, Dr. F. G. annuity, 4676
Bees, suppression of foul brood in, 4675

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Board of Audit bill, 4369
British preference
Canadian ports direct importation, 3456
Manufacturing industries, and, 3472
Business of the House
Bills not distributed, 4104
Private members' day, 1160
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Cadet services, 883
Canadian National Railways bills
Branch lines construction, 4401
Securities, 4526
Capitalistic system and labour organizations, 2895
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 568
Civil Service patronage, 368
Class antagonism, prevention of, 1233
Combines bill, registrar, inquiry, 2624
Commercial union, 3906, 3911
Conversion loan, qu. 386
Co-operation, industrial relations, 2895
Copper bounty bill, 4374
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4252, 4263, 4270
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4673
Estimates, method of discussion, 4614-6
Experimental farms
Buildings, 4630
Overlapping, 4633
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4396
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Fertilizers, duty, 3487
Foreign relations, 4659
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 341
Health of animals, 4676
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4390
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4660
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1118
Hindu, 1120
Policy, 1116-1120
Imperial Conference 4640-4666
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 4660
Confidential matters, 4660
Preferential tariff, 4661
Imperial Economic Conference, 4659, 4666
Agenda, 4250
Interest rate, 4131
International questions, opportunity for discussion, 3998
Joint industrial councils, 1655

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Labour
Cheap, 1118
Estimates, reduction in, 1643
Gazette, editor, 1671, 1675
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 220, 222
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4227
Land, vacant, taxation of, 1104, 1118
League of Nations, 3998
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Liquor exports and imports, 3704
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Manila fibre bounties, 4369
Merchants' bank, investigation, 4068, 4156
Money, purchasing power of, 4666
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll)
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that legislation be submitted before end of session, 3567
Point of order, 3571
Petroleum bounty, 3916, 3918
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Privilege, question of veracity, 2181
Proportional representation, 427
Lord Bryce, 391
M. for alternative vote in single-member constituencies, 388
Multi-member constituencies, M., 389
Protection and industries, 3472
Public debt, maturing obligations, 3822
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4396
Race-track betting, M., 494, 709, 764
Railways and canals dept., salaries, 3195
Raney, Hon. W. E., letter from, 2181
Reciprocity with United States, 3905
Offer to negotiate, 3908
Renovated butter, 4252, 4263, 4270
Rideau Hall expenditure, 4627
Rural mail carriers, names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Stationery, embossed, 1716
Tariff stability, 3054
Toronto
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621, 4622
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unearned increment, appropriation by state, 1119
United States tariff, 1119
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Woollen goods, prices, 3463

Good roads. *See* Highways

Goods, Marking of. *See* Imports and Exports

Goodspeed, Mr. F. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Gordon, Mr. George N. *See* Deputy Speaker

Gordon, Sir Charles, director Bank of Montreal, 4022

Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, Vancouver, shipments, 2519, 2615

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 1080, 2051, 2204, 3318
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2052
Bankruptcy Act
Administration, 780
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1523
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 2252, 3085-3127, 3209-21
Farmer and, 3211
Senate amendments, 4201
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2423
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-16, 2419-23
Capital punishment, 769
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 1483, 2281
Opium joints, etc., 2281
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971, 2053
Directorships, 4024
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2355
Good, Mr., statement with regard to Hon. W. E. Raney, 2182
Guessing competitions, 733
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 3128
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3264, 3452, 3604
Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Department, estimates, 705
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Lake of the Woods Regulation Act repeal bill, 2885, 4163, 4179, 4185
Liquor, government control, 2406
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 180, 270
Senate amendments, 2050
Pecuniary claims convention, 779
Penitentiaries, 706
Estimates, 770

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer—*Con.*
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 2639, 3127
Fiats, 3224
Race-track betting. *See also under this title,* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
M. (Mr. Good) 738, 743
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Legal adviser, 778
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment, 1147
Naturalization, 778
Pensions, 776
Reorganization, 776
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-48
Tariff stability, ref. to, 2819
Washington, visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Accredited herd system, 587
Agricultural conditions in West, 1357
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Annual drill, 4636
Artificial silk duty, 3452
Australia, land settlement, 1389
Automobile accidents, 3958
Belle river harbour, 4610
Bienfait briquetting plant, 3206
British and foreign news service, 4713
Budget, 2951; congratulations to Finance Minister; last two budgets disappointing; Liberal promises and performances; tariff planks of 1896 and 1919; broken pledges, 2951; reciprocity; Liberal platform of 1919, duties upon implements of production; appeal to the West; speeches of the Minister of Agriculture; curtain lectures to Progressives, 2952; agricultural conditions; municipal taxation, non-payment; advice to farmers; more work and mixed farming; Canada a great exporting country; charge of extravagance unfounded; utterances of Mr. Motherwell, 2953; combines; lake freights; terminal elevators; Price, Waterhouse & Company report; elevator profits; income tax; unearned income, 2954; harbour facilities; free sites to elevator companies, Fort William; land speculators; stumping machines; tariff on implements of production and necessaries of life; amendment; special committee on the

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff; tariff revision; permanent tariff commission to investigate industries, 2955; the "say-so" of tariff beneficiaries; watered stock, dividends; debt; direct taxation; government ownership, 2956; bounties; flax industry; hemp industry; special privileges; oleomargarine; protected industries; Progressive party and power, 2957
Business profits tax, 4489
Canada Grain Act, administration, 4710
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3408
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4198, 4325
Paris offices, 3679
Public ownership, 3679
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3958
Cheque tax, 3932
Chief Electoral Officer, salaries, 4001
Combines bill, 2627
Copper bounty bill, 3235, 3241, 4375
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Deputy ministers
Perquisites, 4669
Salaries, increase, 4669, 4673
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Dredging, Fort William and Port Arthur, 3341
Emigration to the United States, 1389
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farms, 468, 4632
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4273
Free trade, Progressive party and, 1196
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 1762
French treaty, 442
Fuel supply, 799
Grain and grain trade
Grain commissioners, salaries, 4710
Grain unsold, 273
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 296
Mixing of grain, 1388
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Wheat in farmers' hands, Saskatchewan, 1975
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of animals, 577, 587
Hector celebration, 4636
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1357, 1878
Child, 1470

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Policy, 1356, 1387
Publicity, special writers, 1874
Income tax, agricultural forms, 4498
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4498
Indians, agricultural production, 2162
Interest rates on land payments, 1088
Labour Gazette correspondents, 1627
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4235
Liberal platform of 1919, 2853
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201, 2203
Maritime provinces, public expenditure, 4586
Military hospitals, 673
Moose mountain
Forest reserve, insect pests, 3453
Indian reserve, qu. 706
Pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Parliament buildings
Estimated and actual cost, 1725
Tower, 1722
Passports, issuing of, 4707
Peebles-Lampman branch railway, 4325
Petroleum bounty, 3920
Prices of binders and labour, 1886
Printing bureau, new building, 1738
Protection
Applications for, 3235
Granted without investigation, 3489
Public expenditure, apportionment of, 4559, 4560
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2503
Pugsley, and Meighen, Messrs., exchange of compliments, 2503
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 3951
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3475
Reciprocity
Agreement of 1911, 2854
Agricultural implements, 3499
Boots and shoes, 3499
Coal, 3499
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4491
St. John, N. B., visit to by members of parliament, 2503
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3788
School lands
Balance due on purchase price, 1389
Unpaid taxes, 4205
Seed inspection, 197-8
Shipping combine, 4235
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries, 669
Steamship subsidies, 4004
Topographical survey, towers, 2512
Trade commissioners, 1840

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Tuberculosis in cattle, 587
Welland canal construction, 3788
Western provinces, conditons in, 1357, 1388

Government. *See also* Legislation
Appointment of supporters, 2710
Burdensome and costly, 2719
Business principles applied to, 2806
Canada a difficult country to govern, 2796, 2852, 3002, 3023, 3074
Capitalistic hold upon, 2726
Civil government, retrenchment, 2964
Commission, by, 428, 4037, 4039
Committees, by, 2979
Cost of, 1153, 2785, 2805, 2968, 3027
Increasing, 2712, 2756
"Cuckoo" 3451, 3510
Decentralization of, 66
Departments, increase in cost of, 2970
Difficulties of, 2796
Duplication and overlapping of services, 2805
Economy, 2816, 2823, 2825, 2831, 2842, 2921, 2950, 2959, 2963, 2969, 3043, 3073, 3076, 4236
Indemnity of members, 4236
New methods of, 2914
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Taxation unaccompanied by, 2997
Financial control of, 2812
Group government, 1427
Senate and, 1378
Supply, amdts. to, 1299
Inconsistency, 2990
Invisible, 2812
Irresponsible, 2979
Offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Officials, travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Order in Council, by, 4354, 4487. *See also* Orders in Council
Policies, review of, 407,409
Resignation of. See Lack of Confidence Vote
Responsibility of, 2805
Retrenchment, 2805
Too much from Ottawa, 3434

Government Ownership. *See* Public Ownership

Government Printing. *See* Printing

Government Publications. *See also* Editorial Committee; Printing
Agricultural, 598, 1428
Distribution of, 1712, 3266
Fisheries, 3364
Interior department, 3443

Government Publications—*Con.*
Mines and Geological Survey, 3197
Printing, 811
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste in, 1734
Waste paper sold, 1713
Judge Snider's report, 1714
Governor General
Address, acknowledgement of, 1256
Expenditure, 4627
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Royal assent, 4755. *See also that title*
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; travels in western Canada and Yukon; improvement in economic conditions; trade conventions with France and Italy; Canadian National Railways consolidation; Great Lakes shipping; anti-combines and trusts legislation; cattle embargo; abundant harvest; immigration publicity campaign; Bank Act revision; redistribution; Postal Conference; Vimy Ridge site, 2-3
Speech on prorogation, 4756
Vimy Ridge memorial, 2, 1631
Governor in Council, judicial or administrative power, 1912
Grading of Seeds. *See* Seed Inspection
Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of National Defence; Minister of Railways and Canals from April 28, 1923.)
Address in reply, 54; The late Minister of Railways, 54; new members; Mr. Forke, 54-55; the railway problem, mileage of Canadian National railways; value of property; employees, 55; history of acquisition and amalgamation, 55-63; Canadian Northern, acquisition, 55-57; Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59; Grand Trunk acquisition, 59-60; amalgamation under one board of directors, 60; formal transfer of Grand Trunk, 60-61; amalgamation of Canadian National and Grand Trunk, 61; purchase of rolling stock, 61; establishment of headquarters, 62-63
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4692
Agriculture estimates, form of, 610
Alaskan, wreck of, 3173
Ammunition, 884, 1740, 1741
Appointment as Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Atherley bridge, 3648
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4197
Belle river harbour, 4599, 4606
Bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
British mails, delay in, 2694
Brockville rifle range, 889
Bruederheim branch line railway, 4316
Business of the House
Motions, anticipatory, 3327
Privilege, Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Involving lengthy answers, 622
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 4303
Placed on order paper without members' knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Supply, calling of, 2296
Cadet services, 877
Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill, 2253, 2338, 2469, 2470. *See also under this title,* Highways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983, 3208, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3377, 3798, 3824, 3841
Deficits, 3816
Earnings and expenditure, 3399
Lease of freighters, 3848
Negotiation for sale of ships, 1976
Canadian National Railways, 55-63
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650
$13,099,493.34, 1764, 3376
$1,550,000, 4692
Statements of appropriation, 1922-23, 1923-24, 3789
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Colonel, reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 3646, 4188, 4197, 4303-4344, 4397, 4694
Expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4400
Finance, 4319, 4330
Rejection by Senate, 4695
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Bituminous, duty, 1278
Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027.
Correspondence, inquiry for, 244
Dominion Express Company, contract, termination, 2473
Employees' pension, 288
Estimates, 1619
Opportunity to discuss, 3703
Expenditure, 4304
Express business and sale of electric lines bill, 2392, 2470, 2479
Radial railways, sale of, 2479, qu. 2612
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Express and electric lines—*Con.*
Freight rates, 1620. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Coal, on, 1278, 1280
Grand Trunk, 58-60
Gratuities to directors and officials, royal commission, 1665, 1976
Ocean ports, 1760
Providence, 1762
United States, 1762
Hanna, Mr. D. B., retirement of, 1666
Hudson Bay railway and, 1067
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 1635, 2048, 2105
Insurance, rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 1760
Pensions, 3196
Management
Non-interference with, 2472, 3670
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3654
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 55, 3197
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646
Ocean ports, 1760
Operating deficits, 3701
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3626, 3650, 3681, 3682, 4514
M. (Mr. Stevens) 3670
Pre-audit, 3701
Public ownership, 2475, 3670, 4198
Railway Commission and, 666
Regions, boundaries of, 1754
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1484
Robb, Mr., 2471
St. John station, 3646
St. John terminals, 2481, 4311
Securities bill, 4515
Thomas, Mr. A. J., appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3670, 3675
Appointment
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4198
Office building, 1664, 3629
Viaduct and union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Toronto Suburban railways, sale of, qu. 2612
Transcontinental
Conditions and prospects, 3681
Fortin & Moffatt, claim, 3646
Quebec port and, 3681

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Transcontinental—*Con.*
Unification, 1666, 3196
Chinese immigration bill, 2332
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 550
Civil Service
Postmasters, appointments, 1823, 1827
Returned soldiers, 1773
Copper bounty bill, 4373
Credits, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Demers, Mr. Amedee, contract, 1977
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1807
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 665
Estimates, civil government, form of, 610, 668
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Fiset, Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Forest preservation, 3416
Freight rates
Coal, 1278, 1280
Comparison, 1620
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1930
Equalization, 3192
Railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1925
Fuel supply, 793
Advisory fuel committee, 1278, 4692
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4197
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 280
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Grants to military and rifle associations, 889
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Highways. *See also under this title,* Canada Highways Act
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Canada Highways Commissioner, staff, 2489, 3173
Federal grant, 519
Hamilton-Brantford, 2492
Ontario, 2490
Statements
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Tabulated, 3174
Hudson Bay railway,
Canadian Air force, 1749
Construction vote, 4681
Dominion lands, sale of, 1068
Feasibility of route, 1068
M. (Mr. Knox) 1066

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Co., refund, 4687, 4690
Port Nelson Terminal, 3647
Repair of second 118 miles, 1070, 4198
Turning first sod, 1069
Welland canal and, 1068, 3779
Work this year, 4310
Hydro electric power, radial railways, 2475
Immigration, Canadian National railways and Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island employees, pensions, 3196
Inverness railway, 4198
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Kent Northern railway, 4197
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 236
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 1740, 2053, 2086
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4197
National Defence
Ammunition, 884
England from, value and quantities, 1740
Quantity on hand, 1741
Annual training, 859
Cadet service, 877
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749, 1775
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, 1778
Forestry protection work, 1776
Mail carrying, 1775
Operation, maintenance, repairs, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Department, salaries and contingencies, 901
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740-4
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Expenditure, 1744
Estimates, 859, 1740
Grants to rifle associations, 889
Military districts, reduction of, 868
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia expenditures, statement of, 1747
Officers retired, 890
Permanent force, 892
Schools of instruction, 900
Staff
Pay, 891
Reduction, 1773
Naval service, 902
Department of National Defence and, 3342
War claims, adustment of, Llandovery Castle, 1745
North Essex by-election, 4606

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Nova Scotia miner's strike, use of troops, 868, 893
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3571
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1833
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1816, 1826
Post Office
Department
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1805, 1807, 1826
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Excise taxes, payment in postage stamps, 1815
Printing, 1818, 1820
Revenue not attribuable to postal service, 1815, 1818, 1820
Salaries, 1780, 1794
Staff, reductions 1824
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1687
Letter carriers, bonus, 1784
Mail contractors, 3144
Mail service, 1778
Postal rates
Reduction of, 1780
Special delivery, 1873
Postmasters
Appointments held in suspension, 1832
Clementsport, 1797
Woodbridge, 1823
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786, 1801, 1805
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. C., 1823
Carriers, 1784, 3264
Compensation for loss, 1833
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144
Routes, spur lines, 1826
Statistics of, 1801
Western provinces, 1802
Extension, 1790
Saskatoon, accommodation, 1785
Toronto
New building, 1780
Revenue, 1780
Prince Edward Island railway
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Pensions, 3196
Railway employees, death of, 3196
Public buildings
Ontario, 4615
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public ownership of railways, 3670, 4198
Radial railways, 2475
Toronto street railway, 2475

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Public Works, expenditure, apportionment, 4578
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment and salary, 3043
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3417
Royal commission, 4709
Railway Commission, 3188
Annual report, 1659
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3188
Constitution and work of, 3192
Railways and Canals
Bell, Major Graham A., 3195
Estimates, 1764, 3173, 3376, 3760
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648
Returned soldiers, Civil Service, 1773
Rideau canal, 4691
Royal Canadian navy, 903. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403, 3145
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Agreement with United States, 3772
Provincial undertakings, 3782
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3647
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Thornton, Sir Henry. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845
Reported statement on immigration, 2795
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 4578
Street railway, 2475
Union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Viaduct, 4325, 4336, 4452
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 893
Unrest, alleged in Western Canada, 4514
War claims adjustment, 900
War medals, 1744
Warlike stores, 900
Water powers, jurisdiction, 665
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3771, 3778
Hudson Bay railway and, 1068, 3779
Request for, 3073, 3772

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Freight Rates; Lake Grain Rates
Additional outlets for, 53
Alberta production, 1435
Bankers and, 4048
Bank liens upon seed grain and crop, 4102
Barley flour, sales tax, 4431
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 2035, 4709

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Canada Grain Act—*Con.*
Appeal, 781
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Licenses, 2299
Litigation, 2045
Canadian National Railways, 3680. *See also that title*
Cargoes, loading of. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Cheque tax charged back to farmers, 3039
Comparative rates on, 78
Crop of 1922, 20
Dockages. *See under this title,* Elevators
Drought, effect on grain production, 3429
Elevators. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Commission, qu. 1867
Co-operative, 2043
Dockages, 782, qu. 1661, 2039, qu. 3141, qu. 3505, qu. 4300
Earnings, 2042
Edmonton, 4716
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Fort William and Port Arthur, qu. 4132
Georgian Bay, qu. 620
Government, 2036, 3264
Grain Growers', 2675
Halifax, 4713, qu. 4751
Lethbridge, 4716
Montreal, qu. 385, qu. 1663, 1768, 1974, 3767
Short weight, complaint of, 2037
Multiplication of, 1400
Ontario, 2038, 4716, 4719
Overages, 494, 782, 2039
Port Arthur, qu. 4132. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Screenings, purchase of, qu. 2612, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Port Colborne, qu. 1029, 4690
Public ownership, 2956
Quebec, 2903, 3768, 4233
St. Croix, 2903
Saskatchewan co-operative, 2779
Screenings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1633, qu 1661, qu. 1739, 2042, qu. 2613, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Seed supplied by. *See* Seed Inspection
Terminal, 3821
Abuses. *See under this title,* Marketing
Fort William and Port Arthur
Dockages, screenings and scalpings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1739, 2254, 2867
Sale of, qu. 1633
Free sites, 2955
Maintenance, 810

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Terminal—*Con.*
Montreal, 1768
Price, Waterhouse, report, 2954
Profits, 2954
Vancouver, 1057, qu. 1487. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Dockages, 782
Improvement, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Exports, 2748
Flax, weed seeds and, 4378
France, pre-war production, 2247
Freight cars, shortage of, 4697
Freight rates on, 1914, 3194. *See also* Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland canal
Shipping. *See* Lake Grain Rates bill, *and under this title,* Shipment
French treaty, 455, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Gage case, 2592
Gambling in futures, 3058
Grain
Adulteration of Canadian at United States ports, 3649, 3764, 3961
Combine, 4048
Commission. *See under this title* Marketing
Loading at Canadian ports, 3974. *See also under this title,* Shipment
Mixing, 1388, 3764
New varieties, introduction, 483
Samples for exhibitions, 1454
Surveys, qu. 4131
Unsold, 273, 1975, 2748, 2773
Grain Act. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Grain Commissioners, board of, 53, 2036
Commissioners, residence of, 787
Dockage and screenings, 782
Elevator screenings, inquiry into, 2254
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Lake grain rates, 4218
Names, occupations, etc., qu. 2206
Personnel, 4221
Salaries, 4709
Grain Growers' Guide, Mr. Shaw, 987
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1763, 4710
Lawyers, employment of, 4710
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Handling of. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Hudson Bay railway 1032
India, wheat production, 1840

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Indian reserves, grain production, 1139, 2156
Injustice to western farmers, 1114
Inquiry into trade, etc. 48, 301. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 2774
Inspection. *See under this title,* Marketing
Lake Grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates Bill
Royal commission on, report, 2885
Liverpool Corn Trade Association, shortages, 1764
London Corn Exchange, adulteration, 3649, 3961
Mandscheuri barley, introduction of, 483
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Marketing, 53. *See also* Hudson Bay Railway; Markets
Costs, 68
M. (Mr. Millar) for commission of inquiry, 288 agreed to as amended, 311
Shipment and, 494
Markets, 1410
Grain unsold, 1975, 2748, 2773
Milling and baking tests, 463
Millfeeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act
Montreal
Grain shipments, qu. 1973, 1974
Shortages, 1764
Oats
Acreage and production, 2934
Price, 1388
Ocean freights. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
Overages, 494, 782, 2039. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Overhead, 1400
Pooling, 1400
Prices. *See also* Immigration; Prices
Comparison with United States. *See under this title,* Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar)
Royal commission recommended, 1209
Sample market at Winnipeg, qu. 345, qu. 494
Screenings. *See under this title,* Elevators, *and also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Seed. *See* Seed Inspection
Seed grain advances, 3444, 3447
Amount outstanding, 3444
Municipal indebtedness for, 3446
Seed purchasing commission, qu. 279
Shipment, 1032, 2854, 4193, 4714. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill *and under this title,* Wheat
Canadian and United States ports, 1756, 1767, 1768, 3764
Adulteration, 3649, 3764, 3961
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3263, 3812

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Canals, utilization of, 2808, 3763
Congestion, 3767
Quebec, 3768
Cost of, 2808, 2044
Discrimination against Canadian ports, 2960
Diversion to United States railways, 2898
Elevators. *See under this title,* Elevators
Facilities for, 730
Improvement of, 2745
Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Hudson Bay railway, 4681. *See also that title*
Lake, 2959. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Montreal, to, qu. 385
Pacific coast, 3769
Panama canal, 1921
Portland, St. John and Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Prince Rupert, 151-2
Royal commission on lake rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3342, 3763
Shipping rates, 2517, 2613. *See also* Freight Rates
Vancouver, by, 257, 1057
Volume of, 2757
Welland canal, 3763
Wheat, Quebec, qu. 3820
Shortages
Complaints by British importers, 1764, 2037
Transportation, 19, 69, 77, 4222. *See also under this title,* Shipment
United Grain Growers, Calgary, 1408
Warehousing. *See under this title* Elevators
Western grain route, 69, 1924. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Wheat
Bounty on, 1196
Bushels required to purchase agricultural implements, 1912, and 1922, 1408
Canada greatest wheat export country, 2780
Canada third in acreage and production, 2934
Central European competition, 2396
Exports, 2750, 2774, 2780, 2843, 3062. *See also* Imports and Exports
French treaty, 1978
Hard, 2873
Markets, 3068
Marquis III, introduction of, 483
Pool, 2526

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Wheat—*Con.*
Prices, 628, 1101, 1886, 3004. *See also that title*
Production, 68, 265, 1405, 4224
Reciprocity in, 2993
Rust, 595
Saskatchewan, in farmers' hands, 1975
Screenings as feed for lambs, 2867
United States tariff against, 2823. *See also* United States, Fordney-McCumber tariff
Wheat-growing as permanent operation, 1423
Wheat stem saw-fly, 2774
World competition, 2781
Wheat board, 409, 2548, 2592, 2836, 2857, 3235
Correspondence, 626
Legislation, extension of, 2696, 2740, 2927
Order in council, 2696, 3045
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Profits, 3239
Progressive party and, 3030
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345, qu. 494

Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board

Grain Commission. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Grain Growers' Guide reference to, Mr. Shaw, 987

Grain Inquiry Commission. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Jury System
Abolition of, 2695, 3272
Combines, 2585

Grand Manan, island of
Breakwaters, 945
Population, 2172
Steamship service, 2172

Grand River, Que. wharf, 958

Grand Trunk. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Pacific. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grant, Dr. W. L., Civil Service, 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Letter to Dr. Roche, 355

Granville, Earl, Canadian Pacific Railway, 1916

Granville Island, taxation, qu. 1485

Grape-Growers. *See* Fruit; Treaties, French Treaty; Wines

Grapes. *See* Fruit

Grasshoppers. *See* Insect Pests

Gratuities. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Grazing Leases. *See* Dominion lands; Interior

Great Britain. *See also* British Preference
Agricultural conditions, 1861, 2755
Agricultural labourer's strike, 2822
Agricultural products, markets for, 2869
Agricultural representative in, 3291, 4675
Agriculture and free trade, 1858
Ammunition received from, 1740
Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824
"British policy" 4652
British preference. *See that title*
Budgets of Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2984, 3001
Canada's relations with. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties
Capital levy, 2722
Cattle
Embargo, 2871
Markets for, 208, 2871
Shipments to. *See* Live stock
Coal exports, 1263
Conditions in, 2748
Copyright legislation, 2140
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 3007
Anti-Corn law league, 1859
Bright, Mr. John, 3013
Peel, Sir Robert, 3050
Prosperity, return of, 3020
Dairy representative in, 3297
"Dangerous agitators from," 3033
Debt
Per capita, 2956
Reduction, 3072
United States to, 2879, 2918
War, 24, 2986
Deportation of Irish men and women, 3158
Depression in, 1854
Dumping ground, 2822
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Exchange, refund, 2641, 2658
Exhibitions, 1454, 1467. *See also that title*
Federation of British industries, 2726
Foreign policy, 165. *See also* Near East
Free trade, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3072, 3012. *See also under this title,* Corn Laws
Progress of movement, 3050
Rents, and, 1862
Grey, Earl, 1418
Halibut Fisheries Treaty and, 1308, 4457
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374
Immigration from, 1084, 1218. *See also* Immigration

Great Britain—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Prepaid passages, 2611
Imports and exports, 2928
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Industrial revolution, 2723
Liberty of the subject, 3158
National Farmers' union, 2791
National Labour party, policy, 2721
Naturalization. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Near East crisis. *See that title*
Necessities of life, taxation, 2789
Parliament, history of. *See* Lack of Confidence
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Precedent, 2788
Protection, 2752
Proportional representation, 392
Railways, 1618
Reciprocity treaties with France, 3050
Rural depopulation in, 1854
Shipbuilding, 3072
Surplus, 2823
Taxation, 2796
Expenditure and reduction, 2749
Income tax, 2881, 2986
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Luxuries, 3069
Necessaries, 2754
Reduction of, 2712, 4493
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2294
Trade with, 3072. *See also* British Preference
Unemployment in, 1205, 2754, 2822
War debt, 24, 2986. *See also under this title,* Debt
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Great Lakes
Disarmament
Correspondence with United States, M. (Mr. Meighen), 244, 247, 494
Tabled, 1307
Diversion of waters, qu. 3821
Shipping rates on. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates
Subsidized Steamship services, suggested extension, 2175

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Transportation Company, lease of freighters to, 3848

Great War Veterans Association
MacNeil case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Great War Veterans Association—*Con.*
Oleomargarine, 3547
Pensions. *See that title*
Petition, 4535

Greece
Grecian loan, qu. 623, 2010

Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Grenville by-election, 4606

Grey, Earl, Canada and the Empire, 1418

Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Budget, 2898. British preference, increase of; Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, 2898; railways and transportation; ports, development of; United States, railways, ports and commerce; Passamaquoddy bay, "greatest natural harbour on Atlantic coast; Canadian National Railways, ocean terminals; "Canadian export trade routed by United States ports; Senate committee's report; diversion of grain traffic; Winnipeg-St. Croix direct route; saving in transportation costs; Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen, report, 2899; Commander Compbell, report; Captain Henry Mowat, report; Hon. Robert Rogers; examination of St. Croix harbour; Mr. E. C. Swan, report; Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, report; 2900; Messrs. Fillies, Kenney and Elliot, master mariners, reports; St. Stephen, industrial centre; advantages of St. Croix from railway point of view; Mr. D. F. Maxwell, statement of mileage, 2901; St. Croix as winter port; small cost of development; construction of railway across state of Maine, 2902; gradients; St. John Journal editorial, 2903
Canadian National Railways, 2898
Talbot, Mr. O., director, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 945

Grisdale, Dr. J. H. *See also* Agriculture department
Cattle shipment, 3040
Salary, 610

Groceries. *See* Prices

Grondines wharf, 959

Grosse Isle. *See* Health, Quarantine

Grosses Roches, Que., wharf, 968

Group Government. *See* Government

Group Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Guarantee. *See* Railways

Guessing Contests, qu. 733. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Ammunition, 884
Annuities branch, advertising, 1641
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3217
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1500
Canadian National Institute for Blind, 693
Canadian National railways, Paris offices, 3633, 3693
Cold Storage Act Amdt bill, 2057
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2139, 2288
History of legislation, 2140
Le Droit D'Auteur, 2141
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, 2060
Dominion Fuel Board, 3198
Dredging
Expenditure, 4590
Maritime provinces, 1009
Estimates, time of presentation, 4577
Field crop competitions, 603
French treaty, 2227
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238
Border states
Agreements with, 2231
Concessions to, 2402
Favoured nation treatment, 2232, 2234
Manufacturers and, 2236
Pianos and organs, 2237
Revenue loss through, 2235
Rubber, manufacturers of, 2237
Sewing machines, 2237
Summary of, 2232
Trade results, 2230
Treaty of 1907, 2229
Fruit industry, 598
Fuel supply, 797, 3198
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Grondines wharf, 959
M. to reduce item, 963
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 949
Nova Scotia, 944, 4576
Ontario, 981

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 2061
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2139
Italian treaty bill, 2402
Labour
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 2061
Strikes, 1628
Troops, employment of, 893, 1627
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, correspondents, 1626
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Linen yarns, 3897, 3898
Lunenburg harbour dredging, 4576, 4591
Amdt. to reduce amount, 4577, neg. 4580
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3314
Political partisanship, 3315
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Murray Bay wharf, 973
National Defence
Annual training, 859
Arsenal, Quebec, bonus to employees, 1751
Estimates, 859
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 893, 1627
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and contingencies, 901
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2111, 2182
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2074, 2078, 2080, 2130
Public Works
Dominon Archives, building, 1730
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Quebec riots, 893
Society of Chemical Industries, 2069
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, amalgamation, 3893
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3892
Soldier Settlement Board, Moss Mr. H. H. compensation, 2030
Supplementary estimates, lack of information, 4576, 4577
Trade and Commerce
Estimates, increase, 2033
Staff, 2031
War claims, adjustment of, 1745
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1746
Vickers Company contract, cancellation, 1746
War medals, 1743
Yarmouth harbour, dredging, 1011

Gypsum Lands. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Hackland, Capt. J., Hudson Bay route, 1064

Haggard, Sir Rider, immigration, 1206

Hail Insurance. *See* Insurance

Haileybury, armoury and post office, 4615

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Agricultural publications, 598
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855
Eight-hour day, 1650
Farming, investment to start, 1415
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4275, 4538
Hog grading, 591
Immigration
Farm labourers, 1416
Policy, 1415
Tariff and, 1416
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3554
"Plutocrats and profiteers" 1417
Senate, elective or nominative, 1378
Toronto, expenditure on public buildings, 4621

Half Breed Claims. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill; Mackenzie

Halibut Fishery Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut

Halifax
Camp Hill hospital, qu. 3506
Duties on goods shipped from Vancouver via Panama canal, 2519, 2615
Exodus from, 2400
Grain
Elevator, 4713, qu. 4751
Shipments from, qu. 1484
Immigration building, 4612
Importation through port of. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Naval college, 1744
Naval stores at, 110
Ocean terminals, qu. 4510, qu. 4713, 4751
Port, development of, 109
Quarantine station, 4612
Rockhead hospital, 4613

Halifax-Cape Breton steamship service, 2173

Halifax-Newfoundland steamship service, 2173

Halton County customs officials. *See* Customs and Excise

Hamilton
Harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Public building, 4628

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Automobile accidents, 3959
Bracebridge harbour, 4612
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4546
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
Redistribution committee, 1660
Reference to, 2884

Haney, Mr. M. J., purchase of steamer Murray Stewart, 3354

Hanging. *See* Capital Punishment

Hanna, Mr. D. B. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Director, Canada Steamship Lines, 3208
Dismissal of, 157
Insurance companies, interest in, 2050

Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Ammunition, 887
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt bill, 2048
Annual drill, 859, 863
Arichat wharf, qu. 2180
Atlantic Fisheries Commission, inquiry, 3365
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-95
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, dismissal, qu. 4511
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613
Bridges, New Brunswick, 2342
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4489
Campbellton wharf, 945
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, Moncton, transfer, 574
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4189, 4309-22
Coal purchases, qu. 4303, qu. 4511, qu. 4752
Directors, board of, 60
Dominion Express Company, contract, 2473
Express and Electric lines bill, 2471
Fredericton bridge, 3645
Grand Trunk ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 2048
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Paris offices, 3638, 3683
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Capital punishment, 768
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, qu. 204
Carleton county, execution in, 778
Cheque tax, 3931
Chinese immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Dismissals, 856
In 1922, 3324
Civil Service Act, violation of, 1794
Coal. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Cost of, 1813
Railway rates on, 1272, 1813
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C.
Administration of Yukon territory, 2299
Appointment as commissioner, qu. 3131
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Descheneaux, Mr. P., lightkeeper, qu. 4512
Digby harbour, dredging, 4568
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 2375, 2379
Dominion arsenals, 887
East Sandy Cove, 4571
Eastern Harbour, dredging, 4569
Edmundston public buildings, site, 4613
Fishways, 3362
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1271
Geological survey, exploration, 2504
Gorman, Mr. L. F., salary, 3360
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 4562
Hayes, Mr., Canadian National Railways, 2471
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment, 2498
Highway bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Hudson Bay railway, 4310
Construction vote, 4683
Icebreaker Mikula, qu. 1384
Immigration
Child, 1471
Policy in New Brunswick, 1086
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4494, 4502
Indians, 2154
Agent at Perth, N. B., 2154
Intercolonial inclusion in Canadian National, 13
International bridges, 2342, 3647
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Joggins breakwater, 943
Kent Northern railway, 4189

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Labour
Employment bureaus, private, 1630
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4232
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouse and lightkeepers
Descheneau, Mr. P., qu. 4512
Maintenance and repairs, 3353, 3354
New lights, 3357
Salaries and allowances, 3352
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4573
Magdalen islands wharves, 974
Mail contracts
Sporting mountain, qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, Quebec, 4302
Margaree river salmon fisheries, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Maritime provinces coal, freight rates, 1813
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 2615
Meteorological service, 3360
Miramichi smelt fisheries, 1974
Moncton and Buctouche railway, qu. 203, 3646
Morrison, Mr. D. W., 1489
Murray Bay wharf, 973
Murray Stewart, purchase, qu. 203, 3354, 3359
National monument, Connaught place, 1020
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2186
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Nova Scotia, harbours and rivers, 941
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Parliament buildings, 1727
Patents of Invention bill, 2072, 2087
Permanent force, 892
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Port Greville breakwater, 944
Postmasters
Appointments and dismisals, 4534
Angouleme, qu. 3139
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, N. S., qu. 1363, 1795, 1797, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698
Herbertville, Que., qu. 3139
Labarre, Que., qu. 3138
Larouche, Que., qu. 3137
Pierreville, Que., qu. 4511
St. Bruno, Que., qu. 3140
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
St. Peter's, N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D. W., qu. 1488, 1489
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, qu. 3139
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4534
Post Office department, administration, 1817
Printing bureau, 1710
Public buildings
New Brunswick, 4613
Ontario, 4615
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1486, 2498, 2504
Rimouski wharf, 977
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1802
Russell, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebes railway, 4309
Sale and Inspection of Fruit bill 2105
Sales tax, exemption of hospital supplies, 4432
Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1369
Smelt-fishing regulations, qu. 1868, 1974
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldiers Settlement Board, staff, 2020
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Telegraph lines
Chicoutimi county, qu. 3138
St. Charles-Peribonka, qu. 3262
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment to Bench, 1868
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal qu. 3140
War claims, 2498
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Harbours. *See* Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual harbours, *See* Harbours and Rivers
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Vancouver, Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers, 993, 4554. *See also* Public Works, Dredging
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 2671
Canoe wharf, 1005
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Fraser river improvements, 1003-07
Generally, 1002
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Port Renfrew, 1008
Salmon arm, 1006
Vancouver. *See also that title*
Stanley Park, 1008
Victoria. *See that title*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Day labour, 950, 956
Expenditure, 83, 947
Generally, 1009
Manitoba, 993, 4589
Red River, 1000
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Selkirk, 1000
Wanipigow (Hole river), 1000
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
Campbellton, 945
Cummings Cove, 945
Generally, 946
Grand Manan, 945
Head Harbour, 2900
Passamaquoddy bay, 2899
Portage river, 950
St. Andrew's, 2899
St. Croix, 2899
St. John. *See that title*
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Wharves transferred to Dominion government, 946
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Abbott's harbour, 4563
Advocate, 4560
Annapolis Royal, 941
Arichat, qu. 2180
Bass River, 4563
Battery Point, 4563
Black Point, 941
Broad Cove marsh, 4564
Burlington Centre, 4564
Canada Creek, 4564
Canso, 941
Cape St. Mary, 941
Cariboo Island, 4564, 4567
Chapel Cove, 941
Cheverie wharf, 4567
Chimney Corner, 941
Culloden, 4567
Dartmouth, 4568
D'Escousse, 4568
Digby, 942
Dredging, 4568
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Eastern Harbour, 4569
Ecum Secum, 4571
Five Islands, 4571
Fruid's Point, 4571
Generally, 942
Gillis Point, 4571
Grand Narrows, 4572
Half Island Cove, 4572
Halifax. *See that title*
Hampton, 4572
Haulover, 943
Inverness, 4572

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Joggins, 943
Judique, 943
Leitche's Creek, 943
Little Anse, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4722, 4572
Little Harbour, 4575
Livingstone's Cove, 4576
Lockeport, 943
Lunenburg, 4576
Dredging, amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580
Malagash, dredging, 4580
Margaree, 4581
Margaretville, 4581
Meteghan, 4581
North Ingonish, 4582
North Sydney, 4582
Nyanza wharf, 4582
Ostrea Lake, 943
Parrsboro, 4583
Pembroke, 4584
Pictou, 4584
Beach light, 4583
Piper's Cove, 4583
Point Aconi, 4583
Port Beckerton, 4583
Port Greville, 944, 4583
Port Lorne, 4584
Portugese Cove 4584
Riverport, 4584
Round Hill, 4584
Sandford, 4584
Scotch Cove, 4584
Scott's Bay, 4584
Shaw Bay, 4585
Shelburne, 4585
Sheet Harbour West, 4585
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Ship Harbour, 4586
Smith's Cove, 4585
Sonora wharf, 4585
South Lake, 4585
Summerville, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Yarmouth, 944
Ontario, 2690, 4588, 4594
Bayfield, 981
Belle River, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Big Bay Point, 981
Blind River, 981
Bracebridge, 4612
Chatham, 982

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Cloud Bay, 982
Cobourg, 981
Fort William, 2675, 4610
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Generally, 982
Grassmere, 4612
Jackson's Point, 4589
Kincardine, 982
Little Current, 982
Meaford, 983
Midland, 983
Owen Sound, 2690
Port Arthur, 2675, 4610
Port Burwell, 983
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Port Maitland, 4589
Rondeau, 983
Southampton, 984
Toronto, 2678. *See also that title*
Prince Edward Island, 945
Beach Point, 4586
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Quebec
Bryant's Landing, 950
Cap de la Madeleine, 950
Chicoutimi, 950
Contrecoeur, 950, 1008
Cross Point, 955
Descente des Femmes, 955
East Templeton, 955
Generally, 968
Grand River, 958
Grondines wharf, 959
M. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 963
Grosses Roches, 968
La Malbaie, 968
Lanoraie, 969
Lavaltrie, 969
L'Islet, 969
Matane, 970
Montreal. *See that title.*
New Carlisle, 973
Peribonka, 973
Piche Point, 973
Pointe a Elie, Magdalen islands, 974
Point au Pic, Murray Bay, 973
Pointe aux Trembles, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) 977
Quebec harbour. *See that title*
Repentigny, 977
Rimouski, 977
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Riviere du Lievre, 978
Roberval, 978
St. Alexis, 980

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne des Monts, 979
St. Charles, 980
St. Jean d'Orleans, 980
St. Michel de Bellechasse, 980
St. Omer, 980
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Three Rivers, 3399, 3963. *See also that title*
Ville Marie, 981
Saskatchewan, 1001, 4589
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winter ports, 2902

Harington, Sir Charles. *See* Near East Crisis

Harness, duty on, 3048

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582-3
Budget, 2804. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Bank Act revision; tariff; former criticism of minister; irritating taxation; sales tax; increase passed on to consumer; application to foreign and domestic goods, 2804; encouraging the middlemen; dilemma of the Minister of the Interior; free trade and protection; cost of civil government; balanced budget; Civil Service salaries; duplication and overlapping of services; retrenchment; ship of state drifting; Liberal party near rocks of destruction; immigration policy, 2805; government on business principles; tariff stability, protection and free trade; indigenous industries; wood production; reciprocity with United States; a begging request; parliamentary speeches; brevity, 2806; shipment of cattle to British markets; Transcontinental railway; Winnipeg-Quebec route; shipping facilities; Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats for cattle trade; St. Lawrence river waterway, parliamentary discussion of, 2807; talk of secession in western provinces; breezes blowing in the mulberry trees; national and imperial unity, 2808
Canadian National Railways
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Directors, inspection trip, qu. 489
Special train, qu. 489
Experimental farms, 467, 472

Harris, Mr. Joseph H.—*Con.*
Feed inspection, 602
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4589
Health of animals, 582
Hog cholera, 582
Jackson's Point wharf, 4589
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, Stornoway, 2181
Montreal harbour commissioners, advances, qu. 812
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 4753
Retired farmers, income, 1118
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Toronto viaduct, qu. 517
Trade commissioners, 1840

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 958

Hatters Bands, etc. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Haulover, N.S., wharf, 943

Hawkesbury, government revenue and salaries, qu. 2205

Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal from Calgary post office, 1687, 1868

Hazelton telegraph line, 150

Hazen, Sir Douglas
Appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Health. *See also* Housing; Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Advancement of, 2827
Children, mortality of, 1179
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Death rate, 1197
Department of
Estimates, 697, 2170
Food and Drugs Act, administration, 697
Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Institutions for sailors, 2167
Legal adviser, 777
Maple products, 1810
Marine hospitals, 2167
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Grosse Isle, number of vessels calling, 2168
Halifax building, 4612
St. John, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Health—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Sick mariners' dues, 2167-8
Dominion Council of Health, women members, 3649
Medical research, standardizing and testing laboratories, 703
Immigration, medical inspection, 702
Oleomargarine and, 3558
Pharmaceutical preparations, country of origin, qu. 3261
Venereal diseases, 705

Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live stock

Healy, Mr. A. F. (North Essex)
Belle River harbour, 4594, 4608
Canadian Press Limited, 2555, 2630, qu. 3703
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Combines bill, 2555, 2621, 2630
Registrar, appointment of, 2630
Introduction, 1135
Newspaper combines, 2630
North Essex election, visit of Mr. Meighen to Belle River, 4594

Hearst Publications. *See* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)

Hebert River coal district. *See* Coal

Hebridean Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Hector Celebration, grant to Scottish Pioneer Association, 4636, 4705

Helium, discoveries
Macallum, Dr., 4439
McLennan, Professor by, 703

Hemp
Belfast, 3032
Bounty, 2647, 2659, 2704, 2709, 2778, 2823, 2827, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3018, 3031, 3911, 3963
Binder twine, 2780
Extension of time, 3911
Duty, 3017
Industry, establishment of, 3031
Seed, for agricultural purposes, 3474
Free entry of, 2645, 2651

Hemp Bounty Bill
Res. 3911, 3914, 3963; lr., 3963; 2r., com., 4376; 3r., 4391
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4376, neg. 4391

Henderson, Right Hon. Arthur, class rule in politics, 2733

Herbertville, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3139

Herschell Island, Eskimos, trial. *See* North West Territories Act Amdt.

Hides, imports, qu. 617

High Commissioner in London
Empire settlement board, agreement, 1476
Grain shortage, complaint of British importers, 1764
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Office building, 4629
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., representative on Pacific Cable board, 1832
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456

Highland Battalions. *See* Hector Celebration

Highways. *See also* Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill
Alberta, 2342
Appropriations under act of 1919, 2338
Banff-Windermere, 3437, 3584
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
British Columbia, 2941, 3186
Unemployment, 3032
British Columbia-Washington state, 2941
Buckhorn lock roadway, 4691
Canada Highways Commission, 2489
Campbell, Mr. A. W., C.E., 3173
Staff, 3173
Canboro-Dunville-Welland-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Cariboo road, 3032
Cost per mile, 2491, 3176
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Dundas street, qu. 708
Effect on railway traffic, 1619
Estimates, 2489, 3173
Federal contribution to, 2489
Grants
Federal inquiry, 519, qu. 623
Ontario, to, qu. 620
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 624, 2492
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 813
Hope-Princeton, 2342
Indian reserves, passing through, 2153
International, 2941
Bridges, 2342
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Jasper Park, 3435
Lachute-Arundel, 4313
Manitoba, 3184
Meaford-Clarksburg, 4565
Millbrook reserve, 2124
Montreal-Hull, 2341
Montreal-Mont Laurier, 2341, 4313
New Brunswick, 3182

Highways—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 3183
Ontario, 3177
Grant, qu. 620
Projected, 624
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 2085
Pacific highway, 2341
Prince Edward Island, 3184
Quebec, 3180
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Saskatchewan, 3185
Statements
Cost per mile, 3176
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Types of roads, 3174
Toronto-London, qu. 708
Waterton lakes, qu. 2085
Yukon, 3943

Hindus. *See also* Immigration, Oriental
Immigrants, franchise, 503, 4077, 4640-53

Hirtle, Carrie L., schooner, qu. 3323

Historic Sites. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Canadian National Parks and Reservations bill; Monuments and Memorials

Hoboes, products of unemployment, 1194

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Annuities, old age, 1697
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Belle River harbour, 4597
British mail, delay in, 2639, 2695
Business, difficulties of, 1419
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4190
Paris offices, 3279
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Combines bill, 2522
Co-operative associations, 1419
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4558
Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 335
Hamilton harbour commissioners qu. 912
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hemp bounty, 3911
Hudson Bay railway, 4192
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3590
Policy, 1418
International Joint Commission, 3427
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour, hours, 1842

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
Canadian, encouragement of, M., 826, 855
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Midland post office, qu. 623
Montreal harbour commission, qu. 1137
National Monument, Connaught place, 1021
Navigation, aids to, 3333
Newspaper combines, 2522
Paper, prices in Canada and United States, 829
Peat experiments, 794
"Plutocrats and profiteers," 1418
Post Office department
Appointments and retirements, 1826
Ross, Mr. George, retirement, 1825
Progressive party and tariff, 1421
Proportional representation, 388
Public ownership of railways, 4190
Public Works department, patronage, 946
Quebec harbour commissioners, qu. 1136
Radio direction finding, qu. 3820
St. John harbour commissioners, qu. 911
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2780
Sales tax, 4414
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Tariff
Immigration and, 1418
Reduction of, 1421
Toronto
Customs house, 3279
Harbour improvements, 2679
Seed branch building, 4624
Union station, 4444
Viaduct, 4444
Vancouver harbour bill, 264
Vancouver harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Welland canal construction, 3780

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 186
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs., trip to South America, qu. 1031
House of Commons furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Address in reply, 63. No reference in speech to tariff revision, 63; rapid deflation in price of foodstuffs; market for surplus farm products; Canadian agriculturist to-day feeding Europe, 64; Canadian representation in the United States; foreign policy bound up in that of United States; conference of provincial representatives on revenue; amendment, 65

Hoey, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 999
Authors' Association of Canada, copyright, 3155
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4038
Bank robberies, 776
Binder twine, prices, 4377
Brandon, damage by floods, 999
Cadet services, 877
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3961
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 565
Civil Service, exempted positions, 367
Copper bounty bill, 3235
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155
Dominion Elections Act amdt. 1027
Experimental farms, 462
Farm homes, 1215
Grand jury system, abolition of, 3271
Hemp bounty, 3912, 4377
Hopkins, Mr., and reciprocity, 3010
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1215
Policy, 1213
Story of an immigrant's struggle and success, 1216
Inheritance tax, 2803
Institutionalism, over, 1214
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225, 4227
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4175
League of Nations, 142
Manitoba
Agricultural economic conditions, 1213
Institutions and services in excess of present need, 1214
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Proportional representation, 406, 418, 424
Reciprocity with the United States, 2854, 3905
Rural credits, 4039
Settlement schemes, 1089
Shipping combine, prosecution of, 4077, 4227
Taxation commission, 4039
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Western provinces, conditions, 1213

Hogs. *See* Livestock

Holland
Butter, competition, 2863
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration, from, 1085, 1095, 3591
Imports and exports, 1977

Home Building. *See* Building; Housing

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697, 1810

Hong Kong, goods imported via Suez canal and, 3454

Honorary Advisory Council. *See* Research

Honours. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, Labour Gazette, 1625-6

Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supply, 1263

Hopkins, Mr. E. N. (Moose Jaw)
Budget, 2980. First speech in House of Commons; limited vision of new members; Canada's destiny; Moose Jaw district; selection of wheat by millers; high tariff bears unduly on the West, 2980; interests of the East and West; recapitalization and adjustment of debts; sharing of war burdens, 2981
Introduction, 2417
Moose Jaw income tax office, qu. 2699
Reciprocity, attitude towards, 3010

Hoppe and Isenberg Leases. *See also* Dominion Lands Act (Coal Leases); Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill
Cancellation of, 3146, 3222
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Investigation into, 3128

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse-Racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Information. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bills

Horses. *See* Live stock

Horticulture. *See also* Fruit; Insect Pests
Canadian Council of, 2307
Garden and grass seeds, purity of, 601
Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423
Nursery stock, 1990
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Seed testing. *See* that title

Hospitals. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Health
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Marine, 701, 2167
Military, 669
Closed, 669
Brant House, Burlington, 4075
Euclid House, Toronto, 4075

Hospitals—*Con.*
Military—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
Repairs and improvements, 4629
Staffs, 675
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Transients, treatment of, 673
Sales tax, 4432
Soldiers, maintenance cost, qu. 812
Standardization, 2934
X-Ray plates, coverings, duty, 3501

Hotel Scribe, purchase of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hotels. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hours. *See* Civil Service; Labour

House of Commons. *See also.* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1721, 2446. *See also under this title,* Audibility of debates
Members, speaking, to occupy central position, 1721
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven o'clock, 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3208, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
To await action of Senate on bill, 4754
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
British Columbia fishing licenses, M., (Mr. Clark), 1540
Hebridean immigrants, M. (Mr. Speakman) 3584
Powell River Paper Company, M. (Mr. Neill) 2886
Union Bank, M. (Mr. Forke) 4296
Twelve, midnight, 4672
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Audibility of debates, 645, 976, 2446, 3327, 4572, 4580, 4593
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Bills
Alterations in, 3325, 3451
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3974, 3976, 4185
Preparation and form of, 4007
Principle discussed on second reading, 3091
Private, suspension of rules, posting, 4248
Third reading by consent, 4141
Business of the House, 179, 250

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Amdt. to amdt.
Mr. Crerar, session of 1922, 1300
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1299-1307
Budget debate, precedence, 2694
For to-morrow, 3750
Government orders to have precedence Monday and Wednesday, 1158
Legislation
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
Pending, qu. 2517, 2795, 3265
Announcement, 3452
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Post Office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' days, 1158
Progress of, 2469
Supply. *See also under this title,* Supply
Calling on Mondays and Tuesdays, 2295
Relevancy, 4720
By-elections, 99. *See also* Elections and, *under this title,* Vacancies
Grenville, 4606
Moose Jaw, return, delay, 2295
North Essex, 4594
Chamber
Acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics;
Conversation, 4528, 4572
Lighting, 1728
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Canadian Government Merchant Marine vote, 4598
Committees, For proceedings and reports, *See titles* of the several committees
Expenses of, 2691
Reports
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Right to consider questions not referred to, 3266
Select Standing, 3, 199
Changes in membership, 382, 486, 435, 615, 811, 857
Special, cost of, 2979
Contingencies, 2691
Debate
Audibility of. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility
Speeches
Brevity, 2806
Length of, 2883
Debates, Official Report of
Abolition, 1734
Committee, 202

House of Commons—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of—*Con.*
Distribution, 1715
Estimates, 2691
Insertion of documents not read, 1830, 3174
Pages missing from bound copy, 887, 1081
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Revised edition, inquiry, 122
Undiscussed items in supply, 1638, 3284, 3292
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Divisions
Address in reply
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) neg. 178
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Shaw) neg. 177
Bank Act Amdt. bill
Bank charters, extension, amdt. (Mr. Good) 4141, neg. 4147
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Officers, right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Budget
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means agreed to, 3084
Canadian National Railways bill (Branch lines) amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to 3r., neg. 4401
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) for repeal; amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for Special Com. agreed to, 571
Combines bill, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for 2r., agreed to, 2609
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Robb) for concurrence in amdt. agreed to, 2292
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to supply neg. 2391
Export Act Amdt. bill (Pulpwood) amdt. (Mr. Power) six months hoist, neg. 4397
French Treaty bill, M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., agreed to, 2250-51
Lack of Confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) neg. 243
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill M. (Sir Lomer Gouin) for 2r., agreed to, 4180
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) to permit manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) to remove suspension of prohibition, agreed to, 3581

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that government submit legislation before prorogation, neg. 3580
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 434
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment of, neg. 1152
Titles, Honours and Decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) neg. 1299
Documents, distribution of, 1712
Estimates, 2691. *See also that title;* Supply
Discussion
En bloc 4554, 4558, 4587, 4612
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614-15
Furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Indemnity of members, 4674. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Proposed reduction 2915, 2967, 3043
M. (Mr. Leader) 1153
Senate and House of Commons Act, proposed changes, 4007, 4008. *See also that title*
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Joint Committee of both Houses on matters of common interest, 4007. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611
Report, 3887
Language, unparliamentary. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Letters
Quotation from by private member, 4599
Signature withheld, 4599
Library of Parliament, salaries, 2691
Members
Alleged reflection on, 4237
Attendance, 4007, 4008, 4236. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Coaching each other, 405
Deceased, 10, 102, 166
Blackadder, Dr. Edward, 4-8, 102

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Kennedy, Hon. W. C., 4-8, 10, 102, 166, 281
Lafortune, Mr. D. A., 4-8, 281
Stewart, Hon. J. A., 4-8, 435
Indemnity of. *See under this title,* Indemnity
Labour, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033
New, election and introduction of
Benoit, Mr. A. J., 3
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., 2837
Finn, Mr. R. E., 3
Healy, Mr. A. F., 1135
Hopkins, Mr. E. N., 2417
Preston, Mr. R. F., 3
Rheaume, Mr. J. F., 3
Roberge, Mr. Eusebe, 3
Robichaud Mr. J. G., 3
Party funds, and, 4237
Relationship with constituents, 3021
Sessional attendance. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Stenographers, qu. 518
Votes, 4237
Motions. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Amendment to amendment
Proposed change in rules, 856, 1299
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Precedence, 3451
To keep place on order paper pending Speaker's ruling, 1285
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the day. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Parliamentary counsel, Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Privilege
Bancroft, Mr.—Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner), 1308
Béland, Hon. Mr.—Reported statement of Mr. Meighen in North Essex election, 708
Carroll, Mr.—Com. on Agriculture and Colonization, 3266
Clark, Mr.—Equalization of railway rates, 1910
Coote, Mr.—Correction of newspaper report, 2519
Good, Mr.—Question of veracity, 2181
Irvine, Mr.—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Martell, Mr.—Civil Service Committee report, 4363
Shaw, Mr.—Grain Growers' Guide, 987

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr.—Redistribution Committee, 1660
Questions
Answers and, 1385
Inquiry as to, 940
Lengthy, 939
Passed as orders for returns, 938, 940, 1139, 1385, 4303
Placed on order paper without member's knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Representation. *See* Redistribution
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 1307
Inquiry for, 1212, 1636, 2208, 2254, 2394, 2640, 3324, 3508, 3962, 4184, 4295, 4513
Tabled, 3399
Rules
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Special committee to consider, M. (Mr. Johnston) 856, 1299
Suspension of, private bills, 4248
Wednesday, hour of meeting, Rule 2, 1 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Senate and, Joint Committee. *See* Senate
Sergeant-at-Arms, estimates, 2691
Session
Economy in length of, 132, 133
Waste of time in, 143, 144
Sittings. *See also under this title,* Adjournments
All night, 4672
Late, 4599
Midnight, 4579, 4672
Mornings, 4132, 4249
Saturday, 2694, 3452, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Change in hour of meeting, 1
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Speaker's rulings. *See also* Speaker
Discussion of, 4013, 4076
Speeches. *See under this title,* Debate
Staff
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Organization, 4592
Salaries, 2691
Translators, Arsenault, Mr. H. P., 2691
Supply
M. to postpone proposed resolution, 3667
Voting in, 4610, 4611
Vacancies. *See also under this title,* By-elections
Cape Breton North and Victoria, 1763, 2469
Moose Jaw, 615
Nicolet, 2178

House of Commons—*Con.*
Votes and proceedings, questions passed as orders for returns, 939

House of Lords, constitution of, 1378

Housing. *See also* Building; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Assistance for, 2987
Building trades and, 1812
Farm homes, 1178, 1215
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1215, 1240, 1406
Harvesters, 2822
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 2517, 2518
Loans to provinces, 4558, 4603, 4704

Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2393, 2347, 2419, 2469, 3155

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4082
Budget, 3060. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity with United States; sugar duties, reduction in; tariff stability; review of fiscal system; national policy and its results; comparison of imports 1879 and 1923, 3060; new inventions, standards and wants; imports increasing in spite of high tariff; United States, Fordney tariff; iron ore and smelting industry; Canada not a self-contained country; imports must be paid for by exports; products of farm, sea and forest; manufactured products, export of, 3061; United States market; free admission of boots and shoes and farm implements; Canadian manufacturers, after 40 years protection not able to compete; folly to encourage new industries by artificial means; new duties and bounties; sectionalism; solidarity of the West; tariff and unjust tax; wheat production; producers get no benefit from tariff; Liberal platform of 1919; no hope of tariff planks being carried out; vote against government tariff proposals, 3062
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, grain trade, 1211
Rules, 1301. M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com. on
Tariff proposals, vote against, 3062, 3084

Hudson Bay
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Resources. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Company
Claim to Rocky Mountain park, qu. 2418
Navigation of Hudson bay and strait. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways, branch lines; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland Canal
Agricultural resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Appropriation of land for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Canadian air force, 1748
Climatic conditions, 1072
Coal, transportation of, 1055, 1073, 1283
Cochrane, Hon. Frank, statement by, 1071
Commercial feasibility. *See under this title,* Feasibility
Commission to inquire and investigate, 3005
Comparative distances, 1034, 1070
Competition with Canadian National Railways, 1041, 1050, 1056, 1058, 1067, 1973-4
Construction, 4680
Correspondence, 208
Discontinuance of, 1062, 2747
Deficit, operating, 1560
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1062, 1761, 4682
Expenditure, 1033, 3073, 3076, 4192, 4198. *See also* Welland canal construction
Public and, 3005
Experiments, 461
Feasibility, 1033-70, 1749, 2878, 2939, 3005
Anderson, Captain, 1038, 1042, 1044, 1057, 1064
Bartlett, Capt, 1047
Bell, Dr., report, 1052
Bernier, Capt., testimony, 1072
Chisby, Capt., report, 1052
Crean, Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1072
Gordon report, 1038
Hackland, Capt. J., statement, 1064
Investigation by Canadian air service, 1749-50
Kennedy, Capt. William, report, 1052
Low. Mr. A. P., report, 1072
MeKenna, Mr. J. A. J. report, 1063
Manitoba legislature, com., report, 1052
Pritchard, Capt. William, report, 1052
Reid, Capt John, 1046
Test of, 1069
Tyrrell, Mr. J. W. report, 1072
Wakeham report, 1038
Finance, 1053
Dominion lands, appropriation for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Lash, late Mr. Z. A., 1053
Oliver, Hon. Frank, statement, 1053
Fishery resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Fort Churchill terminal. *See under this title,* Terminals

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1061, 1072
Freight rates, 3779. *See also that title*
Graham, Hon. George P., statement in 1916, 1071
Grain, transportation and marketing, 1032-80, 4681. *See also that title*
Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, 1061
Hazen, Sir Douglas, 1061
History and condition of, 1040, 1076
Hydro-electric power, 1065
James Bay railway, 1036, 1049
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4170
Land sold for qu. 283. *See also under this title,* Finance
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid
Announcement of project at Niagara Falls, 1047
Statement, 1066, 1071
London Times 1059
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co. claim, 4686
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
Military aspect of, 1057
Monthly Trade Review, London, editorial, 1036
M. (Mr. Knox) for consideration of Senate report, 1032; agreed to "on division," 1080
Motherwell Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686, 2774, 4683
Obstacles to success of, 2939
Policy, 2878
Port Nelson. *See under this title,* Terminals
Postponement of, 2951
Press statement as to cost—correction, 2296
Priority of undertaking, 1073, 1079
Progressive party and, 3030
Rail removals qu. 203
Reclamation of land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Repair, 1070. 3647, 4198, 4680
Resources Hudson bay and region, 1039, 1064, 1072
Agricultural, 1065
Crean Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Fishery, 1064, 1073
Lower, Mr. A. R. M. report, 1065
Melville, Mr. C. D. report, 1064
Sifton, Sir Clifford announcement of project at Brandon, 1047
Surveys and gradings, 4310
Terminals, 1071
Bartlett, Captain, 1063
Fort Churchill, 1039, 1043, 1063
Hazen Sir Douglas, statement, 1063

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Terminals—*Con.*
Port Nelson, 1032, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1063, 1069, 3647
Dredging, 1012
Reid, Hon. J. D. statement, 1063
Thornton, Sir Henry, 4683
Turgeon, Hon. Senator, 1071
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Utility of, 1076
Waterpowers, 1065
Welland canal and, 1054, 1068, 3779. *See also that title.*
West, interest in scheme, 1035
Work this year, 4310

Hudson Bay Route, feasibility of. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply 123. Financial question; social and industrial unrest, 123; transportation and the railway problem, 126; contrast between government railways and Canadian Pacific, 127; Prince Edward Island railway, 128; decrease in population of Prince Edward Island, 129; representation of Prince Edward Island on government commissions, 130; discrimination in freight rates, potato-growing; immigration; the eight-hour day, 131; hours of railway station agents, 132
Budget, 2919; Multiplicity of counsel; mild criticism of budget from opposition benches, 2919; taxation and debt; responsibility for; increase of expenditure by Conservative administration; civil service dismissals and appointments; war prices; 50 per cent of war expenditure wasted or stolen, 2920; Liberals associated with late government; purchase of medical supplies through middleman; Conservatives preach economy but propose no specific reduction, 2921; reciprocity with United States; offer by Sir John Macdonald; election campaign of 1891; statement of Mr. Blaine; protection and free trade; balance of trade; imports and exports, 2922; international trade, profit and loss; artificial trade barriers; trade commissioners and subsidized steamship services; war blockade; selling without buying 2923; defeat of reciprocity in 1911; world-wide free trade not attainable; high tariff unprofitable; revenue necessities; farmers and reciprocity, 2924; legislation in advance of public sentiment; Liberal platform of 1919; progressive opposition, amendment, 2925
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 531
Amdt. to refer to special committee, 534
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Morning and Saturday sittings, 4132
Powell River Paper Company, 2893
Proportional representation, 419, 423

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Budget, 2940. Congratulations to Finance Minister; western provinces, lack of knowledge of; British Columbia, resources, 2940; Asiatic immigration; highways; electors of Revelstoke and Nelson; Mr. McQuarrie's charge of bribery, 2941; Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; immigration; fruit-growing industry; returned soldiers, treatment of; discontent; Canadian Legion, Victoria, B.C. resolution; administration of Pension Act, 2942; Board of Pension Commissioners; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, withdrawal from Nelson; telegram of Nelson Board of Trade; professional agitators; copper bounty, 2943; Trail smelter; opening of copper rod mill; optimistic feeling in British Columbia; tariff; amendment, 2944
Canadian National Railways, legislation, qu. 4300
Canadian National Safety League, 3958
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-37
Copper bounty bill, 3241, 4373
Freight rates, equalization of railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1970
Hindu franchise, 4658
Housing
Administration of act, 2171
Loans to provinces, 4704
Imperial Conference, 4658
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour, right to organize, 2895
Ore-testing, Ottawa plant, 2505, 2511
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3282, 4748
Pensions, 2942
Appeal boards, 697

Humphrey, Mr. L. W.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Royal commission
Interim report, 2167
Recommendations, 2394
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 4734

Hungary, immigration from, 1094

Hunter, Mr. J. B. *See* Public Works Department

Husband's Brother, Marriage with. *See* Deceased, Marriage

Huskisson, William, tariff reduction in Great Britain, 3050

Hydro Electric Power. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Beck, Sir Adam, Morrisburg dam, 1270
Development in Ontario, 1270
Electric railways, 2475
Municipalities, 2475
Pointe Fortune, qu. 1974
Power exported to the United States, 1266
Quebec and New England Hydro Company, qu. 1974
Whitney, Sir James, 1266

Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 3782
Public ownership, 3056
Radial railways, 2476
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324

Hydrographic Survey. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Ice and Icebreakers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries; Vessels
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Cabot strait, obstruction in, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3354

Iceland, immigration from, 1096

Illicit Liquor Traffic. *See* Liquor

Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Immigration, 2784, 3060, 3066. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Labour, Unemployment; Naturalization
Advertising, 43, 81, 1084, 1085, 1103, 1180, 1218, 1318, 1873

Immigration—*Con.*
Agents
Appointment of, 1188
Biden, Miss, 1099
Bowder, Mr. W. R., representation of New Brunswick in Great Britain, 1086, 1198
European, 1876
Gardiner, Mr., 1099
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085, 1135, 1243
May, Mr., 2663
Murphy, Mr. representative in Scotland, 1095, 1879
Pattullo, Mr., 1096
Railways acting as, 1191
Agriculturists of, 37-38, 1881. *See also under this title,* Farmers
Alien enemies, restriction of, 1128, 2428, 2667
Alleged campaign against, 332
Appointments, 3252. *See also under this title,* Agents
Army officers, 1432
Artisans, shopkeepers, town dwellers, 1204
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental
Assimilation, 1346
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Assisted passages, 1096, 1132
Great Britain, from, 1100
Immigrants family or friends, advance, 1100
Loans for passages, 1475-8
Banks and, 4042. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Barnado Boys' home, 1099, 1470
Beatty, Mr. E. W. and, 1337-8
Belgium from, 1096, 1173
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister, visit to England, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Boundary inspection, 1875
Bracken, Premier, statement, 1123
British, 20, 43, 1084, 1105, 1218, 1339, 1346, 2929
Preference for Australia and New Zealand, 2932
British Columbia into, 1096, 1112, 2942
Co-operation with, 1097
Oriental, 1217. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Buildings
Halifax, 4612
St. John, 1457, 1464
"Canada an immigration sieve," 628, 647
Canada Colonization Association, 51, 71, 1089, 1118, 1133, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1191, 1208, 1215, 1237, 1240, 1315, 1352, 1357, 1396, 1391, 1399, 1425, 1428, 1437, 1439, 1479, 3637

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Advances, qu. 517, 1479
Advertising, 1318
Agreement, 1879, 3036
Signing of, 1976
Terms, 1102
Amery, Colonel, 1328
Brown, Mr. M. A., 1102-3, 1172, 1328
Letters from Messrs. Meighen and Forke, 1333
Budget expenses, 1877
Calder, Hon. Senator, voluntary colonizing agency, 1333
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, contribution, 1164
Canadian National Railways, 3324
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3324
Commission, 1877
Community clubs, 1183
Crawford and Kurdydyk, Messrs., letters, 1396
Creelman, Mr. George, manager, eastern Canada, 1172
Dennis, Col. J. S., statement of, 1324
Everett, Mr. Edward, manager, 1092, 1103, 1172
Forke, Mr. Robert, director, 1407
Letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Statement by, 1105
Grant, 1877
Hebridean immigrants, 3585
History of organization, 1102
Imperial government, financial support, 1429
Land, sales of, 1316, 1431, 1877
Commission of ten per cent, 1102
Interest rate, 1877
Selection and purchase, 1091
Luse Land Company, 1103
McRae, General, 1324
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Minister's statement, 1320
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Officers and directors, 1327
Proposals, memo of, 1877
Published statement of objects, 1180
Railway contributions, 3400, 3633
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Salvation army, 1093
Soldier Settlement supervisors, services of, 1090, 1877
Speculation in unimproved land, 1118
Subscriptions, 1877
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1172, 1182, 1323, 1328, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Willison, Sir John—*Con.*
Letter to directors, 1431
Retirement from presidency, 1164, 1332, 1431
Telegram, 1325, 1331
Withdrawal of financial support, 1208
Canadian born, 3032
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876
Central, southern and eastern European, 1346, 1883
Child, 1099, 1227, 1243, 1342, 1469, 1472, 1475
Agencies, grants to, 1469, 1470
Barnardo, Dr., 1099, 1470
Bilbrough-Wallace, Mrs., 1470
Cardinal Manning, 1470
Catholic Emigration Association, 1470
Cossar, Dr. George C., 1471
Inspection, 1874
Marchmont Homes, 1470
Middlemore, Sir J. T., 1470
National Children's home and orphanage, 1470
Oriental, 1445. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Quarrier, Mr. William, 1470
Rye, Miss 1470
Salvation army, 1470
Smart, Mr. Bogue, 1469
Statistics as to 1470
Chinese. *See under this title,* Oriental
Colonization, 1178, 1333
Eastern provinces, 1134
Societies, 1876
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Competition and, 1418, 1426
Conference with railway and shipping companies, 1193
Conservative administration under, 1335-6
Co-ordination of activities, 2800
Co-operation, 1255
Cost of, 1439
Crerar, Hon. T. A., statement, 1123
"Dangerous agitators from British Isles", 3033
Denmark, from, 1096
Department. *See* Immigration and Colonization
Deportation, 1875
British soldier, alleged inhuman treatment, 2254
Deserters from ships, 2435
Discrimination between native-born and immigrant, 2732
Distribution of, 1198

Immigration—*Con.*
Domestic servants, 1099, 1115, 1166, 1189, 1200, 1243, 1474, 1475-6, 1477, 1876
Doukhobors, 1176
Settlement and migration, 1340
Drift to cities, 1165-1171, 1342
Economic conditions and, 1231
Emigration, *See that title*
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 1096, 1111, 1120, 1127, 1132, 1175, 1205, 1237, 1328, 1480
Canada's non-co-operation, 1096
Canada's participation, 667
Grant
Agreement, 1461, 1464, 1469
Division of, 1475
European, 1085, 1094, 1170, 1340, 1346, 2748
Agencies, 1876
Assimilation of, 2749
Northern European, 1227, 1249
Southeastern European, 1195
Exhibitions, 1454
Expenditure, 1908, 2969
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Total, 1208
Farm labourers, 1100, 1115, 1166, 1174, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1200, 1358, 1416, 1475
Farmers, of, 1115, 1188, 1189, 1421
Farmers' Advocate, 1186
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Follow-up policy, 1181
Foster homes for children. *See under this title,* Child
Fowler, Senator, statement by, 3032
France, 1173
German and Hungarian immigrants, 1094
Growth of West due to, 1881-2
Hebridean, 2950, 3037, 3252, 3584, 4706
Canada Colonization Association, 3585
Macdonnell, Rev. Father, 3585
Settlement in valley of Red Deer, 3252
Treatment of, M. (Mr. Speakman) to discuss etc., 3584, withdrawn, 3603
"Hidden Hand," the, 1167, 1193, 1201
Hindu, 498, 1120-8. *See also that title*
Franchise, 503, 4077, 4640, 4655
Iceland, from, 1096
Immigrant's struggle and success, 1216, 1399
Immigrants, rejected, qu. 706, qu. 1992
Imperial government, and, 1328
Increase of, 3055
Indian army officers, 1096
Intending immigrants to make application. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
International Labour Conference, 1631
Isle of Man, address by Mr. F. W. Kerr, 2949
Jacobs, Mr., speech at Winnipeg, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental
King, Mackenzie, Mr., speech at Stouffville, 1430
Labour. *See also that title*
Attitude of, 1167, 1176, 1186, 1193, 1196, 1241, 1337, 1892-3
Competition with, 2816
Employers and, 1193, 1194
Howat and Meyerscough, detention. *See* Howat; Labour
Restriction of, 1104
Land, 1091, 1102. *See also* Dominion Lands
Adjoining railways, 1893
For American immigrants, 1093, 1101
Sales, appraisal, 1316, 1431, 1877
Settlement, 2834
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156. *See also* Howat
Literature, 1097-8, 1226, 1239, 1389, 1414, 1428, 1433. *See also under this title* Advertising; Propaganda; Publicity
Misreprensentations, 1203
Lloyd, Bishop, reported statement, 1117, 2844
Loans for passages. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Overseas settlement board, 1469, 1481
Location of immigrants, 2834
London Times
Advertisement, South Africa, 1180
Statement of, 1124
Lougheed, Sir James, statement by, 3032
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 1204
Maritime provinces to, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236
Ignoring of, 2950
Mechanics from the Clyde, 1204
Medical inspection, 702, 1875
Mennonites, 1176, 1229, 1341, 1884
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1170
National Trust Company, statement of president, 1122
Naturalization, 2196. *See also that title*
Netherlands, 1095, 3591
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Nomination system, 1360, 1475-8
Non-English speaking immigrants, 1216
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Officers in Great Britain, 1879. *See also under this title* Agents
Ontario, into, 1096-98, 1428, 1475
Child immigration and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Northern, into, 1097, 1320
Oriental, 1117, 1247, 1307, 1346, 1443, 1900, 2941, 3037. *See also* Imperial Conference
Bill respecting, 4441

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Bishop of New Westminster, on, 504
Chinese, 499, 1443, 1448, 4641. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission, statistics, 1921-22, 1445
Assimilation, 2321
Children, 1445, 1452, 2484
Education of, 1896
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Estimates, 1443
Exclusion, 2313
Fingerprints, 502
Head tax, 1445
Evasion of, 2309
Indentured labour, 2330
Japanese and, 1117
Liberal platform of 1919, 1652
Merchants, 2309
Definition of, 2329
Students and, 1445, 2308, 2310
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2319
Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike, 2319
Registration, 502, 1445, 1447, 1452
Regulations, 1445
Religious organizations, representations from, 2310
Roosevelt, the late Theodore, statement, 2320
Sailors, 2333
Schools, 2326
Silverton, B.C., public meeting, res. 2338
Tong wars, 2337
Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1896
United States, 2313
Victoria retail merchants, 2316
Wives, 2484
Women, 2310, 2318
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1161
Estimates, 1441, 1443
Exclusion of, 2869
United States, from, 1194
Hindu, 498, 1120, 1128. *See also* Hindus, Franchise
Franchise, 503, 4077
Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa
Letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Visit to Canada, 4641
Japanese, 1450, 1894, 4641. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Birth rate, 1898
British Columbia, menace to, 1900
Canadian Japanese Association, pamphlet, 1894
Citizenship, 2442

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Japanese—*Con.*
Consul General at Ottawa, pamphlet, 1894
Correspondence with Mr. McQuarrie, 1894
Direct, 1448
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
"Gentlemen's agreement" 512. *See also under this title,* Lemieux agreement
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 859, 1448, 1451, 1454
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Lemieux agreement, 1894
Modification, 1447
Limitation of, 1449
Merchants, 1452
Nationality, 2443
Naturalization, 2442
Negotiations with Japanese government, 2328, 4441
North American Commission of American Legion, pamphlet, 1898
Petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, 2837, 4075
Irregular, Speaker's ruling, 2885
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Race equality, 1896
Restriction of emigration by Japanese government, 2328
Rights as British Subjects, 1899
Root-Takahjira "gentleman's agreement" 512
Supposed special privilege to land holders, 1450
Merchants, definition of, 1452. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Naturalization, 1453
Ormsby-Gore, Mr. W. G. on Canadian policy, 1111
Overcharging, Quebec, 3324
Overseas Settlement Board, 1099, 1469
Agreement, 1476. *See also under this title,* Empire Settlement Scheme
Passage. *See* Assisted Passages
Paternalism, 1133
Permission to intending immigrants. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Poland, 1204
Policy, 19, 29, 42, 1095, 1120-30, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1461, 2774, 2805, 2816, 2833, 2844, 2869, 2874, 2911, 2949, 3036
British dominions, 1882
Comment of London Times on, 1111
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 1177

Immigration—*Con.*
Population. *See also that title.*
Loss of, 3018
Not increased by, 1195
Prepaid passages, agreement with Imperial government, 2611. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1407. *See also* Prices
Printing, 1873
Private enterprise, 1414
Progressive members, attitude of, 2774
Propaganda, 1192, 1389. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Publicity
Embracing all Canada, 1098
Oriental, 1894-6-8
Prosperity and depression, 1177
Provinces
Co-operation of, 1085
Other than western, discrimination against, 1097
Provincial governments and, 1327
Publicity, 1873. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Propaganda
Advertisements, cost of, qu. 518
Committee, 1871
Special writers, 1874
"Public charge" 3155
Qualifications of immigrant, 1882
Quebec, into, 1104, 1198
Railways acting as agents, 1191
Recruiting, 2834
Repatriation, 1085, 1188, 1198, 1876, 2834
French Canadians in United States, 1462
Restriction of, 1169, 1174, 1186, 1233. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Orders in council, 1128
Russia, 1340, 2845
St. John immigration building, 1464, 1908
Agreement with C.P.R., 1458
Salvation army, 1093, 1430, 1876
Saskatchewan
Domestic servants, 1099
Mennonites, 1229
Scandinavia, 1216
Scotland from, 1095, 1876
Scottish Aid Society, 1876
Selection, 1098, 1108, 1219, 1254
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Settlements far removed from railways, 3431
Shaw, Lord, statement in Winnipeg, 2833
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Sifton, Sir Clifford
Importation fo British workmen, 1186
Policy, 1204, 1881-83

Immigration—*Con.*
Smart, Mr. Bogue, child immigration, 1469
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1255. *See also under this title,* Canada Colonization Association
Extension of system to immigrants, 1128
Supervisory agents, 1179
Speeches
Adverse effect of, 1423
"Blue ruin," 3037
Standards of living, 1127
Statistics, 3036, 3055
1881-1922, 1094
1914-1921, 1111
1920-22, 1105
Steamship companies, bonuses to, 1109, 1462
Stornoway immigrants, 3037. *See also under this title* Hebridean
Supplies, Quebec, 496
Alleged overcharging, 3324
Sweden and Holland, from, 1095, 3591
Switzerland, 3591
Tariff and, 1133. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation and, 1121, 1319, 2791. *See also* speeches on Budget
Thirty-two year payment plan, 1317
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1167 2795, 2844
Trade
Effect upon, 1122
Relations with oriental countries, 507
Ukrainians, 1341, 1396, 1883
Unemployment relief, 1679, 2730
Union Nationale Francais, 1877
United Farmers of Alberta, res. 81
United Farmers of Ontario, res. 1191
United States. *See also that title*
Agencies, 1875
From, 43, 1105, 1113, 1243
Unskilled labourers, 2822
Vancouver immigration sheds, 1896
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981. *See also* Japanese
Walker, Sir Edmund, 1343
War years, during, 20
Western Canada, 1086, 1347
Attitude of, 107, 1086-92, 1129
Western Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Canada Colonization
Women's immigration division, 1876

Immigration Act Amendment Bills. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
1. Permission to intending immigrants (Mr. Neill) 1r., 74; order for 2r. stands, 497, 857

Immigration Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
2. Alien enemies; fines, shipmasters reporting desertions (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1r., 2204; 2r., com., 2428; com., 2668; 3r., 2671; Senate amdts., 3981
Sections and subjects discussed
British subject, 2429
Canadian citizen, definition, 2429
Canadian domicile, 2429
Deportation, 2429, 3981
Conspirators, 2428
Without trial, 2433
Deposit as security for return of deserters, 2435
Discharging crew without examination, 2435
Enemy aliens, 2428, 2667
Repeal of 1919 legislation, 2428
Undesirable classes, 2428, 2668
Aliens, 2428, 2667
Assassination, 2669
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981

Immigration and Colonization department
Chief Controller, 2308
Chinese immigration, salaries, 1443
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Statement of expenditure, 1480
George, Little, deportation, qu. 3704
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Little, Mr. W. R., employment, qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Minister
Reported statement, Sir Henry Thornton, as to, 2795, 2844
Statement of, 1082
Outside service, salaries, 1082, 1106, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386
Quebec employees, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Transfers, qu. 3141
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) to reduce, 1441, neg. 1441
Staff transfers, qu. 2517
Travelling expenses of inspectors, 1874

Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638
Opportunity for, 3059, 3223, 3453, 4250

Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Agenda—*Con.*
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled, 1991
British North America Act, right to amend, 4660
Canada's status, 4664
Canadian autonomy, 4651
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4664
Commitments, 3059, 3223
Conferences of 1917 and 1921
Cattle embargo, 26
Smuts, General, 72
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4660, 4661
Discussion, forecast of, 3453. *See also under this title,* Agenda
Egyptian policy, 4662
Embargo on breeding cattle, 3291
Expenses of delegation, 4638
Foreign relations, 4659
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 508, 4077, 4640
Imperial Federation, 4661
Imperialism, 4655, 4656
Militarism, 4652
Naval Service, 4654
Policy, 3453
Preferential tariff, 4661. *See also* British Preference
Publicity, 4665
Purchasing power of money, 4666
Reparations, 4653
Report inadequate, 4662
Representation of Canada, 1686
Resolution of Mr. Mackenzie King in 1921, 1535
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, 3822
Treaty of Versailles, modification of, 4653
War, Canada's participation, 4655

Imperial Economic Conference, 4666
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638, 4666
Opportunity for, 3453, 4250
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled 1991
Expenses of delegation, 4638, 4666
Representation of Canada, 1686

Imperial Federation, British labour party and, 4651

Imperial Oil Company. *See also* Oil; Petroleum bounties
Gasoline, price of, 2547

Imperial Relations. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties

Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Imperial Veterans of Canada, petition, 4536

Imperialism. *See* Imperial Conference

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Importation of Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Customs and Excise

Imports and Exports, 2401. *See also* Agriculture; British Preference; Budget; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French, Italian
- Agricultural products, 445, 1390
- Balance of trade, 2922
- Beans, 2981
- Binder twine, 2965
- Coal, 1226. *See also* Coal
- Comparison of 1897 and 1923, 3060
- Direct. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty
- Exports
  - Agricultural machinery, qu. 814
  - Agricultural products, qu. 814
  - Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Canada's best customer, 1838
  - Cattle to United States, 1410, 2910
  - Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Electric power, 658. *See also that title*
  - Export trade, 1838
  - France to, 1977, 2213. *See also under* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Gold, 4249
  - Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
  - Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper
  - Potatoes, qu. 621. *See also that title*
  - Products of farm, sea and forest, 3061
  - Pulpwood. *See* Export Act Amdt.; Pulp and Paper
  - Settlers' effects, 20-21
  - Wheat 2774, 3062. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
    - Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
- Fishery products, 445
- France, 2210, 2230. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Grain, 2748. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
- Great Britain, 2928. *See also* British Preference
- Home markets, 2869
- Imports
  - Agricultural products, qu. 617, 1246, 2917, 2958
    - United States, from, 2708

Imports and Exports—*Con.*
- Imports—*Con.*
  - Animals and animal products, 445
  - Butter, 2821
  - Canned vegetables, 445
  - Coal, qu. 490, qu. 516, 2828. *See also that title*
  - Direct, 2898
  - Duty collected, 2838. *See also* Customs and Excise
  - Eggs from United States, 2708, 2821
  - Farm produce, 1426
  - France, from, 1977
  - Fresh and dried fruits, 445
  - Marking, 931
  - Panama canal, via, 1921
  - Potatoes, 2820
  - Raisins, qu. 2699
  - Sales tax on, 4409
  - Silks, 445
    - France, from, 2397. *See also* Treaties, French
  - Tobacco, qu. 1258
  - United States from, 2820. *See also that title*
- Increased, 2936, 3055
- United States, 2929. *See also that title*

Income Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. Bill (Chief occupation; interest on borrowed capital; deductions for expenses; incomes of consuls and consuls-general; penalty against employer; appeals; taxes; prior lien; indebtedness to taxpayer; distress in default of payment; pension exemptions). Res. 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4508
- Sections and subjects discussed:
  - Act to come into force, 4508
  - Certificate of default to be registered as judgment, 4506
  - Collection of tax from third party, 4506
  - Decision of minister, notice of dissatisfaction with, 4505
  - Income from chief occupation, 4504
  - Taxes to be a lien, 4505

Indebtedness. *See* Bank Act Amdt.; Budget; Finance; Loan; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons; Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Independent Commissions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

India
Automobiles, export to, 508
Canadian trade commissioner in, 1840
Grain production, 1840
Hindu franchise, 4077. *See also* Imperial Conference; Hindus
Immigration of army officers from, 1096

Indian Affairs department. *See this title under* Indians

Indians
Agents
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, 2151
Local, 2146
Perth, New Brunswick, 2154
Wootten, Mr., 2154
British Columbia, 2152, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2125, 2145
Education, 2164
Brandon, 2147
Edmonton school, 2149, 2164, 2165
Elkhorn school, 2147
Kamloops, 2146, 2152
Morley reserve, 2150
Oblate Fathers, 2145
Red Deer school, 2164
Residential schools, 2164
St. Albert school, 2149
Sarcee reserve boarding school, 2145
White Bear reserve, 2162
Farming, 2156
Fishing, grazing and wood permits, qu. 706
General, 2163
Great Slave lake and Mackenzie districts, 2145
Hospitals, medical attendance, 2145, 2160
Hunting grounds, 2146
Indian Affairs, department
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Live stock, 2162
Manitoba, 2145-7
Medical service, doctors, 2145, 2160
New Brunswick, 2124, 2153
North West territories, 2145-7
Nova Scotia, 2124, 4702
Ontario and Quebec, 2124 2146
Peguis, Saulteaux chief, monument, 4704
Potlatching, gaol sentence for, 2163
Preservation of, 2151-52
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Rations, 2148
Relief, 2125
Reserves, 2124
Blackfeet, 2148
Prices charged, qu. 3142

Indians—*Con.*
Reserves—*Con.*
Blood, 2159
Carleton, 2162
Caughnawaga, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
File Hills, 2145
Grain production on, 1139, 2156
Greater production, 2150, 2155, 2156, 2162
Highways passing through, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Moose Mountain, qu. 706
Muscowequan, 2156
Nipissing, 1307
Perth, N. B., 2154
St. Peter's, 2153
St. Pie, fencing, 2154
St. Regis, 2163
Sarcee, 2125, 2145
Six Nations, 1307, 2148
Tobique, timber cutting, 2154, 2155
Turtle Mountain, 3413
White Bear, 2162
Saskatchewan, 2145-7
Sioux, 2160
Round Plain band, 2162
Starving, 2125
Statement by minister, 2145
Titles, extinguishment of, 3398. *See* Dominion Lands Act bill
Tuberculosis, 2152
Western Canada, 2145

Indictable Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils, Joint. *See* Labour

Industrial Designs. *See* Trade Mark and Designs Act

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Application for boards; pending proceedings) 1r., 1361; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2063; Senate amdts., 4357, 4592
Sections and subjects discussed:
Industrial towns, 2889
Judges on conciliation boards, 4358

Industrial Problems, credit and. *See* Credits

Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Labour; Textiles; Trade
Agricultural prosperity and, 2962
Annual production, statement, 2720
Basic
Adequate protection 2822
Assistance to, 3238. *See also* Bounties
Wool-combing, qu. 1973. *See also* Wool
Bonused, 3072
Capital diverted from by income tax, 2914
Conservation of, 2820
Control of bank directors, 4022, 4023
Democracy in, 2727
Encouragement of, 2958
By artificial means, 3062
Farmers and, 2853
French treaty, effect on, *See* French Treaty
Indigenous, 2779, 2806
Industrial centralization, 2850
Industrial conditions, 636, 3002. *See also* speeches on Address, Budget
Industrial revolution, 2723
Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891
Closed town system, 2888
Industry and finance, 4053
Investigation of by tariff commission, 2955
Joint control of, 1654
Key, 2752
Labour costs, 2876
Lack of in western provinces, 4047
Manufactured products
Exports, 3061
Value of, 2934
Manufacturing
Costs, 1409, 2720
Labour organizations and, 1857
Overhead, 2928
Production and distribution, 3029
Establishment in West, 1405
New, assistance to, 2780
Prices of agricultural and industrial products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Primary, relief, 2718
Protected, 2798, 2957
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
St. Stephen, N.B., 2901
Salaries, average, 2720
Small industries, disappearance of, 2850
Tariff and, 3024
Wages, average, 2720
Watered stock, dividends on, 2956
Western Canada, 1889
Wood-working, 2806

Inflation and Deflation. *See* Finance; Money; Prices

Ingram, Mr., appointment. *See* Immigration

Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise
Illicit stills, remission of fines, 2299
Postage stamps, used for, 3938. *See also* Post Office

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bills
1. Excise duties changed; cigarette duties
Res. 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4392; 3r., 4393
2. Certificate of analyst; deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol; home-grown tobacco
Res. 3749; 1r., 4131; 2r., com., 4207; 3r., 4208; Senate amendments, 4528
3. Certificate of analyst, etc., order discharged, 3969

Insect Pests, 595. *See also* Agriculture; Forests and Forestry
Alfalfa weevil, 596
Apple sucker, 596
Browntail moth, 596
Cereal rust, 595
Codling moth, 597
Cornborer, 595
Cut worms, 4632
Grasshoppers, 595, 3447
Gypsy moth, 596
Nursery stock, 596
Potato diseases, 595
Satin moth, 596
Spruce bud worm, 596
White pine blister, 595

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Insolvent Cases. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Inspection of Seeds. *See* Seeds

Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Institutionalism, excess of, 1214, 1400, 1890. *See also* Hoey; Immigration; Speakman

Insulin Treatment, discovery. *See* Banting, Dr.

Insurance. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Returned Soldiers
Agents, bank officials acting as, 4093, 4094
Bank loans, security, 4094
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Combinations, 2591
Fire, soldier settlers, 496
Grain cargoes, 3764, 4219, 4223
Hail, 2769, 4095, 4509
Hail Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan 2770

Insurance—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 2050
Insurance branch
Annuities, old age, 1697
Salaries and contingencies, 3987
Live Stock condemnation, qu. 1972, 2699. *See also* Live Stock
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., director, 2050
Mutual companies, 4095-7
Roof coverings, 4703
Soldier Settlement Board, Edmonton, 3506
Soldiers. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance bill

Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. Bill
(Duplication of returns; automobile insurance; correction of French version)
1r., 3045; 2r., com., 3147; com., 3977, 4357; 3r., 4357
Sections and subsections discussed:
Accidents to persons or property, 3978
Application, 3148
Automobile insurance:
Conditions of license for, 3147, 3977
No liability:
If driver under age limit or intoxicated, 3978
Unless stated in policy, 3978
Exceptions to insurability, 3148
French version amended, 3147
Misrepresentation, 3147
Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance, 3147

Intercolonial Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Intercontinental Transports Limited, ocean freight rates, 2127

Interest. *See* Banks; Credits; Finance; speeches on Budget

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Concurrence, 1482, 1538

Interim Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Interior, Department of. *See also* Geological Survey
Astrophysics
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, Victoria, 3242
Expenditure, 3243
Campbell, Mr. R. H., retirement, 3410
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, salary, 4667
Dominion observatories, 3242

Interior—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, 3406
Canadian National Parks and historic sites, 3938
Contingencies, 3408
Engraving maps, printing reports, 3443
Estimates, 1908, 3242, 3406, 4702
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3252
Grazing leases, Alberta, revenue, qu. 2515
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Mines branch, 2970
Officials, 1108
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Reclamation
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 3949
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, 3447
Topographical surveys, 3244
Water powers, surveys, investigations, 3420

Interlocking Directorates. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundaries
Survey and demarcation, 3246

International Court of Justice, 3994

International Fisheries Commission. *See* Fish and Fisheries

International Harvester Company, 4376

International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Wheat production, 2780

International Joint Commission. *See also* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Lake of the Woods water powers, 3425
Pollution of boundary waters, 700, 3362
St. Lawrence river waterway, aerial survey, 1776, 3762, 3427
Welland canal, 3762

International Labour Conference. *See* Labour

International Law, violation of. *See* Germany, Reparations

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, United States lines

International Postal Conference, 4529

International Questions, opportunity for discussion, 3993, 3998

International Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations; Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Interprovincial Trade. *See* Trade

Interstate Commerce Commission. *See* United States

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Liquor

Inventions. *See* Patents of Invention

Inverness pier, 4572

Investigations. *See* Combines Bill

Ireland
Proportional representation, 395
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Iron and Steel. *See also* Customs Tariff Items; Mines and Minerals
Bounties, 4371, 4381
British industrial development, 3847
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994
Freight rates, 1964
French treaty, 1985, 1988
Iron and steel scrap duty, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Iron ore and smelting industry, 3061
Ore-production and smelting, 3061
Rolled iron and steel
Hoops, bars, etc., duty, 3484
Milling cutters, for, 2653, 3484
Steel-workers strike, 287. *See also* Labour, Strikes
United States, production, 2751

Iron Ores. *See* Mines and Minerals

Irrigation. *See also* Dominion Lands, Reclamation
Alberta, 1436
Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
British Columbia, 457
Central Alberta irrigation scheme, 3428
Drought effect on grain production, 3429
Expenditure, 2969
Lethbridge irrigation district, 3429
Macleod irrigation district, 3429
Northern Saskatchewan, 3430
Surveys and inspections, 3428
United irrigation projects, Cardston, 3429
William Pearce irrigation project, 3430

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Mining rights of lease holders)
1r., 1992; 2r., com., 2138; 3r., 2204

Irvine, Mr. William (Calgary East)
Audibility of debate, 645
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4037, 4049, 4082, 4118
M. that chairman leave chair, 4125
Shareholders' audit, 4089
Bank mergers, 4137
Banking system, 634
Cadet services, 880
Calgary
Post office building, 1024
Unemployment relief, 1682
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3387, 3397
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3650, 3662
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Capital punishment bill, 180, 487
Opportunity for consideration, 1810
Children, mortality of, 1179
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, 914
Examinations, 366
Credit and industry, M. 626, 645, 650
Criminal Code Amdt., capital punishment bill, 180, 487, 1810
Customs and excise seizures, qu. 620
Dredging, 1012
Duff, Mr., amendment to Address, 117
Economic conditions, cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Emigration to the United States, 1178
Employers' liablity compensation, 692
Farm homes, building loans, 1178
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 333
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1176, 1177
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3600
Policy, 1176-80
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706-7
Senate amendments, 4362
Interest rate, 4107, 4116
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Labour department
Capitalistic, 1674
Staff, reduction, 1672

Irvine, Mr. William—*Con.*
Labour
Representation in House, 3556
Right to organize, 2888
Lack of confidence vote, M., 208, 239-243
Land, taxation of, 1178
Lignite Utilization board, 387
Mail contractors, names, 3144
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment and qualifications, 3311, 3295
Redistribution, 3313
Two Ministers of Agriculture, 3313
Money, origin and function, 633
National gallery, 1020
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2688
Nova Scotia strike, troops employed, 495
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3555
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854, 4750
Postal appointments, 1801
Powell River Paper Company, 2888
Privilege—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 414
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1022
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679
Scientific and industrial research, qu. 731
Secession—reported statement of Hon. W. F. Roberts, 3145
Single tax, 1178
Soldier Settlement board, 1179
Steamship services, 3378, 3387, 3397
Unemployment, 628
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Relief, 690, 1679
Vetcraft shops, 695
Western conditions, cause of, 1890

Isenberg Leases. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Italian Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Italy
Senate, constitution of, 1372
Tariff. *See also* Treaties, Italian Treaty
Trade, 2395
Treaty with. *See* Treaties
Wool-combing, 2866

Ivel, Mr. W. M. *See* Redistribution

Jackson, Professor, price chart, 1403

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
American fishing schooner Siloam, capture, 2207

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Arsenals, Quebec and Lindsay, 2165
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4050, 4052, 4056
Point of order, 4055
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1515
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3086-3108 3211-21
Belle River harbour, 4596
Binder twine, duty, removal of, 4387
Board of Audit bill, 4357
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1160
Saturday sittings, 3452
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408 2413
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3832
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 4335
Paris offices, 4514
Canadian representative in United States, 3085
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr. Duncan Marshall, 2614
Civil Service Act. M. (Mr. Power) 547
Combines bill, 2628
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Registration of ownership) 615
Deputy minister of Immigration, 668
English and French-speaking people, 1341
Halibut fishery treaty, 1309
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 514, 4077, 4640
Immigration
Alleged campaign against, 332
Assimilation, 1117
Canada Colonization Association, 1164
President, 1092
Exodus to United States, 1165
Farm labour and domestic servants, 1165
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Labour, attitude towards, 1167
Medical inspection, 702
Policy, 1163-71
Restriction of, 1169
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 514, 2428-35
Legislation of 1919, 243-32
Ships' crews, 2435, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4640-4661
Indians
Caughnawaga reserves, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
Edmonton school, 2165

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4359, 4361
King George and race-track betting, 728
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement in North Essex, 670
Money, purchasing power of, 1167
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2189 2195, 2438, 2461
British system, 2438
Judical and executive authority, 2462
Limited naturalization, 2461
Nationality, dual, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2461
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 700
Printing, outside Bureau, cost of, qu. 3131
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 957
Railway Act Amdt. bill (return tickets) 615
Receipt tax, 4425
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
Sales tax
Book or account, 4434
Licensed manufacturer, 4421
Speech at Winnipeg, 1429
Standard of living, 1168
Thetford Mines strike, 2207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Unemployment, 1168

James Bay Railway, 1036, 1049, 1402
Coal, transportation of, 1073

Japan
Bean-growing industry, 2982
British-Japanese relations, 2470
Canadian naturalization, 2442, 2461, 2467
Competition from, 2861
Expatriation from, 2443
French treaty, 3035
Immigration. *See also that title*
Restriction by Japanese government, 2328
Imports and exports, 1978, 2255
Japanese consul general
Immigration, 1447, 1894
Pamphlet, 2443
Japanese fishermen, 4484. *See also* British Columbia
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Military service, 2443
Mizusawa, Mr. Kosaku, alleged intervview, 1899
Nationality, 2442
Negotiations with, 4441
Rights of foreigners in, 1895
Silks, 2397
Trade concessions to. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Japan—*Con.*
Trade with, 2214, 2234. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Trade treaty with, 1449, 2399
Wool-combing, 2866

Japanese. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration

Japanese Fisheries Association, 1453

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Accredited herds, 586
Agricultural credit system, 1438
Alberta
Grain production, 1435
Irrigation, 1436
Live stock, 1435
Southern, conditions in, 1435
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4113
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3438
Cost of living, burdensome to farmers, 1437
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Freight rates, equalization of, 1437
Grain dockage and screenings, 786
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1437
Policy, 1435
Interest rate, 4113
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3429
Lethbridge elevator, 4716
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Oil prospecting and development, 780
Petroleum bounties, 780
Public buildings, rents, 1025
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 927
Timber wolves, 597
Tourist traffic, Southern Alberta, 3438

Jobbers
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Joggins, N. S., breakwater, 943

Johansen, Mr. F., assistant zoologist, 3360

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moose Jaw)
Certificate of registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Sales tax collections, qu. 285
Status of, inquiry, 202

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agriculture, weed menace, 1887
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4097
British preference
Increase in, 2243
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2777

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred—*Con.*
Business of the House
Amdt. right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Private members' day, 1159
Rules, amendment of, M. for special com. 856, 1299, 1300, 1306-7
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4307
Grand Trunk, gratuities to directors and officials, 1666
Civil Service Act, special committee, names, 2417
Crowsnest pass agreement, statement that Progressives had forced concession, 2855
Dunblane-Aylesbury branch line, 4308
French treaty bill, 2242
Income tax, revenue, 3027
McMaster, Mr., statement of position, 3030
Nova Scotia secession resolution, 2243
Reciprocity with United States, 2243
Redistribution, 4740
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee report, 4740
Royal commission on lake rates, report, printing, 2927
Rules, M. for committee, 856, 1299, 1306-7
Seed grain advances, 3447
War claims, 2495
Waterous-Swift Current branch line, 4308
Wheat Board
Legislation, request to extend, 2927
Proceeding under Act of 1922, 1636
Yorkton-Willowbrook branch line, 4308

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Joint Peat Committee. *See* Fuel

Jolly Roger, the, 2787

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
St. John river wharves, qu. 1488
St. Margaret's bay road, qu. 3135
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Joynson-Hicks, Sir William, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill; Judges Act Amdt. bill; Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Admiralty. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.
Appointments, 3349
County court, naturalization certificates. *See* Naturalization
Industrial disputes conciliation boards, 4358
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Naturalization. *See that title*

Judges—*Con.*
Ontario and Quebec courts. *See* Judges Act
Pensions, qu. 492, 1154
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029, 1154
Political commissions, 3604
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Salaries
Pensions and, 1154. *See also* Judges Act
Total payments, qu. 491
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868
York county, 3607

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
(Salaries; Circuit Court judges)
Res. 3264, 3452, 3603; 1r., 3608; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610
Sections and subjects discussed:
Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court, 3610
Arbitrators or assessors under Railway or public act, 3609
Judges, Supreme Court of Ontario, 3609

Judique, N.S. wharf, 943

Jugo-Slavia, Italian treaty and, 2396

Jurisdiction. *See also* British North America Act; Labour, Unemployment; Lake of the Woods; Provincial Rights
Bankruptcy Act, 3095
Combines. *See that title*
Disallowance of provincial statutes
British Columbia, Chinese immigration, 1161, 1261, 1453
Nova Scotia, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Drainage, 3256
Education, 882, 1884
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1646
Labour, 1442, 1646, 1650, 1618, 2894
Lake freight rates, 4227-31
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Unemployment, 1657, 1678
Water powers, 3421

Jurors, not British subjects. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Jury. *See* Grand Jury

Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Capital punishment, 768. *See also* Criminal Code
Department
Correspondence—Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2299
Employees, number and cost, 2970

Justice—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Deputy minister
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' case, 2521
Salary, 4671
Estimates, 705, 768, 4667
International Labour Conference, 1442
Salaries and contingencies, 780, 4667
Solicitor General, retirement of, 1763, 1764, 1810, 2710
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Executive clemency, correspondence, 1975
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Minister of, absence, 4514
Parole, release on, 1975
Pecuniary claims convention, 780
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Dorchester, qu. 494, 770
Earnings of inmates, 772
Nationality of inmates, 772
Prince Albert, Brenner, Meyer, release, 1975
Stony Mountain, 771
Trial of Eskimos charged with murder, Herschel Island, 4674

Kahn, Mr. Otto H., Elements of Success, 1399

Kamloops
Indian school, 2146
Public building, 1006

Kay, Mr. W. F. (Missisquoi)
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
Carroll, Mr., and, 3268
Oleomargarine, 3268
Reports
First, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock bill, 1441
Baker Memorial Com. report, 1256, 1991
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 4669
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4669
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4541
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3519
Amdt. 3520
Privilege—Mr. Carroll, 3268

Kay, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome, 4012

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Address in reply, 106. Condition of country; inauguration of industrial epoch, 106; farmers in the West and immigration policy, 107; duty of government to see fair play, 108
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027, 4099-4103, 4133, 4139
Mortgages and hypothecs amdt. 4099 withdrawn, 4133
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
British preference and Canadian ports, 2678
Budget, 2809; commendation of Minister of Finance; tariff stability; interpretation of term; speech of Minister of Agriculture; allegation of bad farming; amendment; British preference; comparative statement of rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809; speech of Minister of the Interior; Progressive party, assumption of power by; capitalistic interests and political parties; inheritance tax; reciprocity with the United States, 2810; agriculture, conditions of; budget; business and financial depression; "calamity howlers"; unsatisfactory conditions in West, 2811; disappointing record of Liberal party; no difference between Liberal and Conservative parties; invisible government; financial control; selfishness of those controlling destinies; prices and the tariff; interest rate; freight rates; charges of professional men; purchasing power, reduction of; conditions in the West; allegation of bad farming and extravagance, 2812; professional men, charges and standards of living, earnings of farmers; ridicule and intimidation of the West, 2813; government out of sympathy with people; Progressive party, predicament of; attention to demands of West, 2814
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National railways, wage reductions, qu. 1363
Copper bounties, 3239
Crude petroleum duty, 3481
Dental instruments, raw materials, 3484
Deputy ministers, retirement, qu. 3135
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4364, 4368

Kellner, Mr. Donald F.—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3252
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Dredging, Plamondon, Alberta, 1013
Farming at a profit, 81
Field supervisors, soldier settlement, 1090
Free trade and protection, 2923
Grand Trunk arbitration, commissioners, qu. 624
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3595
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1352
Personnel, 1092
Policy, 1348
Wealth and, 1122
Inland revenue officers, salaries, qu. 3892
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Live stock, tuberculin test, qu. 1972
Merchants bank inquiry, 3990
Solder settlement, 2024, 2027
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Western provinces, conditions in, 1349

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Bacon imports and exports, 938
Business of the House, 1386
Canadian air force, forest patrol, 1778
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship service, 2172
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, construction of, 1185
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Lifting of steel, 1664
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (scrip frauds) 730
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3430
Grain Act, litigation, 2045
Grain shipments, facilities for, 730
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Health department, salaries, 2170
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1180
Statement of objects, 1180
Supervision, 1092
Community clubs, 1183
Immigrants, standard of living, 1127
National land settlement plan, 1181
Policy, 1180, 1401
Indians, 2148
Labour Gazette, 1624
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Mackenzie river district, half breed claims, 3444
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speeches in Great Britain, 3595
Peace river district
Railway surveys, 4701

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M.—*Con.*
Settlement in, 1184
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Purchasing Commission, 1385
Railway Act Amdt. bill, (Equalization of rates) 730
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833, 1834
Scrip frauds, 730
Soldier settlement, 2028
Steamship services, 2172
Northern Alberta, 2176
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Water powers, investigation, 3426

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Agricultural conditions, 1843
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 376
Dairy Industry Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, renovated butter, 4510
Dairying industry, 1843
Exhibitions, 1454
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4620
Health department, salaries, 2170
Indian Affairs department, salaries, 2166
Labour department, employment officers. 1674
Military hospitals, 677
Pensioners, medical examination, 677
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3288
St. Lawrence river islands, St. Regis reserve, 2163
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Kennedy, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C.
Belle River harbour, 4597
References to, 4, 6, 8, 10, 54, 108
Letter of thanks for sympathy from Mrs. Kennedy, 281

Keynes, Mr. John M., on war, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations
Economic Consequences of the Peace, 2724

Kincardine, Ont., pier, 982

King, His Majesty the, race-track betting, 728

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Armouries, fittings, etc., 1024, 2413
Bamfield public building, 1024
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1556

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Calgary post office, 1024
Calumet-Bryson bridge, 1014
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 536
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Dominion roads and bridges, 1014
Dredging
Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1012
Expenditure, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009
Nanaimo harbour, 1014
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Shuswap lake, 1014
Victoria harbour, 1014
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583, 3979
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
Fraser river improvements, 1006
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Graving docks, 2682
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers, 2671
British Columbia, 1002
Stanley park foreshore, 1008
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Manitoba, 993
New Brunswick, 945
Grand Manan, 945
Wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675
Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012
Quebec, 950
Grondines wharf, 959
Matane, 970
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hydro Electric commission, St. Lawrence development, 2682
Lake Manitoba flooding, 1000
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Laurier monument, 1017
Law, the late Bowan B., tablet to memory, 1020
L'Islet wharf, 970
Matapedia birdge, 1014
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
Moose Jaw public building, 1023
National Gallery, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Okanagan lake wharves, repairs, 1008

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Parliament buildings, 1716
Acoustics, 1721
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723
Stone carving, 1720
Tower, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Port Burwell harbour dredging, 983, 1012
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Member for, 2681
Sewerage outlet, 994, 998
Printing bureau
Improvements, 1022
New building, 1732, 1738
Public Works
Engineering branch, 1017
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 2571
Patronage, 945
Public buildings, 2690
Dominion archives building, 1730
Economy, renting or building, 1735
Local improvement taxes, 1023
Maritime provinces, 1022
New departmental, 1729
Ottawa, Daly building, 1023
Ottawa Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also under this title,* Parliament buildings
Power, 1025
Printing bureau new building, 1730
Rents, 1025
Salaries, 2684
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 950, 955
Quebec, Champlain dock, 2675
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1954
St. John harbour improvements, 2676
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., appreciation of, 1006
Selkirk, repair slip, 1000
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Swift Current public building, 1023
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682
Toronto harbour improvements, 985, 1011, 2678
Toronto island protection breakwter, 984
Vancouver harbour bill, 267
Vancouver island telegraph lines, 1017
Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, dredging, 1014

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Victoria
Dry dock, 1002
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Wharves
Revenue, 975, 977
Transfer to Dominion government, 946

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2908. Felicitations to Finance Minister; tariff; automobiles; Henry Ford greatest customs collector in Canada; tariff "purely and simply protective"; Liberal platform of 1896; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on tariff reduction and Senate reform; Liberal party repeating tactics following election of 1896; influences preventing government from carrying out pledges; Progressive party, withdrawals from; capital levy; reciprocity; new sources of revenue; luxuries; inheritance tax, 2909; reciprocity with United States; advantages of enlarged trade; diversity of products; treaty of 1854; abrogation of and its results; reciprocity in natural and manufactured products; manufacturing opportunities in Ontario and Quebec, 2910; President, Massey-Harris Company "ready for free trade"; duties under reciprocity agreement of 1911; members elected to support reciprocity; President Harding and world peace; Washington disarmament conference; trade rivalry cause of war; population greatest need of Canada; five million Canadians in United States; immigration; Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply, 27. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 27; criticisms of Speech from Throne by Mr. Meighen; co-ordination of National railways, 28; government's immigration policy, 29; national resources of western provinces, 29; Near East Crisis, explanation of circumstances, 29-33; communications from British government, 30; delay in receiving despatches, 31-32

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions Com. report, 2181
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annuities branch, transfer, 1641
Australia, trade treaty, 245
Banff national park, power privileges, 3750
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4437, 4676
Bell, Major Graham A., salary, 4557
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M. P., 4
Board of Audit Act, 4249
Bolton speech, 2974
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Empire exhibition, 3950
British mails, delay in, 2639
Budget, 3046. Speech of leader of Opposition; attack on Liberal party; fidelity to pledges and principles; Liberal platform of 1919; presentation of "chart"; statement to convention after adoption of platform; resolution presented by opposition in 1921; appeal to the country; campaign speeches, 3047; position on tariff put plainly before people; Liberal platform carried out; the budget, charge that it is protectionist; tariff reductions; British preference; preference of 50 per cent and over, 3048; reciprocity, sugar duties, reduction; no increase in taxation; substantial tariff revision downwards; commercial treaties with France and Italy; Combines Act, 3049; free trade; speech of Mr. McMaster; theoretical study and concrete application; capital, attraction of; tariff walls going higher and higher; world conditions; free trade in Great Britain; slow progress of movement after its inception; industrial revolution; gradual elimination of tariff duties; reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and France, 3050; attitude of Progressive party and Mr. McMaster; leaders in British free trade movement; problems and difficulties in connection with the tariff; amendment, 3051; stability does not mean finality; United States tariff; European situation; British preference, increase of, 3052; cattle embargo, removal of; development of Canadian railways and ports; trade to Pacific ports by Panama canal; trade relations with the United States; Canada seeking new markets; tariff and economic warfare; declara-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tion of Genoa Conference; endorsement by Assembly of the League of Nations, 3054; economic conditions; statistics indicating revival; building operations; imports and exports; bank clearings; savings deposits; immigration; employment, 3055
Speech on, reference to, 3056, 3068
Statements omitted from, 2898
Business of the House, 179, 199, 250
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Early, 74
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven p.m., 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
Twelve midnight, 4672
Capital punishment bill, proceeding, 487, 1810
Economy of time, 382
Estimates, presentation, 4556, 4598, 4603
Facilitating of, 1836, 4736
Legislation pending, 2518, 3265
Announcement, 3452
M. that Com. rise to report progress, 1836
M. (Mr. Carroll) on oleomargarine, special order, 3270
Private members' day, 1158, 1160-62
Progress of, 2469
Prorogation, 4736
Facilitation of, 4732
Questions as orders for returns, 1385
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com., 1305
Select standing committee, personnel, 3, 202, 435, 486, 811, 1483, 2047
Sittings
Morning, 4132, 4249
Not later than midnight, 4579
Saturday, 2694, 3453, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1305
Concurrence, 4735
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. 4440
Campaign of 1921, speeches, 3047
Canada, constitutional development, 4474
Canada Temperance Act, correspondence, 1308
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, 3705

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Amalgamation, 34
Order in council tabled, 53
Branch lines construction bill, 4400
Rejection by Senate, 4754
Directors, board of
Additional director from Quebec, 34
Labour representation, 1652
Grand Trunk
Gratuities, royal commission, Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2347
Shareholders' representations, 3960
Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders, 3507
Management, responsibility and powers, 3673, 3677
Paris offices, 3673
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3954, 3959
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4727
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4001
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Capital punishment bill, 487, 1810
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Cattle embargo removal, correspondence, 4133
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
China, trade relations with, 2313
Chinese immigration bill, 2312-33
Evasions, 2315
Exclusion, 2313
Head tax, 2312
International relations, 2312
Labour competition, 2312
Restriction of immigration, 2312
Students, 2313
Christie, Mr. Loring resignation, 3988
Civil Service
Bonus 1811
Commission, appointments, 371
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Political partisanship, 286
Superannuation, 4593
Work outside regular duties 1675
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 349, 358, 362, 374, 377, 522, 536, 545, 552, 559, 568
Special committee, 936
Appointment, 986
Change in membership, 2417
Coal, cost of, 1813
Combines bill, 254, 496, 938, 987, 2519, 2602, 2615-38, 2659-68, 2701

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Combines bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed, 2520
Civil Service Act, appointments, 2661
Commissioners, appointment and remuneration, 2627
Definition "combine" 2615, 2666
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar
Appointment, 2628
Inquiry, 2618
Senate amendments, 3505
Statement of provisions, 987, 2520
Technicalities, 2665
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605
Cost of living, reference to, 1812-13
Crowsnest pass agreement, extension, 2741. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs duties on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
M. (Mr. Motherwell) for discharge of order, 3449
Daylight saving, 2612
Debates, official report of
Pages said to be missing, 888, 889, 1082
Revised edition, enquiry, 122
Deceased members, tribute to, 4
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4557
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2384, 2386
Disarmament, Great Lakes, correspondence, 244, 494, 1307
Dominion Elections Act, amdt. 1027
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Election of 1921, speeches, 3047
Estimates, time of presentation, 4556, 4598,
Comparison with previous government, 4603
External Affairs, department, salaries, 3987
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Finance Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 4249
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1962
Suspension of, 1949
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark), 1285, 1490, 1962
Legislation to be introduced, 3265
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1284

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 336
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Grain shipping rates, information, 2517. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Royal commission to inquire into, 1211
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695, 3272
Grant, Dr., civil service, 560
Halibut fishery treaty, 4437, 4474, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Correspondence tabled, 1256
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Ratification by His Majesty, 1309
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1694
Hector celebration, 4706
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Hindu franchise, 4077, 4665
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 4442
House of Commons staff, organization, 4592
Housing, legislation, 2518
Hudson Bay railway, Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement, 1686
Immigration. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1330
Attitude of Conservative and Progressive parties, 1333
Forke, Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Reorganization, inquiry, 3324
Willison, Sir John, telegram, 1331
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Bill respecting (Mr. Neill) 4441
Exclusion, possible results, 1453
Japanese
Japanese stowaways on freighter, 1448
Lemieux agreement, 1447
Negotiations with Japanese govt. 2328, 4441
M. for return, 1261
Policy, 1330
Immigration Act Amdt. bills
Undesirable classes, 2669, 4441
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 3453, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4661
Forecast of discussion, 3453
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4665
Preferential tariff, 4661

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4440
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 2063, 4361
Illicit liquor traffic, 2208
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3978
Internal Economy commission, 3
International Labour Conference
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1647
Italian Treaty bill, 2437, 2701
Japan
Immigration from. *See under this title,* Immigration
Secret agreement, 1448
Trade with, 1449, 2313
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 5
King's birthday, observance of, 3323
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1669
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour
Estimates, 1643
Right to organize, 2895
Strikes correspondence, 816
Lack of confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 213 216, 226
Lafortune the late Mr. D. A. M.P., 4
Lake freight rates, commission, 247
Legislation arising out of report, 3507
Lake of the Woods
Control, 247
Control board expenses, 4001
Levels 247
Lausanne conference, 54
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Legislation, Senate salaries, 3949
Liberal convention of 1919, 2994, 3047
Labour resolution, 1652
Liberal platform, speech of June 1, 1920, 2994
Library of Parliament, 202
Joint committee, 516
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture by Chinese bandits, 2695
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
McDougall, Mrs. William, pension, 3949
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.,
Appointment to Bench, 1810
Retirement, 2392

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Militia and Defence disbursements, 344
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways and Canals
Appointment, 519, 1081
Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
Mines and minerals com. report, 4743
Montreal harbour commission bill, 3463
Moose Jaw by-election, 2295
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Near East crisis, 29-33
Correspondence, 45
Newspaper combines, 2524
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 1309, 2519
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3326, 3524
Precedence, 3451
Special order, 3270
Orders in council, government by, 1652, 1655
Orient, trade relations with, 2313
Pan-American union, 496
Paris agency, 4001
Parliamentary government, 1652
Passports, issuing of, 3988, 4708
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744
Pension board, resolution for removal, 3400
Pensions, old age
Legislation, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res. 1651
Mothers, and, conference with provinces, 3046
Petition of right, fiats, 3146
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1315, 1538
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 247
Prices, monopolies and, 2521
Printing Committee, 202
Private betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494
Private bills, consideration, 1836
Privilege, Mr. Carroll, 3270
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 417, 421
Single transferable vote, 1661, 2181
Public expenditure, 4556
Public Works
Estimates, 4557
Tenders, 4568
Publicity representative in London, 2984
Pulpwood, prohibition of export
Farmers and settlers, 4513
Royal commission, 4709
Purchasing commission, 3950, 4001
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Quebec, statutes of, 1660
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Redistribution bill, 250, 436
Special committee
Reference to, 488, 572
Report, 4742
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers unemployment relief, 1680
Returns, inquiry for, 3962
Roberts, J. H., imprisonment, 1660
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement on secession, 3145
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hours, 4514
Rush-Bagot treaty negotiations, 2700
Russia, relations with, 3402
St. Lawrence river waterway, 204
United States, negotiations with, 3208, 4513
Saar valley commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Sales tax
Exemptions, 2998
Speech in 1921, 2997
Senate and House of Commons report, 2794
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4734
Senate, estimates, 2694
Sastri, Right Hon. Mr., letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Shipping combine, 4077
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207
Singapore naval base, 2470, 3822
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5
Stouffville, speech at, 1430
Supplementary estimates, presentation, 4558
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288, 1298
Toronto viaduct, 4441
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amdt. bill, 2063
Treaties
Newspaper reports, 245-6
Signing of, 4474
Triplets, bonus for, 3145
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., appointment to Bench, 1868
Unemployment relief
Conferences with provinces, 436
Expenditure, 1656
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1680
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
United States liquor laws, 4295
Vimy ridge memorial, 180
War
Commitments, 859
Glorification of, 2687
Wheat board
Extension of legislation, 2696, 2740
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

King's Birthday Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

King's Printer. *See* Printing Bureau

Kingston dry dock, 4563

Kitchener
Local improvement taxes, 1022
Manufacturers and United States markets, 2856

Kitsilano Reserve. *See* Indians

Klondike. *See* Yukon

Knitting Industry. *See* Textiles

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural conditions, special committee, 667
Canadian Air Force, 1750
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4319
Rejection by Senate, 4753
Fixed charges, qu. 814
Cheque tax, 3934
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4254
Drainage areas, 3259
Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4680, 4685
M. for consideration of Senate report, 1032, 1079
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Route, investigation by air service, 1750
Statement as to cost, correction, 2296
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Welland canal and, 3779
Indians, 2162
Duck lake school, 2159
Lake Grain rates bill, 4226
Melfort branch line railway, 4319
Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
National Defence, ammunition, 1741
National monument, Connaught place, 2686
Order paper, absence of, 4744
Paddockwood branch line railway, 4319
Paris agency, 4001
Penitentiaries, 770, 773
Port Nelson dredging, 1012
Public buildings, rents, 1025
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions, 776
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2028

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Steamship services, 4003, 4004
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Waterhen lakes drainage, qu. 4303
Welland canal construction, 3779

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Arrangement between Whips as to adjournment, 53
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317, 4319
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4574
Hudson Bay railway, 1062
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse claim, 4574, 4725
St. Peter's-Louisburg branch line, 4319
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Wrecks, removal of, 3332

Labarre, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3138

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Returned Soldiers
Advertisements, 287
Asiatic competition, 2485. *See also* Immigration
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4016, 4041
British Columbia, conditions in, 1125
British National Labour party
Capital levy, 2722
Policy, 2721
Building trades. *See also* Building
Drift to United States, 1129, 1812
Canadian National Railways. *See also that title*
Directors, representation of, 1652-6, 3636
Labour costs, 1561
Capital and, 2744, 4026. *See also* Capital and Labour
Canadian Pacific railway shopmen, 3338
Cheap, 1118
Chinese, 2310, 2316, 2330. *See also* Immigration
Civil Service. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Special committee, representation on, 937
Coal miners from Belgium, 1177
Combines bill, trades unions not affected, 2666
Competition, 1287, 1418, 2485
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conferences, 1443, 1678
Conventions, 1645, 1652
Copper bounty and, 3031
Cost of living. *See that title*
Costs, 1561, 2748, 2876

Labour—*Con.*
Delegates from United States, detention, *See* Howat
Demand for, 1248
Department
Actuaries, 1677
Annuities branch, 1672, 1682
Old age, administration, 1639
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Superintendent, 1677
Assistant deputy minister, 1671
Canada Gazette, printing, 1707
Capitalistic, 1674
Co-operation with provincial departments of labour, 1678
Deputy minister, 1675
Employees and cost, 2970
Estimates, 1621, 1668
Reduction in, 1638-43
Immigration and, 1170
Salaries and contingencies, 1657, 1668, 1694
Staff, dismissals and transfers, 1671, 2032
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Discontent, 1194
Dominion and provincial
Conference, 1442
Jurisdiction, 1442
Eight-hour day, 131, 207, qu. 279, 287, 1643 4,000. *See also under this title,* Hours
Jurisdiction, 1650
Moore, Mr. Tom., 1427
Emigration of. *See* Emigration to the United States
Employers and immigration, 1193, 1194
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Employment, 1124. *See also* Immigration and *under this title,* Unemployment
Index number, increase, 3055
Employment offices,
Co-ordination, 1643
Director of, 1672, 1676
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Provincial, 2169
St. John, 3453
Espionage, 1142-3
Factory and Shop Act, 1443
Farm, 37, 38, 1100, 1174,1416, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Agriculture; Immigration
Competition of protected industries, 2731
Wages, 1240, 1355
Winnipeg, in, 1976
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Opinion of Justice department, 1650
Financial Post, labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
Grand Trunk, employees' compensation, 1564

Labour—*Con.*
Hours, 1416, 1643, 1841. *See also under this title,* Eight-hour day
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4514
Station agents, 132
Howat, Alexander, detention. *See* Howat
Immigration. *See also that title.*
Attitude on, 332, 1167, 1177, 1186, 1193, 1197, 1224, 1241, 1337, 1413, 1426, 1892-3, 2816
Restriction of, 1104
Trades and Labour Council, and, 1419
"Unseen Hand," the, 1201
Imperial federation, 4651
Industrial disputes. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, 1141
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1655, 1702, 1716. *See also that title*
Federal jurisdiction, 1646
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Granting of boards under, 287
Limited application, 1702
Industrial and "closed" towns, 2886-91
International Association of Machinists, res. 1338
International Federation of Trade Unions, 3158
International labour bureau, 3994, 4000
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1642
Carnegie, Colonel, 1648
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1647
Incomplete return, 1539
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., 1539, 1647
Recommendations and conventions, 1643, 1645
Tabled, 1441, 1631
Report of 1922 meeting, 1442
Representation, papers tabled, 1483
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1648
Statistics, 1631
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Labour bureaus, 1424
Labour Gazette, 1621
Correspondents, 1626
Cost of living, 1684, 1812
Michell, Professor, figures, 1700
Cost prices and freight rates, 1958
Editor, 1625, 1671
Federal Printing Company, 1621
Hooper, Mr. Roland, 1625
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1708, qu. 3131
Union label on, 1621
Labour members, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033

Labour—*Con.*
Labour party platform, 2728, 2815
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Liberal platform "plank" 1652
Lord's Day Act, federal jurisdiction, 1646
Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, labour vote in Great Britain, 2722
May Day, 3158
Mechanics, qu. 203
Skilled, emigration to United States, 2790
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention at border. *See* Meyerscough; Howat
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Moore, Mr. Tom
Delegate to International Labour Conference, 1642
Immigration, 1167
Labour representative on Canadian National Railway Board, 1654, 3636
National Industrial Conference, 2890
Organization of, 50, 123, 2815
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Organizing power of, 1857
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Chinese Immigration bill
Penitentiaries, 772
Pensions, old age, 1646
Popular attitude towards work, 1189
Powell River Paper Company, 2886
Printing bureau. *See also that title*
Estimates, 1710
Professional agitators, 2943
Public works, 950, 956
Railway companies acting as agents, 1191
Railways, 126, 132, 1426, 3621
Renovated butter, 4251
Representation in House, 3033, 3555
Requirements in northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Right to organize, 2886, 2890, 2896
Bank employees, 4084, 4161
British constitution, 2894
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Contract between workingman and employer, 2894, 2896
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2894
Legislation, necessity for, 2896
Treaty of Versailles, 2889
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duty, seven-day week, 4514
Espionage, 1142
Industrial disputes, 1141
Royal commission on industrial relations, 2889
Short hours and high wages, 1416

Labour—*Con.*
Shortage
Lumber camps, Financial Post, statement of, 1125
Saturday Night, statement as to, 1125
Skilled labour, 1224
Strikes, 84, 123-125, 1628, 1702. *See also under this title,* Industrial Disputes
Advocates of, deportation, 2434
Agricultural labourers, Great Britain, 2822
Cape Breton. *See under this sub-title,* Nova Scotia
Conciliation, 2786
District 18, coal miners, 1629
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Lewis, Mr. John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Nova Scotia coal miners, 495, 815, 866, 1627, 1716, 3155
Board of Conciliation award, 1628
Correspondence, 914
Troops, use of, 861, 893
Nova Scotia steel workers, 287, 397, 1643, 1703, 1705
Rainbow shingle mills, Chinese workmen, 2319
Shipping and railway, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) for papers, 245, 495, 815
Thetford Mines, 2207
Troops, employment of, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627, 2893, 3072
United States coal miners, 1262, 2786
Technical Education
Administration of act, 1637
Director of, 1674
Trade unions, 2786
Combines bill, not affected by, 2666
Congress at the Hague, 46
Troubles, 123, 2893. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Unemployment, 50, 628, 1125, 1168, 1187, 1194, 1242, 1348, 1657, 2819, 3032. *See also* Immigration; Soldiers
Calgary post office, 629
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3828, 3843
Decrease of, 15
United States in, 2650
Employment offices. *See under this title,* Employment Offices
Great Britain in, 1205
Hoboes, origin of, 1194
Insurance, 1638
International Labour Conference, 1646
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, letter, 2719
Municipalities, statements as to, 41-43
Order in council No. 220, 435

Labour—*Con.*
Unemployment—*Con.*
Pensioners, 2168
Provision for qu. 732, 1657
Purchasing power, limitation, 2716, 2725
Relief, 1644, 2730, 3032
Calgary, 1679
Expenditure, 1655, 2969
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Federal assistance withdrawn, 1655-58, 1678
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 689
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Responsibility for, 1657
Seamen, 3379
Value of time lost, 1685
Vancouver, 1340
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085
Winnipeg, 435, 1124, 1215, 1416, 1883
United Mine-Workers of America, 3155
Delegates, detention at border, 2297. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Unorganized workers, 3534
Unskilled, employment for, 80
Wages, 1240. *See also* Cost of Living
Average, 2720
Bricklayers, $12 per day, 3017
Building trades, 2165, 3004
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363
Inflation, 1167
Inquiry by fair wage officers, 2982
Loss through strikes, 1628
Manufacturing, 2876
Miners, 3206
Railway, 2800, 2876, 3190, 3205
Reduction, 2800
Textile industry, 3467
United States, 1165, 1248, 2650
Urban and rural, 35-36, 1240, 1355
Wage slavery, 2727
Wage system, 2723
War labour policy, 2887
Welland canal, 3762
Whitley councils, 1654
Workingman, position of, 2982

Labour Party, 2728, 2815

Labrador

Boundary, Mr. James White, salary, 4667
Discovery of placer gold, 1995
Report, 2611
Labrador Goldfields, Limited, qu. 2696

La Chambre de Commerce, Montreal, Bankruptcy Act, 1492

Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 208; neg. on div. 243-4

Lacroix, Mr. Eugene, postmaster, Sayabec. *See* Post Office

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4105-24
Bank loans and deposits, 1133
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1506
British Columbia fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1541
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1213, qu. 2611, 2419
Chinese immigration bill, exclusion, 2482
Civil Service patronage, 368
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4270
Emigration to United States, 1085
Exhibitions, 1467
Forest destruction by fungi and insects, qu. 2178, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1007
Freight rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1967
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 316
Illicit still cases, remissions, 2299
Immigration
Assisted class, 1100
British Columbia, co-operation with, 1096 1097
Empire settlement scheme, 1096
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098
Oriental, 506
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 506
Indians, potlatching, 2163
Interest rate, 4105, 4108
Labour department, co-operation with provinces, 1678
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 221
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 734
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2795
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2117, 2122
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3550
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-69
Disability attributable to war service Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3717, 3736
Royal commission, recommendations, 2983
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664

Ladner, Mr. L. J.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 390, 393, 398, 432
Renovated butter, 4270
Returned soldiers, death from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 921
Scientific knowledge, contributions to, 1286-7
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Titles, honours and decorations, M., 1285, 1297
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Unemployment, provision for, 1657
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 261, 332

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Imperial Conference, 4653

La Flèche, Colonel. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 4, 6, 8, 16
Letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281

Lake, Mr. R. S., Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Lake Freight Rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake Grain Rates Bill
Res. 3960, 4218; 1r., 4235; 2r., 4276; com., 4290; 3r., 4295
Sections and subjects discussed:
Canadian and American ports, 4218-4234
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 4223
Cargo space, 4219
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4219, 4222
Discussion, opportunity for, 4225
Insurance, brokers prohibited from writing, 4219, 4223
Interpretation, "board", 4291
Jurisdiction of parliament, 4227-31
Penalties, 4219
Rates, discrimination in, 4218, 4222
Power to fix minimum, 4218
Receiving and tabulating charges, 4294
Shipping combines, prosecution of, 4227
Tariff to be filed with Grain Commissioners 4219

Lake Grain Rates Commission. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake of the Woods. *See also* Water Powers
Control board
Expenses, 4001
M. for papers, 247

Lake of the Woods—*Con.*
Levels, 247, qu 2700
Water powers, 3421, 3425

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act 1921 Repeal Bill
1r., 2885-6; 2r., on div. 4163-80; com., 4181; 3r., 4185
Agreement with Ontario government, 2885

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 3354

Lamont Park, Buffalo reserve, 3941

Lanark, election, 157

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual training, 865
Imperial Conference, 4656
Imperialism, 4657
Indemnity of members, 4242
Labour Gazette, 1622
Military expenditure, 865
M. for reduction, 866
Naval service, 4657
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
War, Canada's participation in, 4656

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Natural Resources
Clearing by fire, 1185
Colonization of, 1178
Decrease in value, 2019
Dominion reversion of. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Homesteads, second. *See* Dominion Lands
Hudson Bay railway, sold for, qu. 283. *See also that title*
Patents, issue of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bill
Policy, 1344
Purchase price of, 1178
Railway, purchases or sales, 1739
Reclamation, 2969. *See also* Dominion Lands
Sales of. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization
Immigrants, to, 1431
Scrip frauds, 730
School lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Schools
Settlement, 43, 1893, 3060. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldier Settlement
National land settlement plan, 1182
Soldier settlement and, 2019. *See also that title*
Speculation in, 1119, 1395, 1887, 2955

Lands—*Con.*
Taxation, 1178, 1395. *See also that title*
Land values, 2745, 2778, 2803, 3016
Tax sales, 4062
Unimproved, 1118
Vacant, 1105, 1344

Landlord. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Language Questions. *See* French Language

Lanoraie wharf, 969

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Eastern Lands Company, 626
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 661
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Georgian bay elevators, qu. 620
Immigration policy, 1401
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Lumbering in Timiskaming district, 1402
New Ontario, agricultural conditions, 1401
Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307
St. Lawrence river waterway, 661

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Alaskan, wreck of, 1660, 3330
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084, 3365
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3820, 3974
Boots and shoes, free admission, 3500
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540, 1544, 1546
Salmon canning industry, licenses, 1544
Business of the House, adjournments to discuss, etc. 1540
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coastal regulations, suspension, 4276
Distressed seamen, 574, 3969, 4207
Masters and mates certificates, 2418, 2668, 3146, 3972
Pilotage, 3146
Registration of foreign ships, 3749, 3961, 3973
Canadian Arctic expedition, reports, 3360
Canadian National Railways, Mr. Talbot, 2004
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 538
Detroit river, regulation of traffic, 3358
Dredging, unification of work, 3341
False creek bridge, 3376

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Fisheries
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Publicity, 3364
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
White Mud river, fishway, 3363
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 4009, 4207
French Treaty bill, 2216, 2256, 2815
Bottles, 2218
Bronze powder, 2217
Butter, 2217
Cotton, 2218, 2263
Dairy products, 2217
Favoured nation, 2219
France
Balance of trade, 2221
Exports to, 2216
Friendly relations with, 2216
Line of attack, 2216
Luxuries, 2221
Sales tax, 2279
Silks, 2221, 2256
Treaty of 1907, 2222
Grain shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Halibut fishery treaty, 4132, 4440, 4459
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4461
Visit to Washington, 858
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Johnston, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231
McConica, Mr., congratulations upon return, 1660
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 3371
Marine and fisheries
Annual report, 1080
Committee, report, 3084
Distressed seamen, relief, 574, 3332, 3375, 3969, 4207
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Thunder bay, etc. 3359
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Hopper barge, construction, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Ice obstruction, Cabot strait, 2614
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, British Columbia, 1660
Stations, Long Point, Lake Erie, 3335
Lighthouse service
Lights, new, 3357
Maintenance and repairs, 3353

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lighthouse service—*Con.*
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Marine signal service, 3358
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Masters and mates, examination, 2610. *See also under this title,* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, 3354
Navigation
Aids to, 3357
Obstructions to, 3334
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage, 3146
Administration of, 3358
Pensions, 3359
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3335
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334
Wrecks
Investigation into, 3160, 3330
Removal of, 3332
Montreal harbour commissioners bill, 4508
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2640, 3508
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Political patronage, 3344
Quebec arsenal, 888
Radiotelegraphy
Broadcasting stations, 3374
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
Regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill 2086, 2284, 2467
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Alleged dismissals, 3344
Tariff
Liberal policy, 2221
Opposition resolution of 1922, 2220
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3399, 3963, 4207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1290
United States steamer Siloam, capture, 2207
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 255-70, 332
Vimy ridge monument, 182
Visit to Washington, 734, 857

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 657
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Lard. *See* Meat Products

Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border. *See* Immigration; Labour

Larkin, Mr. P. C. *See* High Commissioner

Larouche, Que., postmaster, qu. 3137

Laurentians, The, 4312

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Administration, 2815
Canadian railways and ports, traffic for, 1756
Conscription issue, 3015
Election of 1896, 2936
Hudson Bay railway, 1053, 1061, Announcement ,1047
Immigration policy, 1177, 1425
Imperial Conference, 4663
Last public address, 2995
On hour of meeting in 1918, 1
McMaster, M., and, 3030
Monument, 1017
Protective system, 2719
Reciprocity, defeat of, 3015
Tariff reduction and Senate reform, 2908

Lausanne Conference, 54

Lavaltrie, Que. wharf, 969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Bank draft tax, 3929
Canadian National Railways, directors, 4525
Immigration dept. employees, Quebec, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Little, Mr. W. R., qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Transfers, qu. 2517, qu. 3141
Indemnity of members, 4240
Little, George, deportation of, qu. 3704
Orleans island bridge, 3646
Quebec, Champlain station, 4446
St. Charles river improvements, 4447
St. Malo repair shops, 4447
Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Talbot, Mr. O., 4525
Toronto viaduct, 4446

Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020

Lawyers, charges and standard of living, 1154, 2813. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Lead Pencils, marking of goods, 2988

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herds, 584, 2131, 2132
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2131, 2137
Assiniboine river
Damage by flood, 993, 3041
Expenditure on dyking, etc. qu. 3264
Budget, 3039. Reception of budget in West; district board, Portage la Prairie, resolution; betrayal of the people; British preference; direct importation; obligation to Great Britain for removal of cattle embargo; free admission of British goods; cheque tax charged by grain buyers to farmers, 3039; cattle trade; freight rates, ocean rates; Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels; statements of Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Grisdale, 3040; Assiniboine river floods; resolution of Elie branch of United Farmers; Canadian National Railways, traffic and management; annoyances and inconveniences to passengers; railway equipment; people patronizing their own road; cattle shipment over Canadian Pacific; Riley's army, transportation Ottawa to Toronto, 3042; government interference with railway management; government plea for economy not sincere; new officers with high salaries; Mr. Duncan Marshall; Hon. Mr. Pugsley; members' indemnities, reduction of; extravagance in administration; cabinet ministers absent from duty; cabinet ministers, number in Canada and United States; speech of Mr. McMaster on budget; Manitoba Free Press, stand in defence of common people, 3043
Cattle, ocean space, 2123, 3040
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Experimental farms, 461-486
M. to reduce neg. 486
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 943
Health of animals, 583
Hudson Bay railway, 461
International fishing boat race, 114
Live stock
Ocean shipping rates, 2133, 3040
Removal of cattle embargo, 3039

Leader, Mr. Harry—*Con.*
Ministers' salaries and members' indemnities, 3043, 4243
M. for reduction of, 1153
Reference to, 2915
Officials attending fairs, qu. 285
Portage la Prairie
Representation of, 2680
Sewerage outlet, 993, 997, 2680
Railway mail service, cost of, qu. 3143
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Deductions for non-attendance, 4243
Tuberculosis in cattle, 583

League of Nations. *See also* Imperial Conference
Activities and policies, 3993
Assembly
Tariff
Economic warfare, 3054
Stability, 3053
Canada's contribution to Permanent Secretariat, 3990
Canada's participation in foreign wars, 4000
Canada's withdrawal from, 3999
Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture in Ottawa, 1685
Criticism of, 3993
Expenses of Canadian delegation to, 3989
Franco-German relations, 4652
International Labour Conference, 1441, 1652
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
M. (Mr. Power) for withdrawal, 1529
Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Silesia, partition of, 3995
West Ukrainian republic, settlement, 651

Leases
Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Coal lands. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Leather, free admission to United States, 3016

Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Leblanc, Mr. Louis, qu. 285

Le Droit d'auteur. *See* Copyright Act Amdt.

Lee, Miss Barbara. *See* Immigration department

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
English and French, harmony between, 1341
Export Act Amdt. bill (pulpwood) 4347, 4354
Kent Northern railway, 4190
Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Léger, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*
Lighthouses and lightkeepers
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347, 4354

Legislation. *See also* Government; House of Commons; Senate
Class, 2851
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
House of Commons, 2691
Committees, expenses of, 4674
Indemnity of members, 4674
In advance of public sentiment, 2925
Joint Committee on, 4008
Paternal, 727, 1133. *See also* Race Track Betting
Preparation and form of, 4007
Provincial, disallowance of. *See* Disallowance; Jurisdiction
Record of, 407, 408
Retroactive, 3128
Senate, salaries and contingencies, 3949
Too much, 2543, 2547, 3434. *See also* Combines bill
Uplift, 2054

Legislative Council. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Leitch, Professor
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Dairying industry, 1843

Leitche's Creek, N.S. wharf, 943

Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement. *See* Immigration; Japan

Lemont, Mr. Arthur. *See* Immigration, Agents

Leprosy, treatment of. *See* Health

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. 3870, agreed to, 3871
Petroleum, crude, bounty, 3914, 3922

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Level Crossings. *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Raiways; Toronto

Levels, National. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lévis
Dry dock, 1261
Postmasters, qu. 519
Quarantine station, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 117. Expenditure on agriculture; criticisms from Maritime province members, 118; condition of western farmers; immigration policy, 119; competition in wheat markets, 120; economy in length of session, 120; Near East crisis, 120-121; sales and stamp taxes, 121; necessity for economy in public expenditures. 121
Agricultural conditions in western provinces, 119, 1841
Agriculture
Department, salaries, 611
Immigration and, 1228
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4096-4116
Bounty system, 3922
Cadet services, 881
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3626, 4201, 4333
Dunblane-Mawer, 4201, 4333
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Paris offices, 3626
Cheque tax, 3933
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 543
Civil Service examinations, 366
Combines bill, 2599
Registrar, powers of investigation, 2626
Cost of living, combines and, 2599
Customs drawback, hatters' sweats, 3502
Domestic servants, provision on trains, 1477
Dredging, 1012, 3340
Eggs, price of, 1841
Expenditure in excess of revenue, 1230
Free trade, necessities of life, 1230
French treaty, agricultural implements, 2247
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 2105
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration
Alleged discrimination in favour of West, 1098
Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Child, 1227, 1470
Experience as an immigrant, 1226
Great Britain from, 1105
Literature, 1226
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
Policy, 1225
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2436

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J.—*Con.*
Indians, 2149
Interest rate, 4116
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 839
Matapedia bridge, 1014
Members' indemnity, 4009
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
National gallery, 1018
Naval service, 910
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3536
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849
Pension commissioners, board of, 3743
Petroleum bounty, 3922
Prices, spread in, 1230
Provincial educational rights, 1884
Public works, surveys and inspections, 1020
Quebec arsenal, 884
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3478
Royal Canadian navy, 910
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3778
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, abolition of, 1230
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
Soldier settlement, 2021, 2027
Sorel shipyard, 3349
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar duty, 3479
Swift current public building, 1023
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trade commissioners, 1841
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3777
Western provinces, conditions in, 1225
Wines, tax on, 3938
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334

Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815

Liberal Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2414
Charge of abandonment of policy, unfair, 3010
Conventions of 1893 and 1919, 2777. *See also under this title* Liberal Platform
Senate, elective or nominative, 1369
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2971
Disappointment with, 2812

Liberal Party—*Con.*
Election promises in 1896 and 1921, 2951
High protectionists in, 2931
Influences preventing carrying out of pledges, 2909
Liberal platform of 1919, 2603, 2777, 2885, 2932, 2952, 2974, 2991, 3007, 4393
British preference, increase in, 454
"Chart" 3047
Circumstances of adoption, 3019
Economy, 2003
Endorsed by opposition in 1920, 2994
Euler, Mr., statement of, 3019
Failure to implement, 2981, 3066
French treaty, 2211
Government should not be asked to carry out, 2852
Immigration, Chinese, 1652
Interpretation of, 3047
Labour legislation, 1651, 1652
Maclean, Hon. Mr. (Halifax), statement of, 3019
Planks from, included in amendment, 2861
Progressive party, opposition to, 2925
Proportional representation, 407
Quotation from, 3019
Repudiation of, alleged, 2994, 3019, 3047,
Resolutions moved in opposition, 2736, 3047
Tariff, 1222, 2714, 2718, 2736, 2737, 2872, 2904, 2957, 3008
Planks not carried out, 2220, 3062, 3033. *See also under this title,* Tariff
Taxation, 2003
Luxuries, 2011
Liberals and Conservatives, Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142
Liberals, responsibility for expenditure, 2921
Pledges and promises, 2908, 2981, 2992. *See also under this title,* Conventions; Liberal Platform
Elections of 1896 and 1921, 2908, 2981, 2992
Repudiation of, alleged, 2793, 3035
Senate elective or nominative, 1369
Tariff
Difference between Liberal and Conservative, 3008
Platform of 1896, 2908
Policy, 3007
Protective, 2818
Record since 1896 3009
Stability, new doctrine, 3064

Liberal and Conservative Parties
Alleged union on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142

Liberalism, "watchwords of the past", 3014

Libraries. *See* Public Libraries

Library of Parliament
Committee, 53, 202, 516
Change in membership, 615
Estimates, 2691
Salaries, contingencies, etc. 2692

Life Imprisonment. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Life Saving. *See* Canadian National Safety League; Marine

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers. *See* Marine

Lignite. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Lincoln, Abraham, on immigration, 1236

Lindsay
Arsenal 883, 1744, 1752
Market scales, 208

Linen
Linen thread. *See also* Textiles; Treaties, French Treaty
Bounty, 2647
Linen yarns, 3897
French treaty, 1981
Industry, 3897

Liquor. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Customs and Excise
Beer, excise taxes, qu. 518
Bonded liquor warehouses. *See under this title.* British Columbia; New Brunswick
Bootlegging, 2410, 2419, 3358. *See also* Belle River Harbour
Brandy. *See also* Treaties, French
Duty on, 2742, 2999
French, 444, 2643, 3478
Breweries and export liquor houses
Licensing, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, qu. 1866
British Columbia, 2405-11
Purchases by British Columbia government, 2410
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, qu. 1974, 2404-7, 3144
Canadian and Scotch whisky, competition of French brandy, 3478
Canadian National Railways, transportation, 1868, 3324
Drunkenness, convictions for, 2411
Exportation, 2404, 3144, 3704, 4295
British Columbia, qu. 1260
Government control. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Illicit stills
Prosecutions, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Remissions of fines, 2299

Liquor—*Con.*
Illicit traffic, Canada to United States, 2208
Importation
For sale under regulations, 2404, 3704
Provinces, into. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Intoxicating, consumption of, qu. 285
Laws, evasion of, 2543
Manufacture, 2410, 3704
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
United States laws, 4295
Wines, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French
Beer and, excise taxes, qu. 518
Duty, 2710, 2999
Abolition of, 2742
Reduction of, 2643
Excise tax, qu. 518, 2656, 3937, 4425
French treaty, 438, 442, 452, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225
Native, prohibition of, 2411
Port, manufactured at False Creek, Vancouver, 2411
Yukon, 86

L'Islet wharf, 969

Literature. *See also* Advertising; Immigration
National. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Recognition of work in. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Lithographic Works, marking of goods, 2988

Little Current, Ont., harbour, 982

Live Stock. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Live Stock Acts Amdt.
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, *and under this title,* Health of Animals
Alberta, 1435
Animal contagious diseases. *See also that title*
Eradication board, 2699
Research, 2867
Canada's position as a live stock country, 2934
Cattle
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Diseases *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Embargo. *See also* Agriculture, Experimental Farms
Removal of, 15, 25, 26, 38, 48, 148, 170, 575, 1869, 2871, 3053

Live Stock—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Embargo—*Con.*
Removal of—*Con.*
Conference, 3989
Correspondence, 4132, 4184, 4295
Credit for, 3293
Doherty, Mr. Manning, 3293
Drury, Hon. E. C., 3293
Effect of, 1101
Health of Canadian herds, 2132
Inquiry, 575, 576
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3293
Pledge of British government, 3531
Shipment to Great Britain. *See under this sub-title,* Shipment to Great Britain
Stock, classification of, 3291
Export to United States, 1410, 2910, 3293. *See also* United States
Feeding
Shipment in car lots, 595
Winter feeding, 469
Markets, 2871
Ocean freight rates on, 2127, 2136, 2757, 2807, 3040
Prices, 300, 2877
Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, 2871
Weight and, 2871
Quarantined at Levis, qu. 3141
Reciprocity, 3082. *See also that title*
Scrub, 2810
Shipment to Great Britain, 208, 1036, 2807, 3017, 3324, 3641. *See also under this sub-title.* Embargo
Alleged unsanitary condition of boats, 2127, 2613
Finished cattle shipped as stockers, 2872
First, 3309, 3310
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, reported statement, 3041
Dundee at, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3811
Grisdale, Dr., statement, 3040
Rates, 2133, 2963
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Trial shipment, expenses, 4675
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Vessel space, 1868, 1869, 2757, 2963 3040
Testing, 1307, 2133
Trade, development of, 3040
Chicago Fat Stock show, 1398
Community breeding, 476
Condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Contagious diseases. *See under this title,* Health of Animals

Live Stock—*Con.*
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307
Destruction by timber wolves, 597
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Estimates, 575, 587, 4675
Experimental farms, 457, 460-85
Export. *See under this title,,* Cattle, Embargo, Shipment;*and also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Feeding. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Health of Animals, 483, 575, 4676. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Accredited herds, qu. 206, 484, qu. 492, 577, 626, 3064, 3302
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim, 582
Compensation for slaughter, 462-486, 576, 582
Hall, O., and McDougall, W. F., veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hog cholera, 582
Contracted from whey, 3299
Pathological laboratories, 578
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579, 2866, 2868
Tuberculosis, 576, 2469
Buffalo, 3439
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Eradication, 3989
Restricted area, Manitoba, 576
Tuberculin test, qu. 1972, 3065
No encouragement to farmer, 2933, 3300
Hogs
Bacon type, 2864
Breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865
Corn-fed, 2865
Garbage feeding, 582
Grading, 466, 590, 1905
Prices, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Horses
Glanders, serum for, 579, 584
Horse-breeding, 588
Market for, 590
Racing of. *See* Race Track Betting
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207, 2253
Thoroughbred, breeding of. *See* Race Track Betting
Tariff on. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports and exports, supervision of. *See* Live Stocks Act Amdt
Improvement, 2773
Indian reserves, 2159, 2162
Infected, sale of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Live Stock—*Con.*
Loans, 4103
Loss from inferior, 2862, 2866, 2867
Markets, 588, 594, 1410
Prices and quality, 2862. *See also under this title,* Cattle
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See also that title*
Cattle embargo, 3293
Reported statements, 2614, 3041
Trip to South America, qu. 1031
Poultry. *See that title*
Prices, 2862, 2877. *See also* Prices *and under this title,* Cattle
Decrease in, 1410
West, in, 1101
Propaganda, 594
Purchase of thoroughbred stock, by Mr. E. S. Archibald, 3290
Ranching, 588
Sheep, 2866
Pure-bred, importation, qu. 3141
Screenings, feeding on, 2040, 2867
Sheep-raising. *See* Textiles; Woollen Industry, M. (Mr. Drummond)
Shipments, inspection of, 3334. *See also under this title,* Cattle, Shipment
Stockyards
Agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw, qu. 1156
Fraudulent practices, 276, 485, 576
Moose Jaw, qu. 1156, 2779
Prince Albert, qu. 1156, 2779
Union, 2762
Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587
Trade. *See also that title*
South America, 594, qu. 1031
Visit of Canadian commissioners to, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Transportation. *See also* Freight Rates
Hudson Bay railway, 1071
Tuberculin test. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Western Canada Live Stock Union, 2699
World competition, 2781

Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Marketing, consolidation and amendment)
1r., 193; 2r., 276-277; ref, to Agriculture Com., 277; report of com. 1441; com., 2200; 2992; 3r., 2293; Senate amdts. 3150

Live Stock Exchanges. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill

Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745

Lloyd George, Right Hon. David
Agricultural conditions in Great Britain, 2755
Career of, 1399
Free trade and protection, 3012
German reparations. *See* Germany
Great Britain, unemployment, 1205
Liberalism, "fair play for the under dog," 3014
Near East question, 4655
Proportional representation, 392
Socialist strength in Great Britain, 2722
Turkey, threatened war with, 2815

Loans, 93, 630, 2642. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Harbours, advances to
Agricultural 1400. *See also* Credits
Borrowings of former government, 2831
Comparative commissions on, 158-9
Conversion, recent, qu, 386
Farm. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits
Interest, 2831
Live stock, 4103
New York, 1922, 154-155, 630, 640, 2963
Provincial, 2987
Roumanian and Greek, qu. 623, 2010
Vocational. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
War, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804

Lobster Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Local Improvements. *See* Public Works

Lockeport, N.S. wharf, 943

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079
Bienfait briquetting plant, 2512
British preference, direct importation, 3455
Coal, duty, 3498
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4671
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Johnston, Mr. Alex., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 4671
Members' indemnity, 4009
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3878
Amdt. time for appeal, 3881, agreed to, 3881

London, publicity agent, reported appointment of Mr. W. T. Cranfield, 2927, 2983, 4707

London Times, comment on Canadian immigration, 1111

Lord Selkirk Association, monument to Indian Chief, Peguis, 4704

Lord's Day Act, discrimination against poor, 3585

Lougheed, Sir James
Hudson Bay railway, 1033
Labour members of parliament, 3033

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Annual training, 95th regiment, 863
Arthur Young and Company, qu. 1137
Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration, qu. 1633
Budget, 2944. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2944; budget generally acceptable; return of prosperity; tariff, downward revision; revenue requirements; postage rates, reduction; fishing industry handicaps and difficulties, 2945; reduced freight rates; United States markets; machinery for manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer; optimism of Maritime provinces; immigration; pessimistic utterances of Progressives; Mr. Forke on the budget; statement of Mr. H. W. Wood, 2946; amendment; agriculture, assistance of; forest conservation, 2947; pulpwood, restriction of export; work of Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum in interest of forest conservation; cheque tax; bounties, free admission of machinery; sugar duty; sales tax; British preference; reciprocity, 2948
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, 535
Cost of 1917-22, qu. 1137
Clementsport postmaster, 1796
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4351
Forest conservation, 2947, 4351
Foster, Mr. A. deWitt, qu. 1633
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1137
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4571
Military hospitals, medical staff, 677
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3855
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 2948, 4351

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2138
Budget, 2871. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Canadian cattle embargo, removal of; value of British and United States markets; prices, Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, Scotland; weight and price; finished cattle shipped as stockers; unlimited quantity of cattle available for shipment; agricultural conditions; protection unfair to West; double standard of selling

Lovie, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and buying; Premier Dunning on the tariff; Liberal tariff planks; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; revenue tariff and protection; excise duty, 2872; taxes paid to protected manufacturers; agricultural conditions in Western Canada; statement of Mr. Samuel Larcombe at Winnipeg; wheat, market for; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; unprofitable crop of 1922, 2873; hard wheat; mixed farming; letter from Mr. J. Scott; farmers who own automobiles; automobiles in Ottawa, 2874; mill feeds, adulteration of; freight rates; lumber, price of, 2875; freight, classification of; transfer charges; express rates; labour costs in industrial and agricultural occupations; cost of living, 2876; protective tariff; disparity between producer's and consumer's prices; cheque tax, limitation; discrimination in favour of rich; protection, 2877; Hudson Bay railway; British preference; world conditions; cancellation of war debt, 2878; Sir George Lawson Johnston on payment by Great Britain of debt to United States; dollar reserve fund in Canada, 2879
Experimental farms, 477
Farms of 160 acres, 1087
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4546
Health of animals, 580
Horse-breeding, 588
Mill feeds, adulteration of, 600, 2875
Seed inspection, 196

Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695, 2795

Lower, Mr. A. R. M., fisheries of Hudson bay, 1065

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply, 74, 75. Unfair criticism of Progressive party, 75; Great Britain our best market; condition of western farmers, 76; immigration policy of government, 77; revision of Bank Act; transportation of grain; comparative grain rates; economy in administration, 78; the government and its platform; old party divisions, 79
Agricultural loans, 1400
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4041
Bruederheim branch railway, 4199, 4316
Canadian air force, 1749, 2418
Central repair shops, 1750

Lucas, Mr. W. T.—*Con.*
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4198, 4316
Canadian Pacific Railway, qu. 625
Land, 3704
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Disallowance, Nova Scotia statute, 2378
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1011
Elevators, dockage, 2044
Finance Act 1914 Amdt bill, 4408
Freight rates, reduction of, 1400
Grain pooling, 1400
Immigration
Banks and, 4042
Canada Colonization Association, 1399
Chinese, 1445
Policy, 1397
Institutions, surplus of, 1400
Lloyd George, Right Hon. David, 1399
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261
Public Works engineering branch, 1017
Railway mail service, 1790
Raisins and dried currants, 3478
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Tariff reduction, 1400
Western provinces, conditions in, 1398

Lumber. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Alleged labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
British Columbia in, 1245
Combine, 2593
Competition and prices, 2593
Creosoting industry, qu. 813, qu. 1137, 1245, 3234
Vancouver Creosoting Company. 3231
Depression, 3002
Freight rates, 139, 1961, 2855, 2875, 3036
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Importation for Welland canal, qu. 1867
Manufactures of, 1989. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Prices, 2875, 3036
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Railway ties, freight rates and prices, 3036
Sales tax, 4181, 4418
Sawdust pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Temiskaming district, 1402
Timber exportation, 3416
Wood-working industry, 2806

Lumbermen, emigration to United States, 1125

Lunenburg, N.S. harbour, dredging, 4576
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580

Luse Land Company. *See* Immigration

Lusitania. *See* Germany, Reparations

Luxuries. *See also* Taxation; Treaties, French Treaty
Demand for, 1856

Macallum, Dr., discoveries in helium, 4439

Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpœna, 4145. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill, Merchants Bank

Macbrien, General. *See* National Defence

Maccan Coal District. *See* Coal

Macdonald, Hon. E. M. (Acting Minister of National Defence)
Acting Minister of National Defence, appointment, 2295
After war conditions, 1231
Annual drill, 4635
Bank Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Chair ruling of, 4720
Motions, anticipatory, 3329
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3961
Rejection by Senate. 4698
Coal
Freight rates on, 1277
Purchase of in United States, 3493
Management, responsibility and powers, 3690
Paris offices, 3616-17, 3689
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3617
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition, 1937
Class consciousness 1233
Coal
Canadian National Railways, 1277, 3493
Duty 3493
Nova Scotia 1277
Combines bill enforcement of 4229
Criminal Code amdt. (Betting information) 4733
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute 2372

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Dredging Maritime provinces 4591. *See also under this title* Harbours and Rivers
Emigration to the United States 1234
Eskimos, trial of, 4674
Experimental farms, buildings, 4630
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
Freight rates
Coal, 1277
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1937
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1937
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1277
Halifax grain elevator 4714
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 4586
Nova Scotia, 4561, 4563
Dartmouth, 4568
Digby, 4568
Dredging, 4569, 4591
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Little Anse, 4722
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4572, 4722
Lunenburg, dredging, 4576, 4577
Ship Harbour, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Ontario, 4589, 4594
Belle River, 4596
Port Maitland, 4589
Prince Edward Island, 4586
Georgetown, 4587
Quebec, 4588
Rimouski, Raymond and Talbot, Messrs. claim, 4588
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3597
Hector celebration, grant, 4636, 4705
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 510
Homestead lands in the West, 1087, 1090
Hudson Bay railway, discontinuance, 1062
Immigration
Empire settlement board, 1237
Hebridean, treatment of, 3597
Maritime provinces, and, 1236
Oriental, 509
Policy, 1230-38
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 509
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3452
Justice, administration of, 4674
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4229
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2052, 3582, 3975

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 1738
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2121
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, desertions, 2418
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Estimates, 4635
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976. *See also under this title,* Petawawa
National spirit, 1232
Naval service, recruiting, 2897
Northover, Major H. R., claims, 4635
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3552
Discussion of, 3329
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Policy, 3451
Parliament buildings, common meeting room, 1727
Party system, 1235
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 3749
Public buildings
New, 4615
New Brunswick, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4613, 4628
Ontario, 4615
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, architects, 4633
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public Works
Estimates, 4561, 4594
Roads and bridges, 4590
Reciprocity, defeat of, 1233
Redistribution
Intention of government, 4250
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee, 857, 937
Reports
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4736
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Sworn as member of Privy Council without portfolio, 1764
Toronto
Customs building, 4624
Harbour improvements, 4610
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Seed branch building, 4622
United States civil war, conditions following, 1232

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.
Confederation and, 1366

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.—*Con.*
National policy, 2838
Reciprocity, 2922
Senate and House of Lords, 1374
Title, 1295

Macdonell, Rev. Father
Immigration
Hebridean, 3585
Scotland, from, 1876

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
British Columbia telegraph lines, 1017
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4314
Chinese immigration bill, 2322
Conditions in British Columbia, 2322
Merchants, Vernon, telegram, 2322
Officer in China, 2322
Codling moth, 597
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 1014
Experimental farms, 464
Fruits and vegetables, registration, 2307
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Hope-Princeton highway, 2342
Immigration
British Columbia, into, 1095
Canada Colonization Association, 1346
European, 1346
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Oriental, 509, 1346, 2322
Policy, 1345
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 509
Indians, British Columbia, Major McGraw, 2163
Kamloops-Okanagan line, 4314
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837
Mara, B. C., postmaster, qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Military hospitals, 671
Okanagan lake wharves, 1008
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3723
Seed testing bill, 2307
Sugar lake telegraph line, 1017
Summerland experimental farm, 464
Western provinces, conditions, 1347

Mackenzie River District
Half-breed claims, 3409, 3444
Steamship services, 2176

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 47

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Annual drill, 4637
Artificial limbs for disabled soldiers, 675
Boy Scouts, 879

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
British preference, direct importation, 1772, 2948
Budget, 2948. British preference, increase of direct importation, 2948; French and Italian treaties, limitation to Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, comparison of mileage and traffic; Canadian grain passing through United States seaports; petroleum bounties and tariff on oil; proposal to curtail and discontinue; immigration policy; Maritime provinces ignored; lecture of Mr. F. W. Kerr in Isle of Man, 2949; Hebridean immigrants; naval recruiting in the interior; forest conservation; government economy, 2950; civil government; Hudson Bay railway, 2951
Cadet services, 879
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3970
Canadian air force, 1748
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Negotiation for sale of 27 ships, 1975
Steamship sailings, qu. 4511
For 1924, qu. 4751
Canadian National Railways, 2944
Atlantic division, 1770
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Chicago traffic originating at, 1769
Comparison, mileage and traffic, 2949
Directors, New Brunswick representative, qu. 282
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal. 1768, 1769
Halifax terminals, qu. 4510. qu. 4751
Policy, discussion of, 1762, 1764
Regulations, 496
St. John station, 4310
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1009
Emigration to United States, 1198
Employers' liability compensation, 695
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Flour shipments, Canadian and United States ports, 1767
Forest protection, 2950
M. (Mr. Michaud) 822
French treaty, direct importation, 2303, 2949
Grain shipments, 1767
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 948
Hector celebration, 4637
Hudson Bay railway, 2951, 4681, 4684
Immigration
Bowder, Mr., agent in Great Britain, 1198
Distribution of, 1198
Farm labourers and domestic servants, 1200
Hebridean, 2950
Maritime provinces ignored, 2949
Officers in Great Britain, 1879
Policy, 1197, 2949
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty, direct importation, 2401, 2948
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as minister, 1764
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2116, 2119
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021, 2685, 2688
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4706
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854-67, 4747
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3711
Petroleum bounty, 3919
Post Office department, printing, 1818, 1820
Public ownership, railways, 1770
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Questions unanswered, 4455
St. John
Employment office, 3453
Harbour improvements, 2677
Immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, 1021
Terminals, 4445
St. John and Quebec railway extension, 4310
Sales tax, 4427
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, 3822
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4427
Taxation, payment in postage stamps, 1821
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Vancouver harbour bill, 261
Venereal diseases, 705
Vocational loans, 687

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4083
Budget, 2967. Congratulations to Finance Minister; debt and interest charges; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2967; budget the best possible under circumstances; tariff revision; tendency downwards; reciprocity, offer to negotiate; attitude of United States; British preference, increase in; sugar duty; expenditure and economy, 2968; irrigation, water power survey and land reclamation; immigration; unemployment relief, 2969; migration of Can-

MacLean, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
adians; air force; Civil Service, number of employees; Civil Service Commission; government departments, increase in cost of, 2970; Canadian National Railways; improved situation on eastern division; courtesy of officials; Crowsnest pass agreement, claim that concession forced by Progressives, 2971; natural resources of western provinces and Maritime provinces; agricultural conditions in Prince Edward Island; fishing industry; reciprocity; distribution, cost of; middleman; producer and consumer; confidence and co-operation; evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; cost of living, 2972; tariff stability; deficit; reduction of; reasons for supporting budget; amendment, 2973
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3436
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 557
Combines bill, 2601
English and French, harmony, 1341
Forest protection, 3419
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Maritime provinces, summer resorts, 3436
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Natural resources, 2972, 3436
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3730
Proportional representation, 432
Public expenditure, east and west, 3436
School lands, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed potatoes, inspection, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035, 4080-4124, 4133-60, 4509
Merchants' bank, 4037, 4050, 4156
Proceedings before Banking and Commerce Com. 3887
Shareholders' audit, 4090
Bank mergers, 4138
Merchants' bank 4037, 4050, 4156
Banking and Commerce Committee
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Printing of proceedings, 3887
Reports
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Committee—*Con.*
Reports—*Con.*
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Budget, 3000. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3000; speech of Mr. Meighen; budget, form of presentation; budget statements in Great Britain; budget well received in country; expenditure and taxation, burden upon taxpayers, 3001; the future bright; agriculture; fishing industry; business and industrial depression; problems should be faced in national spirit; Canada difficult country to govern, 3002; secession, talk of; accentuation of provincial and local problems; group political organizations; Alberta farmers resolution; European reconstruction; European origin of Canadian commercial conditions, 3003; wheat prices; emigration to United States; government not responsible; economic causes of movement; inflation in the United States; building trade, 3004; balanced budget; public expenditure; attitude of public and parliament; Hudson Bay railway; commission to inquire and investigate, 3005; commercial feasibility of route; Welland canal; railway extension in the West; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, deficit; deficit in financial operations of government; railway deficit and taxation, 3006; tariff policy of government; Liberal platform of 1919; too much importance attached to; statesmen who have reversed opinions on public policy; Sir Robert Peel and repeal of Corn Laws, 3007; tariff declarations of Liberal Convention; unwise to re-write tariff schedule; Progressive platform; inconsistency of Conservative party; consistently protectionist; Conservative arguments in favour of protection; position of Liberal party, 3008; tariff board; tariff reduction; free trade; Progressive party, inconsistency of; Alberta coal, transportation to Ontario; record of Liberal party since 1896; preferential tariff, 3009; reciprocity agreement with United States; opposition to reciprocity by Progressive members; recent tariff reductions; free trade and revenue; amendment;

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
taxation; income tax; reliance upon customs tariff; tariff, unwise to abandon; United States, attitude towards Canada; Fordney tariff, 3010; reciprocity offer; tariff stability, 3011; problems to be solved, 3012
Speech on, reference to, 3070
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Committee on, 2474
Competition with subsidized service, 3381, 3385
Deficit, 3006
Canadian National Railways, 3006
Committee, 2474
Management, responsibility and power, 3695
Paris offices, 3694
Cheque tax, 3934
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 272, 273
Commercial union, 3907
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4214-17
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 631
Distressed seamen, 3973
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Freight rates, control of, 4226
French treaty, 444
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Hudson Bay railway commission to inquire, 3005
Insulin, supply of, 704
Interest rate, 4105
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 232
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4224-28, 4292
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3997
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003, 3019
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3318
Merchants' bank merger. *See under this title,* Bank mergers
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3274
Nova Scotia miners' strike, troops, 898
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Reciprocity with United States, 3010. 3907
Steamship services, West Indies, 3379
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 258, 259, 262

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4135-45, 4147
Banks
Charters, limitation of time, 4147
Combinations of, 2578
Mergers, 4135
Notes, substitution for national notes, 4408

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Banting, Dr. F. G.. 4440
Budget, 3055. Mr. McMaster in "Greenland"; doubtful virtue of consistency; speech of Prime Minister; professed protectionist; grievances of East and West; railway question; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific; public vs. private ownership; effort to acquire or destroy national system, 3056; strategic advantages; present deficits but success assured; waterways complementary to railway system; company-owned railways; railway situation in United States, 3057; traffic pools and running rights; personnel of management; capitalization; stock exchange gambling; necessities of life; grain and sugar speculation, 3058; race-track betting; new Franchise Act needed; equality of citizenship as between men and women; previous discussion in parliament; right to revise constitution, 3059; tariff; immigration and land settlement; grievances of Maritime and western provinces; banking legislation; rural credits; war clouds 3060
Canada, constitutional development, 4473
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3842
Canadian National Railways, 1050, 3056
Annual statement of minister, 1617
Branch lines construction bill, 4193, 4335
Courtesy, 2971
Electrification, 3203
Estimates, 1566
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1667
Public ownership, 1618, 3056
Report, 3223
Securities, approval of, bill, 4403
Toronto approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Unification of system, 3195, 3223
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2575
Parliament, right to investigate, 2666
Combines, steamship, 2667
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4209-15
Constitution
Right of Canada to make her own, 1378
Right to revise, 3059
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3327
Farm loans, 1088, 3060, 4366
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4407
Forest protection, M. Mr. (Michaud) 824

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amdt. 3223
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1965
Grain, 1965
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1965
Reclassification, 1618
Waterways, 1619
Fuel supply, 3198
M. (Mr. Church) 1272
Government printing, 1733
Halibut fishery treaty, 4473
Hebridean immigrants, 2950
Highways, effect on railways, 1619
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3222
House of Commons acoustics, member should occupy central position, 1721
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374, 1378
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1049
Hydro Electric Commission, 2682
Imperial Conference, 3223
King's birthday, observance, 3323
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4219
Merchants bank, 2576
Mining companies shares, 4209
National Defence estimates, 859
National land bank, 4366
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2185
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Parliament buildings, 1725
Peat experiments, 3199
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3851, 3860
Petition of right, fiats, 3146, 3222
Proportional representation, 420
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Public ownership, 3842
Railways, 3056, 4194
Railways, co-operation between, 4337
Redistribution bill
Opportunity for discussion, 488
Representation by population, 572
Rural credits, 1088, 3060, 4366
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Sales tax, imports, 4409
Senate, elective or nominative, 1373, 1378
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, qu. 3820
Sugar trust, 2576, 3058
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Viaduct, 4447
United States Federal reserve bank, 4407
United States, preferential treatment, 440

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
War commitments, 859
Water powers
Export of electrical energy, 1272
Survey of, 3203
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummand) 933

Macneil Case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Macphail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Agricultural conditions, 1190, 1844
Agriculture, expenditure, 3241
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4048
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Experimental farms, 3241
Farm women, 1844
Immigration
Domestic servants, 1189
Farmers and farm labourers, 1190
Policy, 1189
Labour, attitude towards mental and physical work, 1189
Life on the farm, 1189
Members of parliament, party funds and, 4237
References to, 1243, 1249
Rural depopulation, 1189, 1844
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-47
M. to refer back, neg. 4247
Sessional allowance, M. to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242
Soldier settlement, 2022, 2026
Questionnaire, 1845
Trade
Encouragement, qu. 284
Representatives, qu. 284

Macphail, Sir Andrew, immigration, 1393

McAdoo Award, 126

McArthur, J. D. & Co., Hudson Bay railway claim, 4686, 4689

McArthur, Mr. J. J., international boundaries, 3246

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Annual training, 872
Army officers, settlement in Canada, 1432
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4065, 4096
Mutual insurance companies, 4037
British Columbia
Agricultural production, 1432
Liquor law, administration, 2427

McBride, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Brule lake-Grande Prairie projected railway, 4699
Budget, 3031; pessimism; playing politics; sales tax; pyramiding; equalization of the tax; copper bounty; hemp bounty, 3031; proposed extension; employment of Canadians; British preference, clothing; old age pensions; unemployment relief; highway construction; immigration bill, statement by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler, 3032; labour members, reflection on; people from British Isles, 3033
Building materials, prices, 2165
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2412-15, 2427
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3825
Disposal of, 3385
Grain trade, 4234
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4315
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canoe wharf, 1005
Cariboo wharves, 1005
Chinese immigration bill, 2309-27
Coal
Freight rates, Mines and Minerals Com. 4514
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202
Conscription of fire fighters, 3409
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Easter adjournment, 1162
Exhibitions, 1467
Experimental farms, 475
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4352
False Creek bridge, 3376
Fishways, 3363
Forest protection, 3409
Fruit industry
Alleged combine, 2616
British Columbia, in, 147
Fuel supply, 3202
Grazing inspectors, appointments, 3254
Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, 1005
Hemp bounty bill, 3913, 4388
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4641, 4648
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202
Immigration
Chinese, 2309-27
Estimates, 1446

McBride, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Chinese—*Con.*
Exclusion of, 2327
Schools, 2326
South Africa, 2327
Hindu 1128
Franchise, 4641, 4648
Literature, 1433
Oriental, 511
Policy, 1432
Imperial Conference, 4641, 4648-60
Indians, 2152
Kamloops-Okanagan railway, 4315
Kamloops public building, 1006
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4234
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2199
Navigation schools, 3331
Oleomargarine, Agriculture Com. discussion, 3267
Ore-testing plants, 2507
Peace river district
Immigration, 1433
Railway construction, 1433, 4698
Peat, comparative value of, 3202
Penitentiaries, 771
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Prince George-Peace River railway, 1434, 4701
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4352
Railway rates
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1926
Grades, etc. qu. 625
Renovated butter, 4263
Rural depopulation, 1432
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1789
Salmon Arm wharf, 1006
Settlers' relief, 3447
Steamship services, 2171
Taxation, building materials, prices and, 2165
Telegraph lines, revenue, 3946
Trent valley canal, qu. 4301
Western provinces, conditions, 1252
Winter trips to California, 1252

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Address in reply, 166. The late Mr. Stewart; condition of the West, 166; wheat prices; amendments of Messrs. Hoey and Shaw 167; economy everywhere necessary, 168
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4201
Paris offices, 3700

McConica, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Congratulations upon return to House, 1660
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3531
Wheat Board, correspondence, 626

McCraney, Mr. George E., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Haileybury public building, 4615
Unemployment, 1125

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 378
Government workkshops Ottawa, 4620
Private Bills Committee
Reports
First, 936
Fourth, 2204
Fifth, 2417
Sixth, 2837
Seventh, 3323
Eighth, 3887
Tenth, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

McInnes, Mr., resources of Hudson bay region, 1072

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317
Half Island cove, 4572
Sonora wharf, 4585
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4317

McKenna, Mr. J. A. J., Hudson bay route, 1063

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria; Solicitor General)
Appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Canada Temperence Act, 574, 767
Correspondence with British Columbia, 1032
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Fuel supply, 800
M. (Mr. Church) 1273, 1283
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382
Nova Scotia coal, 800, 1273
Reported statement in Halifax, 147
Resignation, 1763, 2392

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Budget, 2981. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff on sugar and clothing; Liberal pre-election promises; tariff

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
changes not very encouraging; by-election results; handwriting on the wall; duty on exports and imports of beans, 2981; production of beans in Canada; competition with Austria and Japan; Japanese wages for labourers; prices of beans to consumer; conditions of workingmen; fair wage officer; satisfied labour a bulwark against Bolshevism; country needs strong national policy 2982
Civil Service
Appointments, 1922, 3324
Returned soldiers, 386
Grain dockage, qu. 4300

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McLean, Kennedy and Company, ocean rates, 2127

McLennan, Professor
Helium 703
Scientific discoveries, 1287

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Acoustics, "bedside" manner of speaking, 2446
Address in reply, 172. The amendments; view of Minister of Finance, 172; amendments sanctioned by best modern constitutional practice, 173; necessity for a downward revision of tariff, 174
Agricultural conditions, 1858
Special committee on
Leave to report, 911
Reports
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136, 1209
Fourth, 2127
Fifth, sixth and seventh, 4007, 4075
M. to concur in, 4295, 4363
Tariff Commission evidence, 2296
Agriculture, economic organization, 1858
Alpine Club grant, 3954
Attitude towards tariff policy, 3055
Audibility of debate, 3327
British Empire exhibition, 3949
Budget, 3012. Speech of leader of Opposition; reference to Mr. Sinclair; Great Britain and debt reduction; free trade; Mr. Lloyd George, statement by; 3002; United States tariff; reciprocity; permanency of arrangement;

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
treaty of 1854; trade relations and national spirit; defeat of reciprocity agreement of 1911; proposed remedy for unsatisfactory economic conditions —protection and high taxes; Liberal party, attitude towards tariff; a mere "attitude of mind" not sufficient, 3013; to vote for amendment of Mr. Forke and against budget; to sit on cross benches; justification of action; Liberal principles; "need of retrenchment and reform"; "free trade, peace, good will amongst the nations"; "trust in the people"; Mr. Lloyd George's definition, "fair play for the under dog;" absurdities of protectionist principles; language of Liberal statesmen; election of 1896; Liberal budget of 1897; British preference and reciprocity; advances to Washington; reciprocity campaign of 1911, 3014; flag-flapping; racial cries and appeals to sentiment; "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; conscription issue; protectionist budget with strong Maritime flavour; amendment, 3015; claims for protection; reciprocity clause; revenue, methods of raising; tax on unearned increment of land; reciprocity negotiations; standing offers on Canadian and United States statute books; questions of permanence, 3016; United States offer of reciprocity in boots, leather and agricultural implements; ups and downs of the budget; raisins and dried currants, duty; artificial silk duty; hemp and copper bounties, 3017; protection governing principle of budget; not much difference between Liberals and Conservatives on tariff; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; protection a dismal failure; National Policy, anti-national and anti-social; Edmund Burke on function of parliament, 3018; repudiation of Liberal platform of 1919; attitude of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) and Mr. Euler; framing of tariff plank; the platform quoted, 3019; claim of Minister of Finance that he is not bound by platform; acceptance of nomination for leadership; amendments moved by Mr. Fielding in 1920 and 1921, 3020; budget repudiation of utterances of Finance Minister integrity of public life and maintenance of parliamentary institutions; reasons for undertaking an "unpleasant task"; relationship between member and constituent; Edmund Burke, 3201; not leaving party but refusing to support budget, 3022
Speech, comment on, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 4393
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4306
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Combines bill, 2581, 2660-69
Application for investigation restricted, 2617
Civil Service appointments, 2662
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Copper bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances to be repayable, 4369
Cross benches, 3014
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3366
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2349
Experimental farms, 471
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4393
Free trade, 3002
Agriculture and, 1858
French treaty bill, 454
Favoured nation, 2210
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 340
Grain inquiry, royal commission, 1209, 1212
Hemp bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances repayable, 4376
Immigration, undesirable classes, 2669
Liberal platform of 1919, 3019, 4393
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 853
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1212
Maple products industry, 1810
Marriage with deceased husband's brother, bill, 1256, 1836
Moose Jaw election, point of order, 1714
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2453
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3533
Parliament buildings, 1718
Commons galleries, members, 1729
Patents of Invention bill, 2069-78, 2083, 2097
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
New or amended patents, 2082
Points of order
Members coaching each other, 405
Moose Jaw election, 1714
Relevancy, 2663

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 403, 430
Protection, combines and, 2581
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4393
Purchasing commission, 3951
Purchasing power, depreciation in Europe, 1859
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 728
Res. in 1919, free food and implements, vote on, 2996
Rural depopulation, 1860
Shipping combine, 2583
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 3012
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget
Commission, evidence, 2296
Duties, pyramiding, 2998
High, revolt against, 1859
Policy, attitude on, 3067, 3013
Proposals, vote against, 3022, 3081
Trent canal, Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Binder twine, 4376
Educational opportunities, foreigners and, 1885
Government printing, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Hemp bounty bill, 4376
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3587
Policy, 1880
Immigration Act Amdt bill, 2429
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4277
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4168
Municipal and provincial extravagance, 1890
Natural resources, 1880-1
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2463
Judges, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2463
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 404
Railway problems, 1880
Shipping combines, 4277
Soldier settlers, fire insurance, 496
Taxation, burden of, 1880
Unemployment in Winnipeg, 435
Unrest, alleged, in western provinces, 4514
Winnipeg coal purchases, 496

McNeill, Paul. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1453
Appeals from convictions bill, 4250
Bamfield public building, 1024
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1505, 1525

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Bribery charge, Revelstoke and Nelson electors, 2941
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1553
Liquor legislation. *See under this title,* Liquor
Orientals and fishing industry, 1899
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-17, 2428. *See also under this title,* Liquor
Amdt., 2415, neg. 2428
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Chinese immigration bill, 2308-22
Merchants, amdt., 2320
Trade, 2320
Civil Service
Appointments, 372-3
Number in, 3264
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 370
Coast Range Steel Company, 2508
Downie, Mr. Donald, 777
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
Fraser river improvements, 1003
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 316
Health department, returned soldiers, 2171
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1324
Oriental, 1307, 1893
Child, 1453
Chinese, 1446, 2308-22
Assimilation of, 2321
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Labourers, 2310
Merchants, admission of, 1445, 2320
Regulations, evasion, 1445
Statistics, 1445
Students, 2319
Treaty with, 1448
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1261
Exclusion, demand for, 503
Hindu, franchise, 508
Japanese
Alleged rights as British subjects, 1899
Correspondence with Consul-General, 1894
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
Fishermen, 1899
Lemieux agreement, 1447, 1894
Petition against further immigration and naturalization, 2837, 2885, 4075

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con*
Stowaways on freighter, 859, 1448
Naturalization, 1453, 1899
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 503
Japanese trade, 1453
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 211
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia law
Administration, 2412, 2428
Bootlegging, 2414
New Westminster, sale of liquor, 2415
Ottawa Citizen editorial, 2412
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1974
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Correspondence with Vancouver county court judges, 2199
Japanese, 1899
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2183, 2199, 2465
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Orientals. *See also under this title,* Immigration, Oriental
Business competition, 1902
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Pacific highway, 2341
Parliament buildings, members' rooms
Allocation, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Pensioners, unemployed, relief, 2169
Petroleum bounties, 781
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, employment, 733
Returned soldiers
Health department, 2171
Unemployment, 2169
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, legal adviser, 777
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 925
Salmon fisheries, British Columbia, 1553
Secret agreement, 1448
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, qu. 3137

McRae, General. *See* Canada Colonization Association

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Agricultural conditions in West, 1352
Dominion lands, alienation of, 1353
Homestead pre-emption and purchase, qu. 1030, 1032, 4202

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H.—*Con.*
Immigration policy, 1352
Livestock agents, qu. 1156
School lands, 1032
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4204

Machinery. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Customs Tariff Items; Prices
For manufacture of fertilizers. *See* Customs Tariff Items
French treaty, 1981, 1988

Magazines and Periodicals. *See also* Press
Canadian
Competition, 1418
Encouragement of, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Postage, 4436, 4528
Sales tax, 4415, 4421

Magdalen Islands
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Pointe à Elie wharf, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) wharf, 977
Steamship service, 2174

Magna Charta. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Magrath, Mr. C. A., Fuel supply, 799

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Catalogue Prices. *See* Bancroft; Prices

Mail Subsidies. *See* Steamship Services

Main Estimates. *See* Estimates

Maine, state of, railway construction, 2902

Majority Government. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Majority Rule. *See* Proportional Representation

Malbaie, Que. wharf, 968

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British preference, cotton goods, 3466
Civil Service Act, special committee
Order of reference, 1256
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4592-3
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 762
Redistribution bill, 572
Textile industry, 3466

Malcolm Island, Finnish settlement, 1247

Malone, late Lieut. Col. W. P., qu. 206

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manila Fibre. *See also* Bounties; Hemp
Bounties, 4369
Rope, oil used for, drawback, 3502

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Adjournment, time of, 2694
Agriculture, votes for, 3237
Automobile insurance, 3148
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Budget, 2746. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of Mr. Raymond; conditions serious; emigration to the United States; causes; high taxation; railway deficits; small and scattered population; sectional interests and problems; depression, causes of, 2747; prices of manufactured articles and agricultural products; Europe, chaotic condition of; production costs; France, occupation of the Ruhr; world conditions; United States tariff against Canadian products; grain, exports of; home market; lower production; grain, exports of; home market; lower production costs; interprovincial trade; immigration, 2748; European immigrants, assimilation of; taxation, reduction of; Great Britain, retrenchment and tax reduction; sugar duties; national debt; stumping machines, lowering of duties on, 2749; boots for cripples; sales tax; contracts affected; too much pessimism; wheat export; gold output; coal deposits; silver production; cobalt; nickel; asbestos; water powers; pulp, paper and forest products; fertile lands; fisheries; iron ore; vigorous and virile people; causes for optimism; agricultural conditions; farm mortgages; farm credits; United States and protection; claim that United States is a free trade country; high duties imposed by United States; industrial development of United States, 2751; free trade, advocacy of in western Canada; protection and war; trade competition between Great Britain and Germany; Great Britain and protection, 2752; tariff as it affects East and West; world opinion favourable to protection; free raw materials, 2753; agricultural implements; tariff, periodical revision; advisory tariff commission; tariff revenue in Great Britain; taxation on necessaries of life; free trade and unemployment; poverty and pauperism in Great Britain, 2754; British agriculture under free trade; Lloyd George, statement of; Liberal tariff policy; National Policy tariff; stability; amdt. of Mr. Forke, 2755
Building materials, prices, 2164
Canadian Air Force
Camp Borden, 1775
Hospital, 1775
Forestry protection, 1776
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Long Lake branch, 4310
Paris offices, 3631
Cattle embargo, removal of, 3293
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions, 330
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction qu. 278
"Lady who rides to work in automobile", 1772
Returned soldiers, 1792
Cloud Bay wharf, 982
Combines bill, 2542
Copper bounty bill, 3237
Copyright Act Amdt bill, 2287, 3154
Song writers, 2287
Divorce proceedings, publicity, 2054
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2034
Elevators. *See under this title,* Grain
Emigration to United States, 1113
Empire Settlement scheme, 288
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 3413, 4347
France, occupation of the Ruhr, 2748
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 329
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Leases qu. 4132
Screenings, 2039
Inquiry by Grain Commission, 2254
Sale of, qu. 1633
Unscalped or uncleaned, qu. 1739
Grain commission, 2036, 2254
Grain shipments, 3769, 3789
Injustices to western farmers, 1114
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar), 295
Port Colborne, qu. 1209
Shipments, 3769, 3789
Great Britain, to qu. 1867
Health department, salaries, 2170
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3597
Icebreaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 1105
Northern Ontario, 1097, 1112
Policy, 1110-1115

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Western Canada, conditions in, 1112
Indians
Agent, Mr. J. Garry Burke, 2151
Education, 2164
Northern Ontario, 2151
Preservation of, 2151-2
Tuberculosis, 2152
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3148
Labour
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1702
Strikes, 1702
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Legislation
Estimates, 2691
Too much, 2543
"Uplift," 2054
Lighthouses, date of closing, 3356
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 840
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 2116
Home-brew, conviction, 2121
National Defence
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1772
Expenditure, 3238
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 896
Orders in council passed, 1921-1922, qu. 1488
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3853-86
Amdt, 3886, agreed to, 3886
Pensions
European War and active militia, 2166, 3707, 3713
Pension Act, suggested amendment, 2166
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 3742
Royal commission
Findings, action, 2639, 3400
Interim report, 2166
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Pilotage, administration of, 3358
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Progressive members and protection, 3237
Proportional representation, 431
Public Works, salaries, 2684
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413, 4347
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3474
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744, 3892
Returned soldiers in civil service, 1772
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3769
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Soldier settlement, 2020, 2027, 2028
Tariff
Advisory tariff commission 2754
Agricultural implements, 2750, 2754
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1293

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Trade
Commissioners, 1837
Manufactured goods, exports, 1839
Trade and Commerce, estimates, 2031
United States tariff, 1113, 1119, 2751
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Wages, building trades, 2165
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3769

Manitoba. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural and economic conditions, 1213, 1220, 1404, 1462, 1906, 2766
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Bracken, Premier, statement on immigration, 1123
Canada Colonization Association, 1877
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal supply, 1265
Court of Appeal
Grain Inquiry Commission, decision, 1210
Trueman, Mr. W. N., K.C., appointment, 1868
Dairying industry, production in 1921, 2744
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2060
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 459
Freight rates, 1931, 1932
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Grand Jury system abolition of, 2695, 3272
Harbours and rivers, 993, 4589
Hemp production, 2780
Highways, 3184. *See* Canada Highways bill; Highways
Illicit stills, prosecution for operating, 3280
Income tax, 2859
Indians, 2145, 2153
Institutions and services in excess of present needs, 1214, 1400, 1890
Lake of the Woods bill, 2885
McLeod, Hon. G. L., help for needy farmers, 1404
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Mixed farming, 2772, 2773
Natural resources. *See also* Lake of the woods Regulation bill
Cost of administration, 2782
Political patronage, 3348
Prohibition referendum, 2414
Public buildings, 4628
Radio-telegraph service, 2285, 2468, 3338
Reclamation of land, 1065
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1156

Manitoba—*Con.*
Taxation
Agricultural products, 1404
Production and, 1391
Tax sales 2961
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Telephone system, 2285
Unemployment relief, discontinuance, 1658
United Farmers of Manitoba, 1404, 1462
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation bill
Wheat board, 2836

Manitoba Free Press, Sir Clifford Sifton and, 3043

Manna. *See* Dairying Industry

Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney-General, British Columbia
Asiatic immigration 1901
Liquor legislation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Manton, Judge, immigration, 1234, 1237

Manufactured Goods. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Industries; Textiles
Binder twine discrimination against, 2964
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Prices 1167, 2748. *See also* Prices
Spread between producer and consumer, 2713

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers Association
Difficulties, 2854
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Farmers and, 2716
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Japan, competition from, 2861
Licensed, 4410. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Markets, lack of, 2856
Not able to compete, 3062
Ontario and Quebec, 2910
Orient competition from, 2861
Profit, 2854
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue
Securities of manufacturing companies, 2720
Understanding between and people of East, 3023
United States
Competition from, 2861
Markets, 2856

Maple Products industry, 1810

Maps. *See* Interior, Surveys

Mara, B.C., post office, qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Marchand, Mr. J. O. *See* Parliament Buildings, Architects

Marcil Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Business of the House
Debates, official report, returns, 940
Private members' day 1160
Questions right to put on orders of day, 734
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4186, 4307
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 542, 553
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
Gaspe and Bonaventure forest fires, 4010
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4186, 4307
Grondines wharf, 967
Hudson Bay railway, 1041
Japanese immigration, Lemieux agreement, 1448
La Societie des Artisans Canadians Francais, 1028
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 843
National gallery 1018
Oleomargarine M. (Mr. Carroll) 3535
Petition of right, fiats, 3223
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 742
Rulings as Chairman
Amdt. not relevant, 3667
Debates, official report, statements not read, 1830
General argument on particular clause, 4069
Governor General acknowledgment of address, 1256
Member may not reflect on vote of committee 4119
M. that committee rise not debatable, 1836
M. to postpone resolution in supply, 3667
Newspaper article reflecting on proceedings, 4126
Reference to com. in advance of report, 2970
Reflection on sincerity and integrity of members, 4067
Rule 17B, closure, 3667
Supply, relevancy, 808, 871, 1847, 1858, 1861, 4336
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
Special delivery letter postage, 1872
Toronto viaduct, 4307

Marcouiller, Mr. C., St. Barnabé Nord postmaster, 1830

Margaree River Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Margaretville, N.S. harbour, 4581
Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Acts Amdt; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763 3160, 3330
Annual report presented, 1080
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Biological board, 3371
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Expenditure by provinces, statement, 388S
Johnston, Mr. Alex, deputy minister, 3373, 3671, 4667
Publicity, 3364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dredging
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Unification of work, 3341
Examination of masters and mates, 2610
False Creek bridge, 3375
Halibut Fishery treaty. See Treaties
Hopper barge, self-propelling, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Icebreakers, 3160
Ice obstruction in Cabot strait, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Murray Stewart, 3354, 3359
Thunder bay, etc., 3359
Inspection
Boats over 100 tons register, 1660
Live stock shipments, 3334
Steamboats, 3360
Institutions assisting sailors, 701
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, 3171
British Columbia, 1659
Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Rewards, 3335
Lights and lightkeepers
Boudrot, Mr. E., Green island, qu. 2613
Classification, 3352
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Descheneaux, Mr. Patrick, dismissal, qu. 4512

Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lights and lightkeepers—*Con.*
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Reliance, wreck of, qu. 812
Richibucto cape, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Marine signal service, 3358
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, purchase, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354, 3359
Navigation
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Closing of, date, 3356
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3357
Obstructions, Seymour Narrows, 3333
Safeguards, lake Superior, qu. 812
Schools, 3331
Wireless telegraphy, 1046
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3375
Investigation into wrecks, 3160
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330
Maintenance and repairs to steamers, 3160
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Administration, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Pilot boats, 3358
Eureka, qu. 1364
Father Point, 3358
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3339
Dredging and maintenance, 3375
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trout-fishing season, 1686
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3356
Wrecking plants 3334
Wrecks, Alaskan. *See under this title,* Alaskan

Marine Hospitals. *See* Health; Marine and Fisheries

Maritime Provinces. *See also* New Brunswick; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island
Bank centralization, 4079
Boards of trade, conference with Sir Henry Thornton, 1755, 1771

Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, 1764, 1770. *See also that title*
Coal. *See that title*
Conditions in, 1207, 2763, 2936
Dredging 1009, 4590
Freight rates, 1963, 3192. *See also that title*
Coal from, 1272, 1813
Grievances, 3056
Immigration, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236. *See also that title*
Natural markets, loss at confederation, 2852
Natural resources, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Public buildings, 1022, 4614
Secession talk 1757, 2940. *See also* Secession
Roberts, Hon. W. F. reported statement, 3145
Senate elective or nominative, 1376
Shale deposits, 2513

Markets. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Industries; Live Stock; Manufacturers; Prices; Reciprocity Trade; Treaties
Access to, 2937
Agricultural products, 2731, 2861, 2910
Great Britain, 2869. *See also that title*
United States 2869. *See also that title*
Bacon, 2864
Beans, 2982
Cattle, 2871
Competition for, 2725
Dairy products, 2863
Development of, 2869
Disorganized, 2861
Export, 2869
Fish, 2906, 2946, 3002
Foreign, 4054
Fruit, 463
Hogs, 2864
Home, 2869
Industries and, 2975
Horses, 590
Live stock 588. *See also that title*
South America, 594
Manufactured products, 2910
Maritime provinces, 2852
Marketing and quality, 2862, 3066, 4027
Production exceeding demand, 2957
Purchasing power, 637
United States. *See also that title*
Fish, 2946
Wheat, 3068. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Marketing of Grain. *See* Grain

Markham, Violet. *See* Carruthers, Mrs. James

Marking Act. *See* Customs and Excise; Imports

Marking of Woollen Goods. *See* Wool

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4121
Budget, 3022. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of leader of Opposition, able but lacking in generosity; Sir Henry Drayton, amendment; position of Progressive party; difficult country to govern; understanding between manufacturers and people of West; agricultural and business conditions, 3023; difficulties universal; lower freight rates; loss of purchasing power, inflation; rural credits; demand for lower tariffs; free trade "a splendid theory"; revenue; not a protectionist but a development tariff; without moderate tariff industries would close, 3024; prices, Canada and United States; revenue and tariff, 3025; income tax; tax on unearned incomes; inheritance tax; excise duties, 3026; natural resources, development of; capital and people necessary; taxation direct and indirect; expenditure and economy; civil government costing too much; ratio of employees to population, 3027; deficit; spend only what we have to spend; tariff stability; tariff committee; permanent advisory tariff commission, 3028; production costs; distribution; spread between manufacturer and consumer; speech of Mr. McMaster, "chasing a rainbow"; free trade impossible, 3029; rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tariff policy; result of government defeat; Wheat board a protective measure, 3030
Cabot strait, ice obstruction, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3836
Canadian National Railways, debenture holders, 3507
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Canadian Pacific Railway dividends, 1203
Civil Service Commission, 1800
Combines bill, 2536, 2615-21
Definition "combine" 2615
Registrar, inquiry, 2619
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3464
Emigration to the United States, 1128, 1392

Marler, Mr. Herbert—*Con.*
English and French speaking people, 1341
Firebrick, duty, 3482
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1948
Railway rates equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1947
Girl Guides, grant, 3954
Government publications, waste, 1713
Hospital supplies, coverings, duties, 3501
Immigration, 1391
Attitude of the West, 1129
Restrictions upon, 1128
Income tax, 3026
Proposed amendment, 4503
Unearned income, 2882, 3026
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4500
Labour, employment for all willing to work, 1124
McMaster, Mr., speech on budget, 3026, 3029
Montreal, postal appointments, 1800
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-82
Amdt. 3881, neg. 3882
Pension Commissioners, duties, 685
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1128
Taxation, increase of, 1121
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
X-Ray plates, coverings, duties, 3501

Marriage
Publication of evidence, 1971
Settlements. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriage with deceased husband's brother, Bill respecting, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Married Woman, rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriott, Professor, England since Waterloo, 1231

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 70, 286, qu. 384
Agricultural instruction grant, 608, 3293
Appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, 2615, 2710, 3043, 3150, 3303, 3320
Order in council, 3294, 3320, 3303
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Cattle embargo, removal of, 2614, 2871, 3041, 3293
Fordney tariff, 3293
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Qualifications, 3306
Redistribution, 3313
Reports, 3705
Salary, 608, 3043, 3287, 3309, 3352

Marshall—*Con.*
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, 3595
South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309, 3316
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Great Britain, 3290, 3308, 4675
Florida, 3307, 3311
South America, qu. 1031

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Address in reply, 101. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 101-102; deceased members; the Maritime provinces and representation, 102; government ownership of railways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; development of Canadian ports, 103; Minister of Justice, 104; Hants county; Mr. Shaw and Progressives; Near East crisis, 105
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Alaskan, wreck of, 3164
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3099, 3126, 3220
Bay of Fundy, icebreaker, 2615
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
British Columbia
Fisheries Commission, 3372
Fishing licenses, 1548, 1554
British common law, 2894
Budget, 2904. Liberal tariff platform, 2904; tariff for revenue; railway deficit and direct taxation; public ownership and low tariff; relations with United States; reciprocity; printing industry and United States market, 2905; Fordney tariff; markets; fish, 2906; reciprocity agreement of 1911; negotiations with President of the United States; the weapon in our hands; Treaty of 1818; use of Canadian ports by United States fishing vessels; license system, 2906; trans-shipment of catch; shipment in bond; suggested denial of privilege; bounties preferable to tariff increase; reasons for supporting budget; revenue requirements; revision downward; British preferance; elected to support Liberal party, 2907
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2694, 3452
Business profits tax, 4490
Calder Act, 2926
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3818

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4333
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3291
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3189
Civil service
Commission, ministers and, 371
Technical and professional officials, 815
Civil Service Act, M (Mr. Power) 525, 545, 546
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal, duty, 3499
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 273, 2056, 2086
Incorporated companies, 2058
Private enterprises, 2059
Constituents, interests of, 3550
Dairy industry, protection, 3552
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2350
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1010
English and French, harmony, 1341
Exchequer Court judgeship, 2500
Experimental farms, 461
Fertilizers, nitrate of soda, 2307
Fishways, 3363
Fort Edward, N.S., historic site, 3406, 3432, 3435
Fruit trees, new varieties, 2307
Fruits
Pre-cooling, 2056
Vegetables and, freight rates, 626
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs, detention, 3157
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Hydrographic survey, 3337
Immigration
Assisted, 1178
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Chinese, 1445
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3587, 3589
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4646
Japanese, Lemieux agreement, 1447
Imperial Conference, 4645
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4360, 4362
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Johnston, Mr. Alex., salary, 4667
Labour, representation in House, 3555
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 226
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4282, 4290
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Litle Anse, Morrison claim, 4723

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Narcotic Drugs Amdt. bill, 2118, 2122
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2185
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4619
Nova Scotia
Historical society, 3406
Secession talk, 2057, 2177
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3554
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4707
Patents of Invention bill, 2072
Pensions
Appeal board, 683
Old age and mothers, conference, 3046
Pension board, removal, res. 3399
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128, 3223, 3224
Playgrounds, children, 3407, 3432
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4679
Privilege—Civil Service Com. report, 4363
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Railway rates, reductions, 118
Representation, irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, 4490
St. John—Windsor steamship service, 2176
Sawdust pollution of rivers, 3364
Schofield, Rev. Dr., 3399
Seed distribution, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306
Steamship services, Maritime provinces, 2177
Tariff items carried without discussion, 3492
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1298, 4645
Toronto seed branch building, 4623
Windsor-Chester branch line railway, 4333
Windsor, dredging, 1010

Martello Tower, St. John, 3444

Marvale, wreck of, 3333

Massey Harris Company. *See also* Agricultural implements
President of and free trade, 2911
Settlement of war claims, 2497

Masters and Mates. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Matane, Que. wharf, 970

Matapedia Bridge, qu. 4184

Maxwell, Mr. C. F., Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2901

May, Mr. *See* Immigration, Agents

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Dryden, Mr. W. A., payments to, qu. 3704
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, and, 3705
Government offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Grasshopper pest, 596
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Seed-cleaning stations, 600
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973

Mayberry, Col. Thomas R., 286

Meaford, Ont., wharf, 983

Meagher, Mr. N. H. *See* Disallowance

Meats. *See also* Bacon; Cold Storage; Live Stock; Treaties
Canned, inspection, 2202
Chilled and preserved, shipment to Great Britain, 463, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fresh and cured
Exports, 1984
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
Inspection. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Meat products, lard, 1978
Pork products, French treaty, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978

Mechanics. *See* Labour

Medals. *See* War, Medals

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions

Medical Care. *See* Health; Indians

Medical Course, length of, 2934

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance

Medical Inspections. *See* Health; Immigration; Pensions

Medical Research. *See also* Scientific Research
Banting, Dr. *See that title*
Helium, discoveries by Doctors McLennan and Macallum, 703, 4439
Insulin treatment, discovery of, 703. *See also* Banting
Standardizing and testing laboratories, 703

Medical Students. *See* Universities

Medicine Hat
Customs employees, qu. 3505
Dominion lands office, 3250

Medicines and Drugs. *See also* Health; Narcotic Drugs
"Metagen", analysis of, qu. 1867
Patenting, 703, 2077, 2078
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261

Medicines and Drugs—*Con.*
Proprietary or patent, 700
Supplies for hospitals. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Hospitals

Mediterranean
Fish from Maritime provinces, 3002
Steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636

Meductic-New Brunswick boundary line, 4309

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply, 17. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 18; delay in co-ordination and amalgamation of Canadian National Railways, 18-19; Grand Trunk not yet amalgamated with Canadian Nationals; railway expenditure without authority of parliament; immigration policy of government, 19; export of grain crop; export of settlers' effect, 20-21; no government policy to check emigration, provide employment or reduce taxation, 21; natural resources of western provinces; the tariff question; customs collections, 22; national debt increased under present administration, 22-23; decrease in respect to soldiers' pensions, increase in sales tax; added burden of taxes; post office revenue and the stamp tax, 23; late government and reorganization of departments, 24; Great Britain paying off a portion of her national debt, 24; conduct of Dominion finances during war years, 24; western Canada and the harvest of 1922; sounder agricultural conditions; Canada anxious for peace and prosperity; Near East crisis, 25; removal of cattle embargo, 25-26; condition of the western farmer; Bank Act revision, 26; redistribution, 27
Alleged understanding, Mr. Shaw's amendment, 987
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Agricultural conditions, 1853
Committee reports, 1209, 4363
Great Britain in, 1861
Leitch, Prof., dairy industry, 1858
Luxuries, demand for, 1856
Agricultural implements duty, 2246, 2990
Reduction by Conservative government, 2756
Speech of 1910, 2848
Agricultural products, distribution, 1857
Agriculture, estimates, 575

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Alpine Club grant, 3415
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annual drill, 863, 4635
Appointments by government, 2502
Artificial silk, duty, 2990, 3489
Arts, literature and science, recognition, 1289
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084
Attorney General, Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2560
Auditor General, vacancy, 3307, 4512
Australia, trade treaty with, 245, 1849, 1850
Banff park, water powers, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4133-4160
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on, 4143
Newspaper articles, Montreal Standard, 4143
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 496
Bank charters, renewal of, 4143
Bank mergers, 4138
Banking and Commerce Com. proceedings, 4143
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3213-14
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4437
Belgium, treaty with, 246
Belle River wharf, 4594
M. to reduce 4600, neg. 4610
Personal explanation, 4638
Binder twine, duty free, 4379
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, 6
Board of Commerce, 2558, 2571
Boots and shoes, free entry to United States, 3499
Breweries and export liquor houses, 1636
British and foreign news service, 4712
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1546, 1547
Liquor law administration, 2425
British preference, 453
Fifty per cent, 3049
Increase, 3487
Woollen goods, 3460
Brussels postmaster, 1800
Budget, 2984; expressions of good will towards Finance Minister; courtesy and frankness; budget disappointing; omissions from presentation; what a budget should contain; analysis of financial position and trade conditions; budget speeches in Great Britain and Australia; public debt, 2984; additions to; demobilization and war

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
responsibilities; revenues collected during the war; comparison with Great Britain and Australia; taxation of incomes and war profits, 2985; returns for war expenditure; per capita debt; demand for a balanced budget; debt reduction by sale of war material; expenditure, reduction of, 2986; railway obligations; soldiers' civil re-establishment; pensions; soldier settlement; housing; unemployment; expenditure and revenue; tax reductions and debt increases; sugar duty; reduction; refiners' protection not interfered with, 2987; rigid adherence to protective principle; depreciated currency clause; marking clause; orders in council; two favoured industries; lead pencils; lithographic works; dumping clause; tobacco duty, cigarettes, 2988; bootlegging in tobacco; injury to tobacco-manufacturing industry; beet sugar duty; proposals of budget of 1923; British preferential tariff; reasons for changes not apparent; combines and mergers; woollen industry; duty on raisins and currants, 2989; French treaty debate recalled; tariff increase to facilitate negotiations with Australia; artificial silk duty; inconsistency of government; protection principles intact; woollens, tariff reduction and price; farm implements, reduction of duty, 2990; reduction in output and advance in prices; moderate protection; free trade sentiment not making progress; United States competition, 2991; protection cannot be abandoned; reciprocity offer; no change in opinion on question; arguments against reciprocity; geographical considerations; industrial and agricultural competition; organization and production; no guarantee of permanency, 2992; abrogation of the treaty of 1854; termination of recent trade arrangement; trade reprisals, 2993; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; fidelity to political pledges flouted; statements of Mr. Euler, Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Fielding; responsibility of Minister of Finance for Liberal Convention; Prime Minister and the "chart"; declaration of Prime Minister in 1920, 2994; con-

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
vention of Alberta Liberals; endorsement of Liberal platform, 2995; double-dealing policy; appeal to the farmer, assurance to the business man; stability; apostacy of western ministers; declaration for free food and implements of production, 2996; vote in 1919 on the resolution of Mr. McMaster; new taxation unaccompanied by economy; sales tax; declarations of Prime Minister in 1921, 2987; business profits and luxury taxes; pyramiding of taxes; cost of living, comparison of Canadian and United States prices; whole tax passed on to consumer; exempted articles, 2998; addition of newsprint to list; raw wool; agricultural implements; review of government taxation records; necessities of life; implements of production; luxuries; French treaty; embroideries; boots and shoes; wines and brandies; cost of living, 2999; descending curve succeeded by upward movement; professions of economy; direct taxation and "invisible" tariff; political shilly-shally; government losing ground; heroic policy needed; needs of the West and the Maritime provinces, 3000
Speech,
Comment on, 3047, 3077
Revenue statements omitted, 2860, 2898
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House, 179
Adjournments
Early, 74
Hour of, 382, 3208, 3261
Bills
Alteration of, 3449
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3976
Business for to-morrow, 3750
Closure, Rule 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
Committees
Conduct, review by House, 3270
Discussion of questions not referred, 3268
Voting in, 4611
Legislation
Old age pensions, 2518
Pending, 2518, 3265, 3452
Motions
Anticipatory, 3327, 3329
Non-debatable, ruling of Mr. Speaker, 4076
Order of, 4163

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Post office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' day, 1158, 1161-2
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Answers to, 343, 1385
Dropping of, 4511
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 1139, 1385, 4303
Right to put on Orders of the Day, 734
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Resolutions, explanations on, 3483
Returns, inquiry for, 2208, 2394, 3324, 3962, 4513
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4295
Rules
Closure, 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
M. (Mr. Johnston) for special committee, 1301
Supply
Amdt. to amdt. 1301
Motion to postpone, 3667
Procedure, 179
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report of debates, 3285
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada Grain Act administration, 4710
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canada's participation in war, M. (Mr. Power) 1537
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2425
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3827, 3830
Construction without tender and contract, 957
Cost per ton, 957
Policy, 3827
Vote under closure, 4598
Canadian National parks and historic sites
Expenditure, 3941
Water powers, 3939
Canadian National Railways
Advances, $13,099,493.34, 1753
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 34, 58, 2471
Economies resulting, 1616
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 4303-39, 4397, 4689
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4303, 4339, 4397
Amdts. 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Finance, 4329, 4337
Rejection by Senate, 4695

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, 57, 1615
Acquisition of, 1937
Coal purchases, 4708
United States, 3494
Committee on, 2473
Deficits, 1613
Directors, board of. *See also under this title,* Management
Additional director, Quebec, inquiry, 34
Labour representation of, 1653
Removal of late, correspondence, 3962
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Equipment orders, 2701
Estimates, 1620
Expenditure, 4304
Express and electric lines, 2470
Fixed charges, 1614
Grand Trunk and, 1562
Arbitration, 60
Gratuities to directors and officials
Royal commission 1665, 1668, 1976
Condon, Mr. F. T., K.C., 2297, 2502
Operating results, 1613
Shareholders, list of, 940
Hanna, Mr. D. B., resignation, 1666
Insurance, 1616
Mortgaged premises, 1635, 2048
Management. *See also under this title,* Directors
Changes in, 1612
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., 1612
Non-interference with from day to day, 2473
Responsibilities and powers, 3653, 3677 3687
Resolution of 1921, 3688
System of, 2472
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Minister's annual statement, 1612
Paris offices, purchase, 3208, 3653, 3676, 3683, 3687
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), Chairman's ruling, 3667
Forke, Mr., reference to, 3675
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Real estate transactions, 2518
Revaluation, 2860
Robb, Mr. 2471
Securities, approval of, bill 4403, 4516
Expenditure to be voted by parliament, amdt. 4527, neg. 4528
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Appointment, correspondence, 495
Traffic staff, removal to Halifax, 4708

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, 1615
Unification of systems, 1616
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See under this title,* Labour, International Labour Conference
Cattle embargo, removal of, 575
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
Cheque tax, 3923
Chinese immigration, 1441
Estimates, 1443
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-34, 4536
Cigarette duty, 2988, 3230
Civil Service
Appointments, 208
Bonus, 1811, 1814
Commission, appointment of postmasters, 1798, 1829
Political partisanship, 286
Reform, 409
Superannuation, 3402
Work outside regular duties, 1675
Civil Service Act
Abuse of, 3254
Combines staff, appointment, 2661
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 356, 368, 374, 529, 550
Special committee, 937
First report, 1256
Civilization, evolution of, 1856
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal. *See also under this title* Fuel,
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Reciprocity, 3497
Combines, 2989
Printing, 1623
Combines bill, 496, 990, 992, 2519, 2556, 2604, 2607, 2624-29, 2660-68
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2560
Civil Service Act, violation of, 2661
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Legislation, history of, 2557
Privy Council judgment, 2559
Registrar, appointment of, 2628
Commissioner, and, 2558
Senate amendments, 3505

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2559
Appeals, 2051
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 484
Conferences, 3411
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C., appointment, 2297, 2502
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Copper bounty bill, 4370, 4374
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2345
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 1860
Cost of living, 1684, 1812, 2999
Increase of, 1812, 1853
Sales tax and, 1813
Cotton fabrics for pneumatic tires, 3487
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Inquiry, 1483
Publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings, 1971
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1929. *See also under this title* Freight rates
Extension, 2741
"Cuckoo" government, 3451, 3510
Customs duties, reduction, 90
Customs tariff items, passing of, 3486
Dairy Industry Act, Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Deceased members, tributes to, 6
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1805, 1808
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1806
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2364, 4678
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dominion archives building, 1730
Dominion arsenals, 887, 1752
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4365
Dominion lands and parks
Contingencies, 3408
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Salaries, 3250
Dominion Textile Company, stock, 1853
Dredging. *See also under this title,* Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 1012
Manitoba, 1013
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Unification of work, 3341
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Dry red lead, etc., duty, 3481
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2252
Editorial Committee 1670, 1675-86, 1714
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Emigration to the United States, 211, 1093, 1657

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Emigration—*Con.*
Montreal, from, 2216
New York Tribune, reported statement of, 2790
Esquimault dry dock, 2671
Estimates.
Canadian National Railways, expenditure, 4304. *See also that title*
Commitments, 4598
Obligations maturing 1754
Supplementary, 4420
Time of presentation, 4420, 4422, 4594, 4605, 4703
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1817
Experimental farms, 484
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4012, 4354
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742
Finance Act, 255
Firebrick duty, 3482, 3896
Fiset Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. bill 4009
Forest protection, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
France
Imports and exports, 2015
Trade arrangements, termination, 1999
War losses, 2215
Free trade
Great Britain in, 1860
Not making progress, 2991
Freight rates, 3194
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1948
Suspension of, 1948
Equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1307, 1928
Manitoba, 1931, 1932
Shipping. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates
Legislation, 3265, 4710
Westward from prairie provinces, 1158
French-speaking deputy ministers, 1806, 1808
French treaty, 440, 456
Analysis 449
Border states, 440, 450, 2215
British preference, 453
Concessions to United States, 449
Consideration of, inquiry, 1740
Luxuries, 450
French treaty bill, 2013, 2209, 2239, 2242, 2259-63, 2299-2304, 3910
Agricultural implements, 2246
Boots and shoes, 2240
Brandy, 2302
Bronze powder, 2016, 2217

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
French Treaty bill—*Con.*
Butter, 2217
Buttons, 2214
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Embroideries, 2214
Exports and imports, 2222
Exports to France, 2210, 2213
Favoured nation, 2210, 2213, 2402
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Livestock, 2211
Luxuries, 2213, 2259
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2212, 2259
Revenue, loss of, 2209
Sales tax, 2299
Silks, 2215
Specific duties 2215
Treaty of 1907, 2212
Value of, 2210
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wines, 2302
Fuel supply, 790
Children, death of, 751, 1657
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey estimates, 2504, 2508
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 338
Government commissions, appointments of, 2502. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Government publications. *See also under this title,* Editorial Committee
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste, Judge Snider's report, 1715
Grain and grain trade
Grain inquiry commission, 1210, 4710
Delay in appointment, 2254
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Grain sample market, 304
Grain shipments, Quebec elevator, 3768
Halifax elevator, 4713
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695
Great Britain
Depression in, 1854
Free trade, 1860
Taxation, 2796
Great Lakes disarmament, 244, 247, 494
Grant, Dr., civil service, 558
Graving docks, 2682
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3254
Grondines wharf, 959
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Halibut fishery treaty, 4456-79
Correspondence with British government, 1032
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Halibut fishery treaty—*Con.*
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4480
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title,* Dredging
Estimates, 2671
Manitoba, 993
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Saskatchewan and Alberta 1001
Tenders for repair work, 950
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1692
Hector celebration grant, 4636, 4705
Helmer, Mr., appointment, 3254
Hemp bounty bill, 3912, 4378, 4384
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4658
Homesteads
Inspectors, 3252
Second, 4365
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 3226
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Housing legislation, 2518, 2987
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4683
Correspondence, 208
Feasibility of route, 1069
History of, 1076
Letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co., claim, 4690
M. (Mr. Knox) 1075
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686
Rail removals, qu. 203
Senate investigation, 1076
Welland canal and, 3787
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigraton. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Advertising, 1085
Black, Mr. W. J., appointment, 2664
Canada Colonization Association
Agreement with, 1321
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1334
Field supervisors, Soldier Settlement Board, 1090-2
Chinese. *See under this sub-title,* Oriental
Estimates, 1387
Hindu, 4640, 4658
Ingram, Mr., appointment, 2664
Late administration and, 1335
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1086
May, Mr., appointment, 2663
Oriental
Chinese, 1441, 1443, 2327-34, 4536

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1262
Japanese, 1450
Legislation, principle of, 2328
Policy, 1164, 1335
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2430, 2669
Legislation of 1919, 2431
Undesirable classes, 2669
Vessel crews, 2671
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Egypt, British policy, 4663
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495, 4504
Indians, 2154
Agents, 2162
Perth, N.B., 2154
Cattle, 2162
Doctors, Portage la Prairie, appointments, 2160
Education, 2158
Greater production, 2155
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Reorganization, 2162
St. Peter's reserve, hay lands, 2154
Treatment of, 2158
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4359
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3230, 3969, 4528
Inspection of livestock shipments, 3334
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3045
International boundaries, surveys, 3246
International Labour Conference. *See under this title.* Labour
Italian treaty bill, 2401-04, 2701
Favoured nation, 2402
Lord Curzon, signature, 2403
Japanese fishing licenses, 1547
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status of, 202
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3265
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 6
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1668
Labour
Department
Estimates, 1621
Reduction of officials, 524
Drift to United States, 1812. *See also under this title* Emigration

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1648
Incomplete return, 1539
Report of last meeting, 1442
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Organizing power of, 1857
Labour Gazette, cost of printing, 1621, 1708, 1712
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 227
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 6
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 3265, 4710
Lake of the Woods
Control, M. for papers, 247
Levels, 247, qu. 2700
Lake of the Woods bill, 2886, 4163, 4165
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands, Immigration
Homesteads, 3252, 4365
Soldier settlement, 2019. *See also under this title,* Soldier Settlement
Speculation and taxation, 1395
Laurier monument, 1017
Legislation, record of, 407, 408
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250
Liberal appointments by late government, 2503
Liberal Convention of 1919, 2994
British preference, 454
French treaty, 2211
Labour res. 1651
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on Bank Act, 4143
Library of Parliament, 2693
Life-saving service, 3335
Lindsay arsenal, 884
Linen yarn duty, 3898
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment, 1764
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.
Appointment to Bench, 1764, 1810
Retirement, 2392
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 849
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Marine and Fisheries
Committee report, 3084
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3293, 3303, 3320
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Live stock shipments, 3334
Salary, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Masters and mates, examination, 2610

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Mennonites
Contract with, 1885
Emigration of, 1884
Merchants' bank investigation, 4159
Militia and Defence disbursements, 345
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3976
Mines department, salaries, 3207
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways, appointment, 519
Ministers' and officials' travels, 343
Moderate protection, 2991
Moose Jaw election
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 1686
Murdock, Hon. Mr., 1714
National Defence
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 887, 1752
Estimates, 1751
Pay of staff, 890
Salaries and contingencies, 902
National gallery, 1019
National ownership, 93
Natural resources, western provinces, 2782
Expenditure upon, 2510
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2188, 2191, 2195, 2440-63
Judges, 2446, 2451
Favourable report necessary to issue of certificate, 2440
Secretary of State
Administration by, 2440
Certificates, issue, 2440
Powers of, 2188
Naval service, 902
Department, 3341
Navigation schools, 3332
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Near East crisis, 25, 31
New departmental building, Ottawa, architects, 4633
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
North Essex by-election, 4595. *See also under this title,* Belle River
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2014
Fielding, Hon. Mr. and, 2013
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480, 4487. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Nova Scotia strikes, troops, 868, 898
Offensive partisanship, 3344
Oil bounty, 2511
Old age pensions, legislation, 2518
Oleomargarine
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3449

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
Inquiry, 1309, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 2519, 3526, 3536, 3573
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Precedence, 3271, 3451
Point of order, Mr. Sutherland, 3327
Ontario
Elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4162
Number of members, 252
Orders in Council, 1027
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354, 4487
Repeal by statute, 3504
Ore flotation, 2509
Ore-testing plants, British Columbia, 2509
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Ottawa Typographical Union, copyright, 2144
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Pan-American union, 496
Paper. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Control, 2573
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Prices in Canada and United States, 829
Parliament buildings, cost, 1725
Parliamentary government, 1652
Patents of Invention bill, 2129
Penitentiaries, 771
Penny Bank of Toronto bill, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703, 4746, 4748
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
Federal appeal board, 4703
Old age, 1651, 2518
Women, 1651
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4162
Petition of right, fiats, 3226
Petroleum and Naptha Inspection bill, 3969
Pledges, violation of, 2220
Point of order, relevancy, 2663
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Policies, review of, 408, 409
Political patronage, 2160, 3344
Population, increase of, 1398
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Indians, medical service, 2160
Sewerage system, 993, 2679
Postmaster General, absence of, 1314, 1538
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Post Office department
Administration, 1817
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1825
Revenue attributable to postal service, 1817
Ross, Mr. George W., retirement, 1825
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prices. *See also under this title,* Budget; Cost of living
Agricultural products and manufactured goods, 1853
Producer and consumer, 1853
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4678
Printing
Contracts to newspapers, etc., 2394
Reduction in cost, 1671
Printing bureau, new building, 1735
Fire hazard, 1736
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Privilege
Carroll, Mr., 3267
Committee, discussion, anticipatory, 3267
Production costs and labour organization, 1857
Progressive party, Union government and big interests, 1853
Promissory notes, tax, 3923
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389, 410
M. (Mr. Good) 406, 430
Protection, increase in industries, 2798
Public buildings
New departmental, 1729
Nova Scotia, 4612
Renting or building, 1736
Public debt, responsibility for, 2920
Public expenditure. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Estimates
Public Service Act Amdt. bill, 3402
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950-5
Public works, committments, 962
Publication of evidence, etc., 1971
Publicity agent, London, Mr. W. T. Cranfield 2927, 2983, 4707
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4012, 4354
Royal commission, 3412, 3413, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Quebec
Champlain dock, 2675
Grain elevator, 3768
Statutes of, 1660
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2467
Railway Commission, 3192

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Railway Commission—*Con.*
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Minister of Agriculture, 3192
Criticism of, 3192
Railways. *See also under this title,* Canadian National
Branch lines, 1735
Financial situation, 1753
Railways and Canals, Minister, appointment, 1081
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Reciprocity with United States
Agreement of 1911, 3902
Agricultural implements, 3499
Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A., 2922
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
Offer to negotiate, 3901, 3908
Permanency, 3079
Request for information, 3504
Redistribution, 27, 162, 487
Ivel, Mr. W. M., 733
Special Committee on bill, 937
Printing of proceedings, 3399
Report, 4736
References to, 89-96. *See also speeches* on Budget
Returned soldiers
Appointment, 1800
Civil Service appointments, 1797
Revised Hansard, inquiry, 122
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1849, 3475
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1149
Reason for increase in force, 1149
Royal Canadian navy, 902
Recruiting for volunteer reserve, 2898
Rural credit system, 4144
Rural population, 1854
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John harbour improvements, 2677
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., 1006
St. Lawrence river waterway, qu. 204, 3786
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Second homesteads, 4365
Secretary of State dept. estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 4367
Seed testing bill, 2304
Senate estimates, 2694
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 2996

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Singapore naval base, 3822
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Expenditure, 2894
Walkerville, alleged statement at, 2014
Reference to, 670, 708
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 2892
Soldier settlement, 2987
Advertising, 2023
Expenditure, 2018
Land taxation, 3260
Legal expenses, 2018
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 4364, 4409
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 7
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; French Treaty
Agricultural implements, 2756
Election pledges, violation, 1658
Figures, 90
Luxuries, 2015
Policy of government, 3492
Reduction of duties, 2561
Rural population and, 1854
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Address; Budget; Income Tax; Special War Revenue
Increased burden of, 1854
Sales tax, 4409
Imports, 4410
Increase in, 2213
Necessaries of life, 94-5, 2999
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682
Terrebonne public building, 2690
Thornton, Sir Henry, qu. 284, 495. *See also, under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3208, 3845
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288
Tobacco duties, smuggling, 2989, 3230
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3244
Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Harbour improvements, 985, 2678
Viaduct, 4441
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French; Halibut; Italian
Government and, 1850
Signing of, 4457
Tree-planting, 3416
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 898

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Trusts, 3231. *See also under this title,* Combines
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unemployment, 2987
Minister of Labour, responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
United States. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Borrowings from, 95
Industries in Canada, 4380
Liquor laws, 4295
Obligations to, 23, 93
Unrest, western Canada, 4514
Vancouver harbour bill, 259
Victoria dry dock, 1002
Vimy Ridge memorial, 182
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1747
War profiteering, 2921
Waste paper, sale by government, 1714
Water powers, forest reserves, 1256
Welland canal construction, 3786
Western provinces, conditions, 1854
Wharves, revenue, 977
Wheat board
Establishment of, 409
Extension of legislation, 2696
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Native, 2011
Wingham postmaster, 1800
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Melita, Man. bank robbery, 1147

Melville, Mr. G. D., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

Members of Parliament. *See* House of Commons

Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Emigration; Immigration

Mental Tests, 1219

Merchants' Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
Immigration policy, 1115
Lachine canal bridge, 2299
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Transcontinental, Montreal branch line, qu. 2392

Mergers. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Combines bill

Merit System. *See* Civil Service

"Metagen" analysis of, qu. 1867

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service. *See* Marine

Metric System, qu. 914

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 859, 867
Hamilton public building, 4628
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4588
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3329
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3859
Port Maitland pier, 4589
Sales tax, 4418

Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention of, 2297, 2469

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Bankruptcies among farmers, 1495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3105
Capital punishment, 769
Civil Service salaries, qu. 2086
Dorchester penitentiary, supplies, qu. 494
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4345
Forest protection, M., 816
Fuel supply, qu. 203
Indian agent, Perth, N.B., 2155
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 310
Amdt. 311
Mechanics, qu. 203
New Brunswick forest fires, relief, 4010
Pensions, European war, 3713
Political patronage, 3348
Potatoes
Exports, qu. 621
Industry, 310
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
Steel, L. R. Company, qu. 1994

Michell, Professor, cost of living, 1700, 1812

Michigan Central Railway, bridge, qu. 1257

Middleman. *See* Prices

Midland wharves, 983

Migration. *See* Emigration

Migratory Birds Convention Act, administration, 3443

Militarism, 4652. *See* National Defence, Annual Drill, Cadet Services

Military Camps. *See* Petawawa

Military Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner); War

Military Expenditures. *See* National Defence

Military Hospitals. *See* Hospitals

Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See* Labour, Strikes; National Defence

Militia and Defence. *See* National Defence

Militia Pensions. *See* Pensions

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bills
1. Retired war officers in Public Service.
Res. 1740, 2052; 1r., com., 2053; 3r., 2086
2. Period of service entitling to pensions.
Res. 3582, 3975; 1r., 2r., com., 3976; 3r., 3977

Milk. *See* Dairying Industry; Prices

Mill Feeds, adulteration. *See* Agriculture; Feeding Stuffs Act; Grain and Grain Trade; Milling Industry

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply, 50. Unemployment question, 50; immigration; soldier land settlement; Canada Colonization Association, 51; lake grain rates; deep waterways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; com. on agricultural conditions, 52; marketing of grain, 53
Agricultural expenditure, 3239
Agricultural implements, standardization, 789, 805
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2135, 2137
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4081-4113
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Binder twine industry, 4386
Canada Grain Act, administration, 784
Canadian Air Force, Saskatchewan, 1784
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3407, 3434
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4336
Paris offices, 3610
Cattle shipped to Great Britain, 2135
Report as to tuberculosis, 2469
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Cold storage companies, 188
Combines bill, 2546
Copper bounty, 3239

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 3152
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4670
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4368
Dominion lands and parks, 3252
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Experimental farms, 469, 485
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4407
Freight rates, shipping, 3763, 3787
Fuel supply, 792, 805, 3205
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Dockage, 784
Government, mixing, 2036
Screenings, 2039
Sheep feeding, 2040
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commission, appointment, 1763
Marketing and shipment, 53, qu. 494
Amendment, 311
Insurance, 3764
Motion, 288
Shipping rates, 3787. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates bill
Grants to military associations, 889
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Health of animals, 576
Historic sites, 3407, 3434
Hogs
Cholera contracted from whey, 3299
Grading, 591
Homestead inspectors, 3252, 3254
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1057
Immigration, Canada Colonization Association, 51
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4497
Interest rate, 4111
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4221-33
Lightkeepers salaries, 3352
Live Stock Acts Amdt., 276
Live stock industry, 469
National gallery, 1019
National monument, Connaught place, 2688
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2457, 3985
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Judges, 2457
Naturalization, obstacles in way of, 2457
Oil-drilling, southern Alberta, 2508
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions, European war, 3722
Public expenditure, 4422
Public works, apportionment of, 4561
Quebec wharves, 980
Rural mail delivery, 1790

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
St. Lawrence river
Ship channel, 3340, 3343
Waterway, report, 3428
Sales tax, 4422
M. (Mr. Stevens) 922
Saskatchewan wharves, 1001
Seed Purchasing Commission, qu. 279
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, qu. 206, 2021
Special war revenue, 4422
Tree-planting stations, 3413
Tuberculous cattle, fraudulent trade, 485, 576
Vancouver harbour bill, 262, 263
Wages, 3205
Water power leases, 3426
Welland canal construction, 3763, 3787
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345

Miller Bill. *See* Race Track Betting

Miller, Mr. Roger, claim, 4676

Millerand, Mons. A., President French Republic, 1538

Milling Industry. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act; Flour; Grain and Grain Trade
Millers, conference, 604
Millfeeds. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act
Adulteration of, 600, 2875
Legislation, inquiry, 2795
Milling in bond, 2960
Protection, 146-147
Selection of wheat for milling, 2980

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Binder twine, price, 4387
Experimental farms, 470
Fuel oil, standardization, 808
Fuel supply, 808
Gasoline, short measure, 810
Hemp bounty bill, 4387
White Mud river, fishway, 3362

Milner, Lord, credit and industry, 627

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Fuel; Geological Survey
Asbestos, 460, 2750
Assay office, Vancover, 3207
Cobalt, 2750. *See also* Treaties, French
Committee, 3204
Changes in membership, 1483, 2047
Failure to function, 1271
Reports
Coal on, 4514, 4743
First, 1384, 1738
Second, 1738
Third, 4436, 4592

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, 3235
Copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 3035. *See also* Bounties; Copper
Customs drawback, 2655
Rod mill, opening of, 2943
Copper Mountain, 2504
Department
Deputy minister, Mr. Camsell, 1265
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Publications, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207
Dome Mines Company, 4209
Explosives division, 2514
Fuel-testing division, 3197
Gaspé, 1242
Gold. *See also that title*
Labrador gold discovery, 1995, 2611, qu. 2696
Output, 2750
Percentage of national wealth, 2720
Gypsum, 2349
Plaster quarries and, 1010
Hudson bay region, 1049, 1076. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Alberta coal, 1163
Edmonton, 1268
Iron ores
Alberta 2512
Deposit, Vancouver island, 2514
Irrigation, rights of leaseholders. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
Miners' strikes. *See* Labour
Mining companies
Dividends. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
Shares, 4208
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Nickel, 2750
Shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Ontario Goldfields, 4209
Ores
Flotation, 2509
Ore-dressing division, 3197
Ore-testing, Nelson, B.C., 2505
Shipment to Ottawa testing plant, 2505
Precious metals, content of, 4371
Quartz mining in Yukon, 249
Queen Charlotte islands, 150
Revenue from leases, 2510
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Silver production, 2750
Sudbury copper mines, 4371

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Trail, B. C., smelter, 2861, 3235
Refractory ores, 2506
Yukon, 86-89, 249. *See also that title*
Exhibit, British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Mayo silver strike, 3943

Mining Companies. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill

Mining Leases. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill

Mining Rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act; Yukon Act Amdt. bill

Ministers of the Crown
Absence of, 2934, 3043. *See also* Murphy, Hon. Charles
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Appointed acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
Number of, 3043
Salaries, 4671. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act
Proposed reduction of 12½ per cent, M. (Mr. Leader) 1153, 2915
Travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1848-9 2815, 3017, 3474-5

Minorities, Senate and, 1377

Miramichi River fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Miscellaneous Private Bills. *See* Private Bills

Miscou-Shippegan Steamship service, 2173

Mitchell, Mr. A. J. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Interest in insurance companies, 2050

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140, 4145
Banking and Commerce Com., Mr. D. C. Macarow, 4145
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2390

Mixing of Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Modus Vivendi. *See* Fish and Fisheries; United States

Moncton, N.B.
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, 1756
Transfer to Montreal, 574
Headquarters, 13, 2971
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307

Moncton and Buctouche Railway, qu. 203, 3646, 4197

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Prices; Public Expenditure; Purchasing Power
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666
Origin and function of, 632, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 44, 1167, 1168, 4666

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Monk, the late Hon. F. D. *See* Proportional Representation

Monopolies. *See* Combines

Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912

Montreal (city)
Canadian National headquarters, suitability, 62-63
Chamber of Commerce, Bankruptcy Act, 1492
Coal situation, 254
Customs house and revenue, 3280
Daylight saving, post office, qu. 3143
Emigration, 2216
Skilled mechanics, 2790
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, 2719
Ordnance stores building, 1022
Post office
Appointments, 1800
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Postal stations
Number of, qu. 3135
Postal station "G", qu. 623
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Public Works employees, 381
Transcontinental railway, connection, qu. 2393
Unemployment, 42, 2719
Union stockyards, 2762

Montreal (port). *See* also Vancouver Harbour Bill
Cold storage warehouse, 185, 272, qu. 1633, qu. 1488, qu. 2204, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt
Grain elevator
Capacity, 3767
Grand Trunk, qu. 1974
New, qu. 1663
Grain shipments, 1768, qu. 1973, 1974, 4230
Shortages, complaint of British importers, 1764, 2037
United States grain handling, 1760
Wheat shipments, qu. 385

Montreal (port)—*Con.*
Harbour commission. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
Advances, qu. 812, 4363, 4508
Lumber importations, qu. 1867
Names and salaries, qu. 1137
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Montreal Corn Exchange, lake tonnage, 4289

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Advance of $10,000,000.)
Res. 4363; 4508; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4508

Montreal Shipping Federation. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Vessel crews, 2670

Montreal Standard editorial, Bank Act, 4125, 4142

Monuments and Memorials. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; War
Baker, Late Lieut Col. G. H., M.P., 435, 730
Champlain monument, Orillia, 4705
Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, 3433
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 1017
Law, the late Bowman B., 1020
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, 4704
Vimy Ridge monument, 811. *See also that title*

Moore, Mr. Tom, President Dominion Trades Congress, 1170
Immigration, 1167
Labour
Eight-hour day, 1427
Representative on Canadian National board, 1652-6, 3636

Moose Jaw. *See also* Elections; Johnson, R. M.
By-election, 2224, 2760
Announcement of vacancy, 615
Certificate, Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Eggs, price of, 1852
Hopkins, Mr. E. N.
Congratulations to, 2760
Introduction, 2417
Hudson Bay railway
Alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell. 1686, 2774, 2787, 4683
Promises, 1073
Murdock, Hon. Mr. 1714
Oleomargarine, 3536
Results, 2760

Moose Jaw—*Con.*
By-election—*Con.*
Return, delay, 2295
Tariff, one of main issues, 2714
Income tax office, qu. 2699
Member for and reciprocity agreement, 3010
Public building, 1023
Stockyard, 2779

Moose Mountain
Forest reserve, 3453
Pleasure resort, 3408, 3453

Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259

Morel, Mr. E. D. *See* Germany, Reparations

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3211
Canada, constitutional development, 4469
Halibut fishery treaty, 4469
Imperial Conference, 4653
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Translation of bill, 4435
Treaties, signing of, 4469

Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028

Morrisburg and Waddington ferry, qu. 1029

Morrisburg dam, 1270

Morrison, Mr. D. W., postmaster, St. Peter's, N.S. qu. 1488, 1489

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2928. Congratulations to Finance Minister; agricultural conditions; prices of agricultural and manufactured products;purchasing power; manufacturing overhead; "calamity howlers"; British preference; further increase; combines; shipping; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2928; trade with Great Britain and the United States; high duties interfering with trade; cigarettes; immigration; branch lines; emigration to the United States; farm credits; rural credits; commission on banking and credits; unjust treatment of farmers by banks; United States credit service; amortization plan; Canadian Pacific railway, land sale contracts; copper; artificial silk and hemp bounties; assistance to capitalists

Morrison, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
but nothing for the farmer; budget a step backwards; high protectionists in Liberal party; camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours; reciprocity, defeat of in 1911, 2931; Conservatives true to false principles; Liberals false to true principles; election promises not carried out; Liberal platform of 1919 treated as scrap of paper, 2932
Cold Storage bill, 187, 189, 275
Economic conditions, 1238
Farm labourers, wages and dwellings, 1240
Forestry, fire prevention, 4346
Hudson Bay railway, 98
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1240
Literature, 1239
Policy, 1238
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Land, sale of to immigrants, 1091
Postmasters, appointment of returned soldiers, 1799
Tariff as it affects East and West, 2753
Western provinces, conditions in, 1238
Woollen industry
British preference, 3471
Protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 933

Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater claim, 4572, 4722

Mortgaged Premises, Insurance. *See* Canadian National Railway Bills

Mortgages. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Farms, Mortgages

Moss, Mr. H. R., illegal arrest, 2030

Mothers' Pensions. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd system, 577. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Special committee, 667, 706
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agriculture department
Dairy branch activities, 3283
Deputy minister
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Salary, 611
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3988, 4674
Salaries and contingencies, 610
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Alberta coal, freight rates, 3201
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 666, 2047, 2131. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290
Bacon
Grading, 593
Salty, 3301
Bees, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Bounties, copper and hemp, 2778
Budget, 2756. Tariff of Sir John Macdonald on agricultural implements; civil service, increase of; Department of Agriculture, staff; civil government, cost of; estimates, preparation of, 2756; grain shipments; stream of wealth from the West; wheat board; demands from the West; idle statements and threats; no turning back; cattle shipments, space on ships; Manitoba Free Press, 2757; Canadian Government Merchant Marine and cattle shipments; letter from Mr. R. B. Teakle; letter from Sir Henry Thornton, 2758; fictitious demand for space; rates, 2759; cattle embargo, removal of; Moose Jaw election; Atlantic shipping rates; conference in Great Britain; report of North Atlantic Conference; rate on Canadian and United States flour, 2761-2; union stockyards, 2762; agricultural conditions; Maritime provinces; specialized farming; potato-growing in New Brunswick; fruit industry, 2763; Quebec; co-operative cold storage; silos and ensilage; farming on poor land; farm credits, 2764; dairying; Ontario fruit-growing; pre-cooling plants; dairy industry; modernized methods; antipodean competition; butter and cheese, 2765; grading; western provinces; dairying; improved methods; cold storage; diversified farming; chief industry; grain-growing, 2766; failures and successes, 2767; debt, 2768; farm credits; dairying; Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, record production; debts of municipalities; unpaid taxes, 2769; Saskatchewan farm loan bonds bought by farmers; Premier Dunning on economic conditions, 2770; wheat production; cost and selling price; Premier Dunning and the

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
budget, 2771; tariff stability but not finality; agricultural questionaire and answers; mixed farming, 2772; grain unsold, 2773; insect and fungus pests; grasshoppers; live stock and dairy industry; Moose Jaw election; Hudson Bay railway; immigration, 2774; disparagement of the country; opportunities and prospects, 2775; amdt. (Mr. Forke); tariff reduction, Progressive party and; British preference, list of articles admitted at 40 per cent or over of present general tariff rate, 2776; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks; free trade with Great Britain, 2777; reciprocity agreement of 1911; revenue; land values tax; not a protectionist budget; bounties, 2778; assistance to new industries, 2779; excise tax on luxuries; hemp bounty; binder twine, 2780; discrimination against the West; protection of no essential value to prairies; cause of discontent; bad farming, 2781; natural resources; cost of administering; transfer of to western provinces, 2782; terms of settlement discussed with Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2783
Speech, reference to, 2845, 3064
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3819
Cattle shipments. *See also under this title* Cattle
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4316
Management, responsibility and power, 3657
Paris offices, 3657
Canned meats, inspection, 2202
Carvell, Hon. F. B., statement regarding, 3188
Cattle
Cattle embargo
Breeding cattle, 3291
Correspondence, 4295
Removal of, 575, 2760
Shipments
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2758, 3040, 3819
Cattle boats, unsanitary conditions, 2613
Chilled beef, trial shipment, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fat cattle, trial shipment, 3091, 4675

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Vessel space, 1869, 3040
Fictitious demand for, 2759
Cereal rust, 595
Civil Service
Commission, appointments, delay, 3292
Increase of, 2756
Codling moth, 597
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 184, 271-6, 2054, 2055, 2086, 2199
Cold storage plants, 3289
Cheese, 2055
Co-operative, 2764
Pre-cooling, 2056, 2765
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 484. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bills
Butter substitutes, 2518, 3150, 3325
M. for discharge of order, 3325, 3449
Renovated butter, 2961, 4251, 4270, 4344, 4510
Dairying industry, 609, 2765, 3283
Butter grading, 2766, 3283
Butter, pasteurization, 3298
Certified milk, 3300
Cheese grading, 2766, 3283, 3295
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Milk
Filled, 3152
Pasteurizing, 3283
Research laboratory, 3297
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive insect pests, 595, 2774, 3988
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, 3294
Experimental farms, 456-485
Buildings, 4631
Ottawa Central, 481
Farm and Ranch Review, fraudulent stock-yard practices, 576
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4271, 4273, 4538
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Field crop competitions, 602
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 193, 277, 2105, 2131, 3150
Fruit industry, 598, 2763
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, 2307
Grain
Grain-growing, 2766
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar) 301
Unsold, 2773
Grasshopper plague, 596, 2774

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Health of Animals, 575-87, 4676. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle; Live Stock
Contagious diseases, 484
Tuberculosis, 484, 580, 2134, 2469
Eradication, 3989
Tuberculin test, 3300
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hog grading, 594
Horses
Horse-breeding, 589
Market for, 590
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2253
Hudson Bay railway, 2774
Alleged statement, 4683
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3594
Policy, 2774
Progressive members, 2774
"Someone with more money than brains" 1205
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Live Stock, 587. *See also under this title,* Cattle; Horses
Commissioners, visit to South America, 1213
Tuberculosis. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192, 276-7, 2200, 2292, 3150
Penalties, 2203
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Activities, 3310
Appointment, 2614, 3305, 3310
Cattle embargo, reported statements on, 2614
Political partisanship, alleged, 3316
Qualifications, 3306, 3310
Salary, 608, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, in, 3595
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Florida, to, 3311
Great Britain, 3291, 3310, 4675
Millfeeds, adulteration, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs Act
Moose Jaw by-election, reported statement, 1686, 2774
Moose Mountain forest reserve, 3453
Noxious weeds, 2305
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Attitude on, 3576
Dairy Industry Act, correspondence, 3327

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
"Manna" 3152
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3574
Quebec harbour, cold storage, 2055
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 746
Renovated butter, 3151, 4251. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3283, 3288
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed potatoes, inspection of, 2306
Seed purchasing commission, 599
Seed testing bill, 195, 277, 2304
Seeds, purity of, 601
Speeches, pre-election, 2952, 3188
Spruce bud worm, 596
Stock Growers' Protective Association grant, 588
Supply, undiscussed items, 3285
Tariff, attitude on, 2996
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4316
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Tuberculosis in cattle *See under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Winnipeg Free Press, 2790
Woollen industry protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures, fisheries publicity, 3365

Mowat, Capt. Henry, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Mulgrave-Guysboro steamship service, 2173

Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257.

Multi-Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas. *See* Secretary of State

Municipalities
Extravagance, 2797
Historic sites, 3432
Municipal cold storage. *See* Cold Storage
Municipal government in park areas, 3436
Soldiers, hospital treatment, 673
Taxation, 4493. *See also that title*
Irritating, 2804
Land taxes, 1395
School taxes, 3445, 4205
Unpaid, 637, 2953, 2961, 3445, 4205
Tax sales, 2961

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Annuities
Agents for, 1642
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Old age pensions and, 1639, 1651, 1682
Board of Commerce, 2564, 2570
British Empire Steel Corporation employees, 1705
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada National Railways, printing, 1623
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Combines bill, 2562, 2616-34
Definition "combine" 2616
Distribution of report, 2634
Registrar, inquiry, 2620
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2565
Cost of living, 2569
Reference to, 1812
Statistics, 1684
Michell, Prof., 1700
Dominion-provincial labour conference, 1442
Editorial committee, cost, 1669
Emigration to United States, 1657
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 321
Government publications
Distribution, 1712
Waste paper sold, 1713
Hansard
Distribution of, 1715
Revised, inquiry, 122
Immigration, contingencies
M. to reduce, agreed to, 1908
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 1361, 2061
Senate amdts., non-concurrence, 4357
King's Printer, 1669
Labour
Concilliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conference, 1678
Department
Annuities branch, 1639, 1682
Cooperation with provincial departments, 1678
Estimates, 1621, 1637, 1668
Decrease in, 1643
Salaries, 1657, 1668
Staff, reduction of, 1671
Statistics, 1682
Eight-hour day, 1650
Employment offices, 1674
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Employment service director, 1676
St. John, 3453
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 1646, 1702, 1707, 1716

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442
Incomplete return, 1539
Delegates and expenses, 1642
Draft conventions and recommendations, 1441
Papers tabled, 1483
Recommendations
Federal-provincial jurisdiction, 1645
Text, tabled, 1631
Report of last meeting, 1442
Joint Industrial councils, 1654
King's Printer, 1668
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Provincial departments, 1706
Right to organize, 2889
Strikes, 1628, 1702
Nova Scotia miners, 915, 1627, 1716
Sydney steel workers, 287
Thetford Mines, 2207
Year, 1922. M. (Sir Henry Drayton) 245 495, 815
Technical Education
Administration, 1637
Director of, 1674
Labour Gazette
Correspondents, 1626
Editor, 1671
Expenses, 1624
Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1625-6
International Labour Conference, report, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1625, 1708, 1712
Ministers of the Crown, number, 3043
Moose Jaw, by-election, 1714
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3456
Pensions, old age, 1648. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Post office supplies, purchase, 3953
Powell River Paper Company
Labour organization, 2889
Speech, reference to, 3072
Printing bureau
Employees, 1623
New building, 1731, 1735
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Printing contracts to newspapers, 2394, 2614
Purchasing Commission, 3953, 4002
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 764
Reference to, 3067
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Unemployment
Federal-provincial responsibility, 1678
Meighen, Mr., responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
Relief, 1644, 1658
Calgary, 1683
Expenditure, 1655
Responsibility for, 1657, 1678
Returned soldiers, 1679
Winnipeg, 435

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Absence through illness, 1538, 1816, 1826
Boulay, Mlle., Sayabec postmistress, 3706, 3756
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
Parliament buildings committee, 1718
Patronage, 1795
Postal treaties, 4529
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528
Railway mail service, 4529

Murray Bay Point au Pic wharf, 973

Murray Stewart, steamer. *See* Marine; Vessels

Musgrave, Governor, 1916

Musk Ox in Barren Lands, evidence of Mr. Stefansson, 1073

Mustapha Kemal. *See* Near East Crisis

Naphtha. *See* Petroleum and Naphtha

Nappan, dairy herd, 2863

Napoleon, Code. *See* Code Napoleon

Napoleonic Wars
Agricultural products and rents, 1858
Conditions following, 1231

Narcotic Drugs
Export of, 698
International conference, 698
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 1443
Enforcement by Mounted Police, 1142
Prosecutions, 698

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill
(Consolidation; appeals; identification; penalties)
1r., 1136; 2r., com., 2114; 3r., 2124; Senate amdts; 3149

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of, 2120
Certificate of Dominion analyst, 2119
Definitions, 2114
Deportation, convicted alien, 2123
Importing or exporting without license, 2114
Licenses and fees, 2114
Liniments, ointments, etc. 2117
Onus of proof, 2117, 3149
Opium
Resort, being in, 2117
Smoking, 2117
Penalties, 3149
Persons to whom drugs may be sold, 2115
Physicians, veterinary surgeons, dentists, 2115
Power to search for drugs, 2120
Records, not keeping, 2115

National Council of Women, Mrs. James Carruthers, 1647

National Dairy Council. *See* Dairying

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence
Accounts, qu. 205
Active militia, pensions, 2166, 3706
Ammunition, 884
Artillery, 1740
MacBrien, General, 1742
Great Britain from, statement, 1740
Quantity in store, 1741
Small arms, 1741, 1743
Annual training. *See under this title,* Militia
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1024
Haileybury, 4615
Minto Street, Winnipeg, qu. 2084
Army, mental tests, 1219
Arsenals, 2165
Lindsay, 883, 1744
Quebec, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 877, 1743
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749
Approaches to, improvement, 1749, 4565
Building and equipment, acquisition of, 1777
Desertions, 2418
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Repair shops, 1750, 1774
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, new, 1774, 1748

National Defence—*Con.*
Canadian Air Force—*Con.*
Expenditure, 2970
Forest patrol, 1776
Royal air force, aeroplanes, gift, 1748
Vickers company, 1748
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Colt machine guns, inventions, 4635
Department
Acting Minister, 2710. *See also* Graham; Macdonald
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., financial controller, 1806, 3342
Estimates, 859, 1740, 1772, 4635
Expenditures by provinces, 3891
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, 1806
Retirement, 891, 3342, 3135
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as Acting Minister, 2295
Naval Service, amalgamation, 3342
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, amalgamation, 3893
Staff reduction, 1773
Survey work, 2508
Disbursements, qu. 344
Engineer services and works, 4638
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Grants to associations, 889
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
May, Miss H. M., compassionate grant, 900
Militarism, 866
Military districts, reduction, 868
Military expenditure, 858, 873, 901, 2921, 3076, 3238
Reduction of, M. (Mr. Lanctot) 866, neg. 876
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Military signal service, 3338
Militia
Annual training, 859, 4635
Expenditure and results, 2933
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Payments since 1922, 386
Pensions. *See* Militia Pensions bill; Pensions
Petawawa Camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Services, 859, 1747
Use of in strikes. *See under this title,* Troops
Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See under this title,* Troops
Naval Service, 1744
Consolidation with National Defence and Marine depts., 3341
Curtailment of, 2933

National Defence—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Esquimalt
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634
Stores, 4638
Expenditure, 3076
Naval colleges, Esquimalt and Halifax, 1744
Royal Canadian naval reserve, recruiting, 2897, 2950
Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
War claims, adjustment, 900
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1745
Vickers Company, contract, cancellation, 1746
Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635
Ordnance
Arms, lands, etc. 890
Montreal stores building, 1022
Pay of staff, 890
Peachy, Mr. C., Regina, grant, 4638
Permanent force, 892
Physical training, 877
Royal Canadian regiment, 4638
Schools of instruction, 900
Tecumseh barracks, London, 4638
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627
Valcartier camp grounds, qu. 2298
War claims, adjustment, 1745
Militia services, 900
War medals, 1743
Warlike stores, 900
Wireless stations, 3337
Wolseley barracks, London, 4638

National Fuel Policy. *See* Fuel

National Gallery, 1018, 2688

National Industrial Conference. *See* Labour

National Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Ottawa

National Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Lands and Parks

National Parks and Reservations Bill
(Separation of parks from reservations; administration as recreation grounds; bird and wild animal sanctuaries; historic sites) 1r., 3131

National Policy. *See also* speeches on Budget
Adoption by Liberal party, 2838
Agriculture and, 2786
Anti-national and anti-social, 3018
Budget in accordance with, 2718
Canada's development due to, 2818
Permanency of, 4652
Results, 3060
Rural interests, unjust to, 2786
Special privileges, 2786

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Trust Company, 57
Statement of president on immigration, 1123

National Status. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

National Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, Conservative alliance with, 2924

Nationality. *See* Naturalization
Mental tests according to, 1219

Natural Gas. *See* Natural Resources

Natural Resources, 1880-1, 2836. *See also* Coal; Forests and Forestry; Fuel; Hudson Bay Railway; Immigration; Mines and Minerals; Timber
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Development, 2785
Capital necessary for, 2744, 2802, 3027
Estimate of value, 2719
Valuable only when developed, 2744
Drainage, 3256
Forests, 3416. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Gaspe, 1242
Hoppe leases, 3128. *See also* Hoppe
Interchange with United States, 2910
Maritime provinces, equity of, 2972
Minerals, 3198. *See also* Coal; Mines
Investigation of, 3197
Natural gas, well-drilling machinery, 3487
Ownership and taxation, 2729
Paternalism, 3071
Per capita value, 2714
Regaining of, 2728
Unemployment, 629
Water powers, 3420
Western provinces, 21, 2782, 2972, 3424
Expenditure upon, 2510
Immigration policy and, 1092. *See also* Immigration

Naturalization. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Administration of acts, 2495
Judges and. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Jurisdiction over. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental
Repatriation, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1379, withdrawn, 1382
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Naturalization Acts Amdt. Bill
1r., 1384; 2r., com., 2107; com., 2182; 2437; 3983; 3r., 3985
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for naturalization, 2109
Arbitrary powers, 2456
British system, 2438
Citizenship, obstacles in way of, 2455
Consolidation, 2110, 2182, 2199, 2437
Correspondence, Secretary of State and county court judges, Vancouver, 2199
Denaturalization, 2332, 2451, 2456
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Japan, nationality, 2443
Japanese, 1899
Judges, 2437, 2446, 2451
Application for naturalization, 3983
Investigations, "huge joke," 2446
Judicial and executive authority, 2462
Nationality, dual, amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2442, 2451, 2456, 2463
Natural-born British subject, definition, 2107
Naturalization
Imperial, 2463
Limited, 2461
Politics and, 2438, 2466
Orientals, 2461
Relationship, naturalization law to Immigration Act, 2455
Repeal, 3983
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Administration by, 2437, 2453
Discretion, 2447
Winnipeg Free Press, editorial, 2454

Naval Defence. *See under* National Defence, Naval Service

Naval Protection. *See* Canada's Participation in War

Naval Service. *See* Imperial Conference; National Defence

Navigation. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence

Near East Crisis. *See also* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference
Canada's participation, 12-13, 25, 40, 45, 71, 105, 120-121, 141, 162, 169, 1266, 2815, 4655
Prime Minister, statement, 29-33

Necessaries of Life. *See* Address; Budget; Combines; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices; Tariff; Taxation

Negro Point breakwater, 4587

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 174; the two amendments, 174; economy and free trade, 175-176; policy of moderate protection, 177
Agricultural conditions in West, 1192
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, 3160
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Business of the House, M. to increase taxation, 3937
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 114
Canadian National Railways, agents for labour supply, 1191
Canadian Pacific railway, labour supply, 1191
Certificated masters, coasting vessels, 3971
Cheque tax, 3925, 3931
Amdt. 3935
Payment with postage stamps, 1818
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-36, 4537
Children born in Canada, 2323
Head tax, 2323
Merchants and students, 2323
Fraudulent entry, 2324
Merchants
Definition of, 2483
Retail, attitude towards, 2322
Scope of, 2323
Coal, bituminous, duty, 1278, 3495, 3499
Eight-hour law, conference, qu. 207, qu. 279
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fish and fisheries
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Freight rates, 1953
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Free trade, Progressives and, 1196
Freight rates
Oliver, Hon. John, 1952
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1951
Original motion, effect of, 1953

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Fuel oil, competition with coal, 807
Fuel supply, 807
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4643
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1193
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific agents, 1191
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Labour employers and, 1193
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Chinese, registration certificates, 1452
Exclusion from United States, 1194
Japanese
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1450
Lemieux agreement, 1450
Naturalization, 2442
Registration system, 1452
Supposed special privileges to landholders, 1450
Violation of regulations, 1451
Policy, 1191
Population not increased by, 1195
Propaganda, 1192
Railways and, 1193
"Unseen Hand", the, 1193
Immigration Act Amdt. bills, 3981
Intending immigrants, 74, 497, 4441
Imperial Conference, 4643-49
Income tax, 1195, 4501
Japan, trade with, 1450
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Discontent, 1194
Right to organize, 2896
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4240
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Japanese, 2442
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109, 2442, 2465
Amdt. 2442
Nationality, dual, 2442
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 700
Pacific coast steamship services, 4003
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3860
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
Committees, 288
Powell River Paper Company, 2886, 2896
Promissory notes tax, 3925

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 393
Railway Commission, steamship services and, 4003
Reciprocity with United States, 1196
Renovated butter, 4266
Revenue stamps, 1818
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Seymour Narrows, obstruction to navigation, 3333
Steamship services
Canada-West Indies, 3388
Competition, 3398
Railway Commission, control, 4003
Tax exempt bonds, qu. 342
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291, 4645
Amdt. (Mr. Neill), 1292
Seconder, 1308
Uchucklesit-Ecoole telegraph line, 1017
Unemployment, 1193
Hoboes, 1194
Wheat bounty, 1196

Nelson, B.C.
Board of Trade, Mounted Police, 2943
Ore-testing plant, 2505, 2507

Netherlands, The. *See also* Holland; Immigration
Senate, constitution of, 1372

New Brunswick. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Assignments and Preferences Act, 3087
Bonded warehouses, 1212
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Coal, 804
Dredging, 4951
Employment offices, 1630
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Gas and oil fields, 2949, 3920
Geological survey, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 945
Highways, 3182, 4587. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1086, 1198, 1476
Bowder, Mr., representative, Great Britain, 1086
Indians, 2124, 2153
Kent Northern railway, 4189
Labour scarcity in lumber camps, 1125
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949, 3920
Permanent force, strikes, 1627
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Potatoes, 137-139, 2763

New Brunswick—*Con.*
Public buildings, 4613
Representation, Canadian National board, qu. 282
Shale deposits, 2513
Veniot, Premier, statement, qu. 1488

New Carlisle, Que., wharf, 973

New Ontario. *See* Ontario

New Westminster, liquor sales, 2415

New York
Canadian customs officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272, 3275

New York Tribune, reported statement, Mr. Meighen, on immigration, 2790

New Zealand
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3297
Immigration
British, 2932
Chinese, 2313
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Immigration Act, 497
Policy, 1882
Land settlement policy, 1406
Legislative council, constitution, 1371
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis

Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C.
Opinions
Canada Temperance Act, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' Case, 2521
Visit to United States, 3823

Newfoundland steamship service, 2171, 2173, 3377

News Items, dissemination of. *See* Press

News Service. *See* Press

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper

Niagara and St. Catharines Railway, 2475

Niagara Falls
Michigan Central bridge
Construction contracts, qu. 1864
Remission of sales tax, qu. 1257
Power. *See* Welland canal

Niagara District, Grape-growers, competition, 452. *See* Treaties, French; Wines

Nickle Resolution. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Nickle, shipments to Germany during war 4371

Nicolet
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., election, 2837
Vacancy, 2178

Nicomen Island, protection, 626

Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307

Nitti, Ex-Premier, of Italy, 46, 313

"Noble Eighteen". *See* Reciprocity

Noble Foundation Farm, 2813

Nolin, Mrs. J., St. David postmistress, 1489

Nominative Scheme. *See* Immigration

Nominative Senate. *See* Senate

North Atlantic Trading Company. *See* Immigration

North Atlantic and U.K. Conference. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

North Essex Election. *See* Elections

North Vancouver. *See* Vancouver

Northern Ontario. *See* Ontario

Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection Bill. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
(Close season; use of Canadian ports; seizures; International Fisheries Commission)
Res. 4480; 1r., 2r., com., 4485; 3r., 4489

Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635

Northwest Rebellion. *See* Pensions

Northwest Territories
Administration, 3944, 3948
Indians, 2145
Procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974
Purchase and maintenance of new ship, 4702

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 180; 2r., com., 270; 3r., 271; Senate amdts., 2050

Norway
Immigration from, 1191
Storthing, constitution of, 1372

Notes, Tax. *See* Taxation

Nova Scotia. *See also* Maritime Provinces
British Empire Steel Corporation, employees, 1705,
Coal, 1269, 1273, 1277, 3199. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Coke and, 1268
Freight rates on, 1277, 2828
Production, qu. 490
Resources, 800
Confederation, attitude towards, 1376
Disallowance of statute. *See* Disallowance
Dredging, 4591
Emigration from, 1404
Expenditure, 4555
Experimental farms, 460
Harbours and rivers, 941, 4554, 4560, 4635, 4722. *See also that title*
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
Highways, 3183. *See also that title*
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1086, 1200, 1476
Indians, 2124, 4702
Markets for, 2243
Miners
Strike, 495, 1627, 1716
Troops, use of, qu. 624, 866, 869, 892, 2893
United States delegates, detention, 3155. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Nova Scotia Historical Society, 3406
Ports, used by United States fishermen, 3906
Public buildings, 4612
Redistribution and, 73. *See also that title*
Representation, reduction. *See* Redistribution
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Secession, 2057, 2177
Resolution, 2243
Senate, elective or nominative, 1368-76
Sessional indemnity, reduction in, 1155
Steel bounties, 4371
Steel-workers strike, 1643
Supreme Court, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, appointment, 1810
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Windsor, site of Fort Edward, 3406

Noxious Weeds. *See* Seed Inspection

Nursery Stock. *See also* Horticulture
Insects and pests, 596
Sales tax, 4432

Oaths of Office Bill, 1r., 3

Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

Ocean Freight Rates, 69. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Ocean Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Ports

O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Officials, travels of. *See* Government; Marshall

Ogilvie Milling Company, mill feeds, 2875

O'Halloran, Mr. George F. *See also* Patents Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2346

O'Hara, Captain Marshall. *See* Marine

Ohta, Hon. T. *See* Immigration, Oriental, Jananese

Oil. *See also* Bounties; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Alberta, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Prospecting and development, 780
Revenue from, qu. 2515
Southern, 2508, 3423
British Columbia oil companies, 2505
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, drilling, 2508
Customs drawbacks, 2655
Drilling operations, 2505
Fort Norman, 3423
Fuel oil
Competition with coal, 807, 1245
Importations, 1245
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Standardization, 808
Hudson's Hope, 4699
Imperial Oil Company, 4380
Leases, 3423
Lubricating, standardization, 808
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 3920
Petroleum. *See also that title*
Bounty, 2648, 2510, 3914
Duty, 2653, 2644
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Search for, 2802
Speculation in claims, 3423
Southern Alberta, 2508, 3423
Used in manufacture of manila rope, 3901
Drawback, 3502
Well-drilling machinery, 2653, 3487

Oil Springs, Ont., postmaster, qu. 518

Old Age Annuities. *See* Labour, Annuities

Old Age Pensions. *See* Pensions

Oleomargarine. *See also* Dairying Industry
Agriculture and Colonization Com., discussion in, 3266
Butter and, 386. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada Food Board, 3520
Canada only country prohibiting, 3531
Canadian Lumberman's Association, 3508
Class interests, 3534
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3325, 3449. *See also that title*
Dairying industry and, 3296
Denmark, 3515, 3523
Difference of opinion in government, 3530
Duty, 2777
French treaty, 1984
Great War Veterans' Association, 3547
Health and, 3558
Ingredients, 3562
Labelling, 3152
Local Council of Women, 3513
"Manna," 3152
Manufacture, 3153, 3553
Manufacture, importation and sale
Further legislation, inquiry, 230, 1309, 2519, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3508; agreed to as amended, 3581
Amdt. (Mr. Kay), reversion to status quo ante, 3520, agreed to, 3580
Point of order, amdt. direct neg, 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) govt. to submit legislation before end of session, 3567; neg., 3581
Point of order, 3571
Opportunity for discussion, 3510, 3519
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3326
Precedence of, 3451
Materials for, imports, duty and drawback, 3503, qu. 3505
National Dairy Council, 3269, 3509
Order in council suspending prohibition, 3520, 3525, 3526
Pledge to dairymen, 3525, 3531
Propaganda, 3266, 3402
Protection, 3534, 3546
Regulations, 3517
Restaurants, sale in, 3517
Restrictions, 3517
Retail Merchants' Association, 3508, 3551
Substitute, 3522
Victoria Board of Trade, telegram, 3513
War measure, 3520, 3525
Western farmers and, 1423
Women, 3508

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Oliver, Hon. John
Freight rates, 1915, 1952
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383

Olivier, Hon. Mr., Senate, elective or nominative, 1367

Olympic Games, Canadian team, 4706

One-Sixth Vote. *See* Supply, Interim Supply

Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 2765
Attorney General
Betting information, 1483
Combines, 2585
Wholesale Grocers case, decision, 2051 2521
Bootlegging, 2410
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Coal, reported discovery, 2512
Court of Appeal, decision, 2051, 2521
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Drury government, expenditure and debt 2824
Experimental farms, 459
Farm labour, scarcity, 1416
Farmers and protection, 2818
Farmers' government and immigration, 1420
Government house, 4628
Government savings offices, qu. 1488
Interest rate, 1697
Grain elevators, 2037, 4716, 4719
Harbours and rivers, 981, 4588, 4594
Highways, 3177. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Expenditure, 2489
Home markets, 2818
Hydro-electric development, 426, 3056. *See also* Hydro
Hydro Power Commission, 1270
Immigration, 1085, 1096-8, 1320, 1428, 1475, 1476. *See also that title*
Child, and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Indians, 2124, 2146
Lake of the Woods. *See that title*
Legal, fees, expenditure, 1155
New Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 1401
French-Canadian settlement, 1401
Market for agricultural products, 1402
Northern Ontario
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Conditions and possibilities, 3037
Immigration into, 1097, 1112, 1320
Indians, 2151
Opportunities for settlers, 1097

Ontario—*Con.*
Oil bounty, 2510
Ontario elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4005, 4162
Ontario Factory Act, printing bureau, 1763
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public ownership, 3056
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Radial railways, 3056
Raney, Hon. W. E., Attorney General
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Race-track betting, 712
Letter from, to Mr. Good, 2181
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, qu. 1255
See also Post Office
Soldier settlement, qu. 492
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, 1071, 3056
United Farmers, co-operative stores, 4068
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

"Opium Joint". *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Opposition. *See* Conservative Party; Meighen

Orders in Council
Canadian National Railways, 815
Civil Service Commission
June 29th, 1922, qu. 278
September 22nd, 1922, 380-1
Depreciated currency, 2988
Duties against United States, reduction by, 2649, 2650
Exemptions by, 359
Expenditure by, 949, 950
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354
Marking of goods, 2988
Lead pencils, 2988
Lithographic works, 2988
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4487
Number passed, 1921 and 1922, qu. 1488
Numbers
P. C. 220, unemployment, 435
P. C. 223, 815
P. C. 1053, qu. 516
P.C. 1566, 249
Oleomargarine, suspending prohibition of, 3520, 3525, 3526
Peace treaty, under, 767
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4349, 4393
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474, 3479
Repeal of by statute, 3504
Tariff reduction under, 3049
Wheat Board, 3046
Legislation extended, 3045

Ordnance Lands. *See* Interior

Ore-Testing. *See* Mines and Minerals

Orient, Trade with. *See* Trade; Vancouver Harbour Bill

Oriental Immigration. *See* Immigration

Orientals. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration; Labour; Narcotic Drugs Act; Naturalization
British Columbia in, 1541, 1893-1903
Deportation. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Fishing licenses, reduction, 1548
Naturalization of, 2442. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Orillia, Champlain monument, 4705

Orthopedic Boots. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Ostrea Lake, N.S. wharf, 943

Ottawa
Canadian Press, Limited, 2523
Chateau Laurier, deficit, 2976
Daly building, purchase, 1023
Dominion Archives building, addition, 1730
Dominion observatory, 3242
Government workshops, 4616
National Gallery, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020 2685
New departmental building, 1729, 4617
Architects, compensation, 4633
Newspaper combine, 2522, 2630
Ore-testing plant, 2505
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015, 4590
Parliament buildings, 1716
Printing bureau, 1022. *See also that title*
Too much government from, 3434

Ottawa Dairy Company, 2526, 2569

Ottawa Free Press Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085

Ottawa Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa River
Water powers, qu. 1974
Point Fortune, qu. 1974
Water storage, 815

Ottawa Typographical Union, copyrights, 2144

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Overseas Settlement Board. *See* Immigration

Owen, Admiral Sir W. F. W., St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

Owen Sound Wharf, 2690

Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, 835-6

Pacaud, Mr. L. T.
Appointment, 2710
International Labour Conference, 1539, 1647
Pacific Cable Board, representative, 1832

Pacific Cable Board, 1832

Pacific Coast Trade. *See* British Preference; Customs Tariff; Trade

Pacific Fisheries. *See* Japanese; Treaties, Halibut

Pacific Ocean ports. *See* Vancouver Harbour

Pacific Salvage Company, payments, qu. 1763

Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1832

Paints, 2739. *See also* Customs Tariff Items

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Panama Canal. *See also* New York, Customs Officer
Canadian customs regulations, 2519, 2615
Canned salmon via, 2615
Duty on goods passing between Canadian ports, 2519, 2615
Grain shipments, 77, 1921. *See also* Grain
Imports through to British Columbia, 1921
Rail and water competition, 1920
Trade from western to eastern Canada, 2868
Trade, Great Britain to Pacific ports, 3053

Pan-American Union, 496

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment. *See* House of Commons

Paper. *See* Press; Prices; Pulp and Paper

Paper Control. *See* Pulp and Paper

Paper Makers. *See* Powell River Company

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Estimates, time of presentation, 4555
Public expenditure, 4554

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Arctic expedition, 4012
Arctic islands and northern Quebec, 814
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Canadian Pacific railway, Quebec terminals, 815
Cold storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868
Ottawa river, water storage, 815
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Quebec Harbour Commission, cold storage, 2055
Raisins, imports, qu. 2699

Pari-Mutuel System. *See* Race Track Betting

Paris Agency, expenses, 4001

Paris Offices. *See* Canadian National Railways

Park-Davis Company, Metagen, qu. 1867

Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands and Parks; Interior

Parliament
Farmers in, 2732. *See also* Progressive Party
Function of, statement of Edmund Burke, 3018
Opening of, 1
Prorogation, 4755

Parliament Buildings, 1716
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Baker, the late Col. G. H., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Central column at entrance, memorial, 2685
Committee, 1718
Common meeting room, 1727
Commons chamber
Accoustics, 1721. *See also* House of Commons
Lighting, 1728
Members' galleries, 1729
Estimates, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) to reduce, 1727, neg. 1728
Expenditure
To complete, 1716
To date, 1718
Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Marchand, Mr., architect, commission, 1718
Members' rooms
Allocation of, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Ventilation, 1728
Old walls, destruction of, 1723-24
Pearson, Mr. John A., architect, 1716
Policing, 778
Tower, 1722
Chimes, 1722
Completion of, 1719

Parliamentary Documents. *See* Government Publications

Parliamentary Library. *See* Library

Parliamentary Practice, amending of. *See* Lack of Confidence, M.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Responsibility. *See* Canadian National Railways, Branch Lines, Management Lack of Confidence

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee, 53, 382

Parole System. *See* Justice

Participation in War. *See* Canada; Near East Crisis

Partisanship. *See* Political Partisanship

Party Funds, members and, 4237

Party System of Government, 1235, 1254

Passamaquoddy Bay, harbour, 2899, 2938

Passports
Immigrants, 1170
Passport office, 4707
Requirements as to, 3988

Pasteur, Louis, scientific contributions, 1287

Patent Medicines. *See* Health

Patents. *See also* Patent Act Amdt. bill
Revocation of, 2528
Under Combines Act, 2522

Patents and Copyright Branch. *See* Trade and Commerce

Patents of Invention Bill. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs Bill
(To amend and consolidate acts)
1r., 331; 2r., 2064; com., 2064, 2086; 2128; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts., 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, 2129
Exchequer court, 2079
Application for patents, 2067
Conflicting
To be decided by Exchequer court, 2079
To be submitted to arbitration, 2129
Joint, assignments, 2057, 2104, 2130
Particulars required, 2073
Withdrawal of, 2079

Patents of Invention Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Assignments, refusal to execute, 2069
Berne convention, 2064
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2064, 2104, 2128
Conditions, 2089, 2104
Definition, 2064
Domicile, election of, 2070
Food or medicines, 2078
Foreign patents, 2068
Form of issue, 2082
Government use of patented inventions, 2100
Improvements, patenting of, 2069
Inspection by the public, 2101
Issue of new or amended patents, 2082
Models and specimens, 2076
Oath of inventor, 2069
Patent agent or attorney, 2102
Patent office, 2064
Patents for inventions by persons in Public Service, 2082, 2104
Patents to be assignable, 2083, 2086
Register of attorneys, 2101
Repeal, 2102
Restoration and revival of patent, 2100
Revocation of patent, time limit, 2099
Right of appeal, 2100
Special methods or processes of manufacture, 2076
Specifications, drawings, etc., 2073
Suit pending, 2102
Tariff of fees, 2100
Term limit, 2082
What patents shall contain, etc., 2082

Paternalism, excess of, 1133. *See also* Legislation

Patronage. *See* Civil Service; Political Patronage

Patterson, Hon. J. C., investigator of titles, 3360

Peace Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations

Peace River District
German settlers, 1184
Immigration literature, 1433
Railways, 4324
Construction, 1433, 1440, 3006
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Prince George railway, 1434, 4701
Survey, 4698
Settlement in, 1184
Soldier settlers, 1185

Peace Treaty. *See* Germany, Reparations; Treaties

Pearson, Mr. John A., architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Peat. *See* Fuel Supply

Pecuniary Claims Convention, with United States, 779

Peel, Sir Robert, Corn Laws
Abolition of 3050
Reversal of policy on, 3007

Pelee Island steamship service, 2174

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Belanger, Mr. A. C., 1489
Boulay, Mlle, postmistress, Sayabec, 3751, 3759
Matane harbour improvements, 971
Printing committee, fourth report, 4510

Penitentiaries. *See* Justice

Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463

Penny Bank of Toronto Act Amdt. Bill
(Change of name)
1r., 1739; 2r., com., 3r., 2052

Pension Act Amdt. Bill
(Cases subject to review; district appeal boards; federal appeal boards)
Res. 3401, 3748; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3848; 3r., 3887; Senate amdts. 4744
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals to district review board, 3875
Recommendations final, amdt. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 3875, neg. 3881
Time for, 3881
Extension from 3 months to one year, amdt. (Mr. Logan) agreed to, 3881
To be decided under Pension Act, amdt. (Mr. Marler) 3881, neg. 3882
British expeditionary force, members, 3873
Date of coming into force, 3873
Death within five years, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Clark) 3884, agreed to, 3885
Disability
Attributable to military service, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Extent of, how estimated, 3873
In respect of which pensions claimed, 3848
Pensions according to, 3873
Pre-enlistment, 3849
Time of appearance, 3872

Pension Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
District review boards, 3874
Staff or ex-staff officer not eligible, amdt. (Mr. Black), Yukon) 3875, neg. 3875
Federal appeal board, 3875
Insurance principle, 3851
Payment of expenses, 3881
Pension payable to descendants, amdt (Mr. Manion) agreed to, 3886
Review of pension legislation, 3851
When no deduction of pension, 3873
Widow, 4745
Bigamous marriage, 3732, 3886
Who marries after disability appears amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 3882, agreed to 3884
Widowed mother, 3870
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. (Mr. LeSueur) 3870, agreed to, 3871

Pensions. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Judges; Militia Pension Act; Ministers' Salaries and Members' Indemnities; Pensions Act Amdt. Bill
Appeals
Appeal boards, 77, 3875
Dominion Veterans Alliance, com. 3860
Federal, 4703
Attributability, 3850
British expeditionary force, members, 3873, 3885
Committee, re-appointment, inquiry, 288
Commutation of, qu. 4132. *See under this title,* European War
Decrease in amount, 23
Disability entitling to, 677
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166, 3706, 3707
Estimates, suggested postponement, 2166
Expenditure, 2987
Fenian raid, 3742, 3873
Great War Veterans' Association, 2167, 4535
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway employees, 3195
Judges, qu. 492
McDougall, Mrs. William, 3949
Malone, late Lieut.-Col. qu. 206
Medical examination of prisoners, 670
Militia. *See* Militia Pension Act. Amdt bills
Mothers, 2827
Conference with provincial governments, 3046
Northwest rebellion, 3742

Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1646, 2817, 2827, 3032. *See also* Labour, Annuities
Conference with provincial government, 3046
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Inquiry as to legislation, 733, qu. 2517, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res., 1652
Pension Act. *See also* Pension Act Amdt.
Administration of, 3706
Suggested amendments, 2166
Pension Commissioners, board of
Appeal from, 677
Charges against, 685
Estimates, 2166
Interpretation of Pension Act, 2639, 2943
North Essex election and, 670, 708, 2014
Report, 516, 4736
Res., Victoria, B.C., for removal, 3399
Salaries and contingencies, 2168, 3742
Pension legislation, review of, 3851
Petition from veteran organizations, 4535-36
Pilots, 3359
Ralston report. *See under this title,* Royal Commission
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Royal commission
Expenses, 691
Recommendations of, 2394, 2942, 3733
Legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 3400. *See also* Pensions Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill
Inquiry as to, 2639, 2983
Opportunity to discuss, 674, 2394
Reports
First interim report, 2166, 2926, 2983
Final, inquiry, 2516
Printing, qu. 207, 288, 1631, 3401
M. for 1992, 2128
Senators, 1376
South African War, 3873
Tuberculous patients, 3850
Unemployed relief, expenditure, 2168
Women, 1651
Widows, 681

Perfumery. *See* Treaties, French

Peribonka, Que., wharf, 973

Periodicals. *See* Magazines and Periodicals;

Permanency. *See* Reciprocity; Tariff

Permanent Force. *See* National Defence

Peru, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Petawawa Camp, Ontario elections and, 3976, 4005, 4162

Peterborough, weights and measures inspection, qu. 492, 810

Petition of Right Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Coal Leases)
(Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud)
1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3127; 3r., 3130
Sections and subjects discussed:
Fiats, issue and publication of, 3222, 3224
Hoppe leases, 3127
Isenberg estate, 3128
Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud, 3127

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Administration of act, 780
Bounty, 2510, 2648, 2949, 3914, 3963
Duty, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3963
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949
Production and payment, qu. 3262

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act Amdt. Bills
1. Regulations governing sale of naphtha
Res. 3749; order discharged, 3969
2. Sale of naphtha
1r., 4248; 2r., 4249; com., 4276; 3r., 4276

Petroleum Bounty Act Amdt. Bill
(Reduction and discontinuance of bounty)
Res. 2657, 3914, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Pharmaceutical Preparations. *See* Health

Physical Training. *See* National Defence, Cadet Services,

Piche Point, Que. wharf, 973

Pictou, N.S., dredging, 4584. *See also* Harbours and Rivers

Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish steamship service, 2174

Pictou-Souris-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 2174

Pictures. *See* National Gallery

Pierreville, Que., postmaster, qu. 4511

Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Pineapples, production in Fiji Islands, 1848

Pioneer, the, recognition of, 1394, 2870

Piracy. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Pitt, William, reciprocity treaty, France, 3050

Plains of Abraham, Battle of, soldiers who became farmers, 1188

Plaster Quarries. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute

Playgrounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites

Plebiscites. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Pocket Boroughs. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Pointe à Elie, Que. wharf, 974

Point au Pic, Murray Bay, wharf, 973

Pointe aux Trembles, Que. wharf, 974

Pointe Shea (Amherst) pier, 977

Poland
Immigration, 1204
Treatment of Ukrainians. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Political Offenders, imprisonment, 3157

Political Parties. *See also* Conservative; Liberal; Progressive
Big interests, contributions, 2856, 3070
Capital and, 2810
Liberal and Conservative, 2793, 2812

Political Partisanship. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Costly, 2787
Dismissals for, 3344

Political Patronage. *See also* Civil Service; National Policy
Alberta, 522
Appointments, 2710. *See also* Post Office
Boulay, Mlle, dismissal of, 3706, 3750
Canadian National Railways, 134-135
Charlotte county, N.B., 945
Civil Service, 519
Indians, medical service, doctors, 2160
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3303. *See also that title*
Patronage list, 946
Political supporters, jobs for, 2710
Post offices, 3316. *See also* Post office
Sorel shipyard, 3344, 3374

Political Policies. *See also* speeches on Budget; Conservative Party; Liberal Party; National Policy; Progressive Party; Reciprocity
Appropriation of, 2781
Big interests and, 2856, 3070
"Doubtful virtue of consistency," 3056
Economic group organization, 3003
Graft, big interests and old parties, 2855
Liberal and Conservative, 2812
Platforms
Repudiation of, 2973, 2994
Value of, statement, Mr. Euler, 2852, 2974, 2991
Proposed, Hon. Mr. Tolmie, 2870
Reversal of, 3007
Two parties but one policy, 2793

Pollution of Boundary Waters. *See* Health

Pollution of Rivers. *See* Marine

Pool Rooms. *See* Race Track Betting

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Pope, Sir Joseph. *See* External Affairs

Population. *See also* Budget; Emigration; Immigration
Birth rate, 1197
Death rate, 1197
Distribution of, 2747
Immigration
Natural increase and, 1871-1921, 1207
Not increased by, 1195
Increase, 1398, 2819
Net, 1173
Loss of, 119, 1439, 3018. *See also* Emigration
Ratio of public employees to, 3027
Representation by. *See* Proportional Representation
Tax burden upon, 3001. *See also* Taxation
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Pork Products. *See* Bacon; Meats

Port Arthur
Grain shipments, 1114. *See also* Grain
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, 3354

Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012

Port Colborne elevator, 4690. *See also* Grain

Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, monument, 3433

Port Elgin breakwater, 2690

Port Greville, N.S. breakwater, 944

Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or Lakes steamship services, 2174

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Port Renfrew, B.C. wharf, 1008

Portage la Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 993, 998, 3041
District board, resolution, 3039
Indians medical service, doctors, 2160
Sewerage outlet, 993, 2679

Portage River, N.S. breakwater, 950

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Vancouver harbour bill, 269

Portland, Maine. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Terminals
Grain shipments via, qu. 1484

Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Imports and Exports; Shipping, *and also* their individual titles
Canadian, 2898. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
British preference and, 140, 2948, 3053, 3454. *See also* British Preference; Budget
Direct importation by, 3454, 3895
Discrimination against, 2960
Loading of grain cargoes at, 3974
Shipments via, 4714
Use of. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut treaty
United States fishermen, by, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Montreal. *See that title*
Ocean ports, 2937. *See also* Halifax; St. John
Comparative mileages, 2939
Passamaquoddy bay, 2938
St. Croix, 2899, 2938
Shippigan, 2938
Comparative mileage, 2939
Pacific, trade through Panama canal, 3053
Quebec. *See that title*
United States, grain shipments through, 3764
Vancouver. *See that title*
Wardens. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Portugal, Upper Chamber, constitution, 1372

Postal Conference. *See* Post Office

Postage Stamps. *See* Post Office

Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1314-15, 1538, 1816, 1821, 3067

Post Office
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
British mails, delay in, 2639, 2694, 2695
Canadian federation of postal employees, salaries, 1794
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Department
Acting Minister, 2710
Annuities branch, 1640-42
Transfer to Labour dept., 1639
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Coolican, Mr. P. T., General Superintendent of Postal Service, 1816
Deputy Postmaster General
Appointment of, 1805, 2710
Coulter, Dr. R. M.
Retirement, 1822, 1825
Service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135
Estimates, 1778, 1814
Proceedings in minister's absence, 1314
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Purchasing Commission and, 4001
Revenue
Gross, 1818, 1825
Not connected with postal service, 1815
Salaries and contingencies, 1793-4, 1814
Staff, 1824
Superintendeent of mail services, 1814
Superintendent of postal services, Mr. George Ross, retirement, 1825
Supplies, purchase of, 3951
Surplus claimed, 1817
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Dismissals and appointments. *See under this title,* Postmasters
International Postal Conference, 4529
Letter carriers
Bonus to, 1784
Salaries, 1780
Mail contracts. *See also under this title,* Rural Mail
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868, 1977
Sporting Mountain, N.S., qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, qu. 4302
Mail service, 1778
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions. *See* Steamship Services
Ocean mail, pilot boats and, 3359
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Patronage, 1794. *See also under this title,* Postmasters

Post Office—*Con.*
Postage rates
Letter rate
United States and Canada, comparison, 2745
War tax, 2744, 2858
Newspapers and periodicals, 4436, 4528
Public libraries, 1809
Reduction of, 1779, 2824, 2945
Special delivery, 1872, 2933
Postage stamps
Commission on sale of, 1819
Payment of excise taxes with, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3937, 4435
Sale of, 2979
Selling cost, 1818
Postal contracts. *See under this title,* Mail, Rural Mail
Postal service
Quebec district, extra service compensation, 1832
Postal Treaty with United States, 2, 4529
Postmasters
Agents for annuities, 1641-42
Appointments and dismissals, 1809, 1827, 4534
Appointments
List of, 1830
Members' recommendations, 1799-1829
Political patronage, 3316
Returned soldiers, 1799
Dismissals, 4534
Angouleme, Quebec, qu. 3139
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boucher, Mrs., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, Sayabec, 3706, 3750
Brussels, 1800
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, qu. 2698
Herbertville, qu. 3139
Labarre, Que. dismissals, qu. 3138
Larouche, qu. 3137
Levis county, qu. 519
Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Midland, qu. 623
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
North Oakville, 914
Oil Springs, Ont., qu. 518
Portsmouth, Ont., 1832
Rawding, Mr., dismissal, 1795
Renfrew, qu. 205
St. Barnabe Nord, Que., 1830
St. Bruno, Que. qu. 3140
Ste. Claire, Que., qu. 1031

Post Office—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
Dismissals—*Con.*
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140
St. Peters', N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D.W., qu. 1488
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, Que., qu. 3139
Wingham, 1800
Woodbridge, 1821
Commission on stamp sales, 1818
Patronage, 3316
Residence, 1796
Post office money orders, tax, 3923
Post Offices
Grade Three, qu. 4300
Montreal. *See also that title*
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Number of post offices, qu. 3135
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Promotions, qu. 2298
Saskatoon post office, 1785
Toronto
Postal station "A," 4624
Post office building, 3277
Revenue, 1779
Radio equipment, 1780
Railway mail service, 1783, 4529
Payments to Canadian Pacific, qu. 3143
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1821
Carriers
Compensation for loss, 1832
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim, 1832
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Remuneration, 1780, 1822, 3070, 3076
Ontario, average, qu. 1259
Contracts, 1781
Extension of, 1802
Improvement of, 1780, 2830
Spur lines, 1826
Western provinces, 1441, 1790, 1801
War loan dividends, delivery of, 1804
Winnipeg postal employees, salaries, 4672

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
(Rates on newspapers and periodicals)
1r., 4436; 2r., com., 4528; 3r., 4535

Potatoes. *See this title under* Vegetables

Potlatch. *See* Indians

Potter, Mr. Howard G., Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795

Poultry. *See also* Eggs
French treaty, 1983
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 3071
M. (Mr. Neill) to adjourn House, 2886; withdrawn, 2897

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 861, 872
Canada's participation in war, M., 1529
Civil Service Act, M. for repeal, 345, 371, 519, 520, 568
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4346, 4348, 4395
Amdt. six months' hoist, 4396, neg. 4397
Forests, preservation of, 4349
Grondines wharf, 965
Labour troubles, use of troops, 861, 893
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3998
Withdrawal, M., 1529, 3999
Military expenditure, 873
National Defence, pay of staff, 890
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-87
Pension commissioners, removal, 685
Pensions, commutation of, 3725
Permanent force, 892
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4346, 4348, 4395
Quebec riots, 893
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 712
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3744
Saar valley, administration of, 4000
Soldiers 'Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Vocational loans and training, 688

Power Development. *See* Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers

Prairie Provinces. *See* Alberta; Manitoba; Saskatchewan; Western Provinces

Pre-Cooling Plants. *See* Cold Storage

Pre-emptions, sale of. *See* Lands

Preferential Tariff. *See* British Preference; Reciprocity; Treaties, French, Italian

Press
British and foreign news service, 4712
Canadian Press Limited, 1464, 2555, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727

Press—*Con.*
Canadian Press Limited—*Con.*
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Ottawa franchise, 4730
Payments to, qu. 3703
President, 2630
Subsidy, 2631, 4535, 4728
Control, 3074
Capitalistic, 2726
Fisheries publicity, 3364
Gambling in staples, justification of, 3059
Hearst syndicate, 828
Magazines and periodicals, Canadian, encouragement, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Newspapers
Alleged combine, 2522, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630, 4728
Postage rates on, 4436, 4528
Printing contracts with government, 2298, 2394, 2614
Quotations from. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Registration of ownership, 615
Size of, 4534
Statement as to treaties, 245
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2979. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Publishing business, difficulties of, 4415
Reuter's news service, 4712
Subsidy to, 2631
Windsor Telegram, Canadian Press and, 2630

Preston, Mr. R. F. (Lanark)
Introduced, 3

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., qu. 206, 247, 1362. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4312
Grande Freniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312
Laurentians, the, 4312
Quebec highways, qu. 814
Railway commissioners, qu. 1260

Price Waterhouse & Company, report, 2954

Prices. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Customs Tariff Items; Finance; Immigration; Markets; Taxation; Trade
Agricultural products, 2731, 2835, 2862, 3068-9
Higher south of boundary, 2715
Manufactured products and, 1403, 1407, 1851, 1853, 1885, 1907, 2747, 2787, 2873, 2928 3018, 3024
Past and present, 2978

Prices—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2836, 2991, 3070
Comparative, 1407
Babson, Mr. Roger, report, 1084
Bacon, 2933
Banks and, 4047
Binder twine, 4377
Building materials, 2164, 3004
Butter, 2821, 3513, 3533. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada and United States, 2801, 3025
Comparison of, 2738, 2742, 2836, 2916, 3025
Canadian Pacific railway lands, 3704
Cattle, 2871
Cheese, 3295
Coal, 1812, 2824, 3198. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Combines and, Jenks, Professor, 2600
Combines in restraint of trade. *See* Combines bill
Commodity, 1167
Agricultural and, 1083
Consumer. *See also that title.*
Producer, and, 1813, 2727, 2829
Control of, 2812, 4226
Cost, 1851
Cotton goods, 3463
Credit inflation and, 4226
Dairy supplies, 2740
Denims, drills, ginghams, 2738
Electric energy, 3784
Farm products. *See under this title,* Agricultural
Fencing and poultry netting, 2740
Fixing, 2520, 2606, 2786
Food, 2584, 2824, 2933
Clothing and, 2873
Freight rates and, 1958. *See also that title*
Furnaces, warm air, 2739
Gasoline engines, 2740
Harness, 2739
High, 2583, 2737, 2748, 2812
Hogs, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Increase, 2713
By taxation, 2716
Since 1912, 1408
Indians, charged to, qu. 3142
Inflation and deflation, 64, 647, 2800, 3024, 4226
Interest rate and, 4166
Live Stock. *See also that title*
Producer and consumer, 2877
Lumber, 2875, 3036
Manufactured goods, 2823, 2836, 2972, 3018, 3029, 3068
Higher, north of boundary, 2715
Middleman and, 1230, 2972

Prices—*Con.*
Milk, 2569, 2591
Monopolies and, 2521
Nails, 2740
Oleomargarine, 3513
Paints, 2739
Paper, 829, 2888
Potatoes, 2820
Price level, inequality of, 629
Producer and consumer, 1853, 2727, 2829
Pulpwood, 3036, 3417, 4345. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Railway ties, 3036
Re-sale, fixing of, 2525, 2546
Rubber boots, 2740
Safety razors, 2740
Sewing machines, 2739
Silks, 2397-2400
Spread
Producer and consumer, 1852, 2713, 3029
Wholesale and retail, 1230
Stabilization of, 4069, 4666
Sugar, 2646, 2888, 2933, 3069
Gambling in, 3058
Tools, 2740
United States. *See under this title,* Canada and United States
Washing machines, 2740
Wheat, 628, 3004. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Wheat Board, 2857
Woollen goods, 2990, 3459

Prime Ministers' Conference. *See also* Imperial Conference
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Prince Albert stockyards, 2779

Prince Edward Island. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Agricultural conditions, 2763, 2972
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Emigration from, 1404
Experimental farms, 460
Fox industry, 2763
Harbours and rivers, 945, 4586
Highways, 3184. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration and, 1200
Land settlement policy, 1406
Potato-growing, 131, 2763
Public buildings, 4614
Railway employees' pensions, 3195
Railway facilities, 128
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682

Prince George-Peace River projected railway, 1434, 4701

Prince Rupert, 110, 115
Civic employees union, 2086
Development of port, 261, 2734
Dry dock, qu. 1664
Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company
Creditors, 4708
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 1138
Fishing industry, 2734

Printing. *See also* Government Publications; Printing Bureau
Combines, 1623
Contracts, 1974
Newspaper and printing companies, 2298, 2394, 2614
Copyright, 2140. *See also* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Government publications, 3266
Government, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Immigration publications, 1873
Interior dept. reports, 3443
King's Printer, audit of outside accounts, 1623
Parliamentary and departmental publications, 811
Postage stamps, 1818
Presses
Duty, 2653, 2858, 3486
French treaty, 1981
Railway department, 3197

Printing Bureau. *See also* Editorial Committee; Labour
Boilers, condition of, 1736-38
Canada Gazette, 1708
Depreciation, 1711
Draper, Mr. P. M., Director of Printing, 1668
Employees, 1623
Grievances, opportunity to present, 1654
Retiring allowances, former, 3949
Fire hazard, 1736
Govt. publications, distribution, 1712
Immigration publications, 1873
Improvements, 1022
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, appointment, 1668
Labour Gazette, 1621, 1712
Miscellaneous printing, 1716
New building, 1712, 1730
M. (Mr. Beland) to reduce 1730, agreed to, 1737
Ontario Factory Act, 1736
Outside printing, cost of, qu. 3131

Printing Bureau—*Con.*
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Post Office department, 1818, 1820
Publications and documents, distribution, 1712
Purchasing Commission, 1674
Reorganization, 1731, 1735
Stationery, embossed, 1716

Printing, Joint Committee, 53, 202
Reports
First, 1156, 1361
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4436, 4510

Prison Reform. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Agricultural conditions, 1842
Binder twine, price of, 4380
Budget, 2730. Speeches in Parliament; divergence of views as to policy; condition of agriculture; failure of fiscal policy; unemployment; wages and prices, 2730; farmer, unsatisfactory condition of; farm labour; markets; agricultural products, price of; the tariff; natural resources; agricultural production; national debt, 2731; burden upon the farmer; education, cost of; immigration policy; contrast between treatment of native-born and immigrant; farmers in Parliament, 2732; financial influence and class rule in politics; economy, 2733;
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4544
Hemp bounty bill, 4380
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743, 751
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Vocational loans, 689
Vocational training, 689

Pritchard, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Private Betting. *See* Race Track Betting

Private Bills, Committee
Reports, 936, 2204, 2417, 3323, 3887, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

Private Bills Discussed
Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company, 1834
Canadian Press Limited, 1464
Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, 2281
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Woodmen of the World, 3982

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeal from Railway Commission, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Combines, decisions. *See* Combines Bill

Producers' Dairy Company, Vancouver, 2526

Producers' Dairy Company, Ottawa, 2569

Production. *See also* Agriculture; Industries; Manufacturers; Textiles
Annual, statement of, 2720
Costs, 640, 2748, 2815, 2835, 2836. *See also* Labour; Manufacturers
Lower, 2748
Public debt, 640
Exceeding demand, 2957
Implements of, control, 2722
"Produce more, consume less," 4054
Production for use, 2727
Want and, 4053

Professional Men, charges and standard of living, 2813

Profiteering, 2578. *See also* Combines Bill

Progressive Party. *See also* Address; Budget; Forke; Immigration
Alberta, 2799, 2810
Attitude, extreme, 3065
Budget amendments
Forke, Mr., 2717-18, 2809
Opportunity to move, 2711
Constitution and policy, 2791, 2793
Criticism of, 3070
Crowsnest pass agreement and, 2971
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
"Concession forced by Progressives," explanation, Mr. Forke, 2971
Demands, alleged selfish, 3030
Economic, not political, group, 1863, 3003
Expenditures suggested, 3076
Farmers in Parliament, 2732, 2787
Farmers' movement, 2884
Free trade and, 1196, 2818, 3024, 3030
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1666, 1687
Hammell, Mr., 2884
Immigration policy, 1413. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Attitude of some Progressive members on, 2774
Leader of. *See also* Forke
Campaign of 1921, 1853
New, references to, 11, 17, 27
Liberal platform of 1919, opposition, 2925
Manitoba, 2799, 2810
Organization, 2815

Progressive Party—*Con.*
Platform, 2845
Tariff, 2777
Policy and action, 2935
For Western provinces only, 2817
Predicament, of, 2814
Proportional representation, 424
Right to move amendment, 1299-1307
"Stronger and more menacing enemy," 2976
Speeches, pessimistic, 2936
Tariff and, 1421, 2737, 2745
Concessions to, 2743
Reduction of, 3024
Taxation, 2837
Union government and big interests, 1853
Withdrawals from, 2976

Prohibited Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill; Liquor; Race Track Betting
British Columbia Association, control of liquor, 2409
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Plebiscite, cost of, 2495

Promissory Notes. *See* Taxation

Promotions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Proof, Onus of. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Proportional Representation, 171
Alternative vote in single member constituencies, 388, agreed to, 389
Effect on public ownership, 426
Multi-member constituencies, M. (Mr. Good) 389, neg. on div. 434
Single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Proprietary Medicines. *See* Health

Prorogation, 4736, 4755
Probable date of, 2166

Prosecutions. *See* Combines Bill

Protection. *See also* Bounties; speeches on Budget; Industries
Adequate, 2957
Agricultural depression and, 1837-64
Agricultural implement industries, 2975
Applications for, 3235
Basis of government policy, 2718
Budget and, 3077
Case for to be heard publicly, 2718, 3016
Class privilege, 3069

Protection—*Con.*
Conditions
Comparison before and after adoption, 2819
Solution for, 3013
"Dismal failure," 3018
Double standard of buying and selling, 2872
"Economically and fundamentally wrong," 2973
Free trade and, 2806, 2922. *See also that title*
Granted without investigation, 3492
Great Britain, 2752. *See also that title*
"Illogical absurdities of," 3014
Inequity of, 2792
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid on, 2872
"Legalized robbery," 3071
Minister of the Interior and, 2805
Money and moral cost of, 3070
Oleomargarine, 3534, 3546
Ontario, 2852, 2856
Political contributions, 3071
Principle of, 2792
Intact, 2990
Unsound, 2718, 2836
Protected industries and, 2957
"Protectionist budget," 3068, 3077
Quebec, 2852
Rigid adherence to by government, 2988
Sugar refiners, 2987
Suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Tariff stability, 2648
United States and, 2751
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Wheat Board, 3235
Woollen industry, 3458

Providence, R.I. *See* Canadian National Railways; Terminals

Provinces, federal representation. *See* Redistribution

Provincial Governments. *See also* Immigration
Conferences on source of revenue, 65
Extravagance, 2797
Senators, nomination of, 1377

Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* British North America Act; Disallowance; Jurisdiction

Provincial Legislation. *See* Legislation

Provincial Rights. *See also* Disallowance; Jurisdiction; Legislation
Anglo-Japanese treaty, restriction of, 1453
Bankruptcy, 3097
Senate and, 1377
Water Powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Public Accounts. *See* Board of Audit Bill

Public Archives, 3985
Building, addition to, 1730
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, Dominion Archivist, salary, 4673

Public Buildings. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 1023
Calgary post office, 1024
Armouries, fittings and alterations, 1024
British Columbia
Bamfield, 1024
Victoria, old post office, 1024
Charlottetown, 4614
Coal purchases, 496
Economy in. *See* Printing Bureau
Experimental farms, 4629
Generally, 1025
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Improvements, repairs, 1024
Installation of fuel-saving devices, 4629
Manitoba, 4628
Brandon, 4628
Emerson, 4628
Winnipeg, 4628
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal, qu. 4512
Maritime provinces generally, 1022, 4614
Military hospitals, 4629
Montreal ordnance stores, 1022
Moose Jaw, 1023
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario
Haileybury, 4615
Hamilton, 4628
Ottawa government workshops, 4616
Rideau hall, 4627
Royal Military college, 4628
Toronto, 4624
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621
Ottawa, 1716
Daly building purchase, 1023
Departmental buildings, 1729, 4617
Compensation to architects, 4633
M. (Mr. Beland) to strike out, 1729
agreed to, 1730
Dominion archives, 1730
Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also that title*
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Policing, 778
Power for running elevators, 1025
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Quebec, 4614
Terrebonne, 2690, 4615

Public Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, 1025
Rockhead hospital, Halifax, 4613
St. John quarantine building, 1021, **1457,** 4613
Sackville, 4613
Saskatchewan, 1023, 4629
Souris, 4614
Sussex, N.B., 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Public Debt. *See also* Address; Budget; Debt; Finance; Immigration; Loans
Additions to, 2641, 2985, 3078. *See also under this title,* Increase
Budget, particulars of, 2898
Canadian National Railways, fixed charges, qu. 3323
Deficit, 3028
Increase of, 23, 91, 2814, 3072
From 1896-1922, 1173
From 1914–1923, 2842
Inheritance of present government, 2831
Interest, 2963, 2967, 3061
Magnitude of, 2963
Maturing obligations, 3822
Net debt and estimated additions, 2926
New York loan, 1922, 630, 649
Per capita debt, 2797, 2814, 2956, 2986
British Columbia, 2941
Problem of, 2784
Production cost and, 640
Reduction of, 2825, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Tariff reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 2964
War burden, 2967, 2985
Years 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914

Public Expenditure. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Government, Economy
Administration, cost of, 2785
Apportionment of, 1072, 4560
Audit. *See* Board of Audit Bill
Civil government, cost of, 2968
Demand for, 3076
East and West, 3436
Economy. *See* Ministers, Salaries
Estimate for 1923-24, 2642
Expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Extravagance, 3043
Immigration, on, 1208
Increase, 1913-23, 2842
In excess of revenue, 1230
Profitable and productive, 3005
Public Works on, 2785
Railways, appropriation by Parliament, 4397

Public Expenditure—*Con.*
Reduction of, 2986, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Retrenchment, 2784
Special bills instead of estimates, 4304
Supplementary estimates, 4420
Taxation and, 3001
Total of $548,750,714, 4554
War, 2920
1914-1922, qu. 914

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours and Rivers

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; School Lands

Public Libraries
Postal rates, 1809
Sales tax, 1870

Public Life
Integrity of,3021
Rewards of, *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Public Ownership, 4190. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways, 1614, 1618
Coal mines, 2727
Elevators, 2956
Proportional representation and, 426
Public utilities and large-scale industries, 2728
Railways, 1770, 2727, 2859, 2905, 2956, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190
Radial, 2475
Tariff taxation, 2905
Toronto street railways, 2475

Public Service. *See also* Civil Service
Militia pension to retired officers in. *See* Militia Pensions

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Extension of Calder Act for one year)
Res. 3323, 3402; 1r., 3403; 2r., com., 3r., 3977

Public Utilities. *See also* Public Ownership
Industrial disputes, 1703

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Applications for, 2830
Bridges. *See that title*
Commitments, 961, 962

Public Works—*Con.*
Department
Chief Architect's branch, qu. 2517
Engineering branch, salaries, 1017
Engineers' reports, 4571
Morrison claim, on, 4723
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 1716, 2671, 2684, 4554, 4594
House of Commons furniture, qu. 1138
Hunter, Mr. J. B., deputy minister, salary, 4671
Paymaster, qu. 1257
St. Laurent, Late Mr. A., appreciaton, 1006
Salaries, 2684
Sullivan, Mr. A. W., 381
Dredging, 1009, 4590
British Columbia, 1014
Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009, 4591
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Port Burwell, 1012
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Dry docks. *See also* Dry Dock Act Amdt. bill
Champlain, 2681
Esquimalt, 2671
Prince Rupert, qu. 1664
Vancouver, 2671
Expenditure, 3073, 3076
By provinces, qu. 3387
Graving docks, locks, etc., 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Local improvement taxes
Calgary, 1023
Kitchener, 1022
National gallery, 1018
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950
Roads and bridges, 1014. *See also* Bridges; Highways
Rugs for departmental offices, qu., 1486
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682, 4590. *See also that title*
Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers
St. John river, statement of Premier Veniot, qu. 1488
Wireless stations, 3337

Publication of Evidence. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Publications. *See* Government Publications

Publicity. *See also* Immigration; Press
Advertising, United States firms. *See* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Agent in London, Cranfield, Mr. W. T., 2927, 2983, 4707

Publicity—*Con.*
Racing information. *See* Race Track Betting

Publishers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Pugsley, Hon. William
Alien enemy property, 3823
Appointment, under Inquiries Act, qu. 1486, qu. 1993, 2498, 2494, 2710, 3043
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., and, exchange of compliments, 2503
Reparation claims, investigation, qu. 4753
Salary, 3043

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lake of the Woods bill; Labour; Lumber; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken); Natural Resources; Timber
Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2572
Gaspe, 1242
Hudson Bay region, possibilities, 1072
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Newsprint. *See also under this title,* Paper
Exemption from sales tax, 2979, 2999, 3046
Ten per cent duty proposed, 1267
Paper
Book paper, price in Canada and United States, 829
Control, 2572
Cost and sales tax, 2888
Magazine paper, prices, Canada and United States, 829
Manufacturers, payment of sales tax, 4415
Products, French treaty, 1981, 1987
Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 2886
Pulpwood
Destruction by spruce bud worm, 818
Export of, 2711, 2950
Duty on, 2828
Freight rates, 3036
Permit to cut, 4206
Prices, 3036, 4345
Prohibition of export, 2648, 2750, 3416, 4012
See also Export Act Amdt. Bill
Royal commission to inquire into, 2648, 2711, 2948, 2950, 3412, 3413, 4709
Settlers and farmers, 4513
Riordan Company, business profits tax, qu. 1974, 4490

Pulpwood. *See this title* under Pulp and Paper

Purchasing Commission, 114, qu. 1385, 1674
Authority for, qu. 2699
Beer, Mr. L. H., 4704
La Fleche, Col. L. R., 4001
Salary, 3950
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Supervision, government purchases and sales, 3950, 4001

Purchasing Power, 629, 637, 2928. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Combines; Credits; Imperial Economic Conference; Money: Prices
Dollar, 3024
Europe, depreciation of, 1859
Farmers, 1408, 1851
Lack of, 4053
Limitation of, 2716
Money, 1168, 4067, 4666
Reduced, 2737, 2812
Tariff and, 2737
Unemployment and, 2725
Work and saving, necessary to increase, 2743

Pure-Bred Cattle. *See* Live Stock, accredited herds

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, mover, 9. Visit of their Excellencies to West; deceased members, 10; beauty and history of Maritime provinces, 10-11; natural resources; new leader of Progressive party, 11; Vimy Ridge site donated by France; trade relations with France and Italy; Near East crisis, 12-13; Canadian National Railways, new board of directors; Moncton Intercolonial headquarters, 13; Sir Henry Thornton, 13-14; pension rights of Grand Trunk employees; Great lakes shipping investigation, 14; cattle embargo; diminution of unemployment; improved economic conditions; member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume) 15
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4061
British preference, attitude of Mr. Senn, 2959
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3440
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal, 1769
New board of directors, 13
Cheque tax, 3034
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 525
Civil Service appointments, 376

Putnam, Mr. Harold—*Con.*
Combines bill, 2597, 2618, 2626
Registrar, inquiry, 2626
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Farmers' earnings, 2813
French treaty bill, 2248
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 242
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2437, 2445, 2457, 2463
Judges, 2464
Nationality, dual, 2445
Secretary of State
Administration, 2464
Power of, 2457
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3515, 3569
Patents of Invention bill, 2071
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2918
Renovated butter, 4268
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Trade commissioners, 856
Truro
Park, 3440
Subway, 4454

Quarantine. *See* Health

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Champlain market station, 4446
Civil Service employes, 387
Demers, Mr. A., mail contractor, qu. 1868
Immigrants, supplies, 496
Immigration dept. employees, qu., 2517, qu. 3141, qu., 3144, qu., 4302, qu. 4752
Quebec battlefields commission, 3432
Historic sites, 3406
Riots, 893

Quebec (port)
Cattle shipments, 2807
Champlain graving dock, 2675, 2682
Cold storage, 2055
Grain
Congestion, 3765
Diversion to, 3765
Elevator, 3768
Shipment, 4233
Wheat, qu. 3820
Harbour commissioners, names and salaries, qu. 1136
Lorne graving dock, 2682
St. Charles river improvement works, 4446
Transcontinental railway and, 3681

Quebec (province)
Agricultural conditions, 1908, 2764
Bankruptcy. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Civil Code. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Community of property, 2880
Dairying industry, cold storage, 2764
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Emigration to United States, 1404, 2834
Experimental farms, 459
Harbours and rivers, 950, 1008, 4588. *See also that title*
Highways, 814, 2341, 3180. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1085, 1104, 1198, 1200
Indians, 2124
Labelle county. development, 4199
Legislature , Bankruptcy Act, 3091
Northern, conditions, 3037
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public buildings, 4614
Railways, 4189
Repatriation of Canadians, 1085

Quebec Conference, 2348

Quebec-North Shore St. Lawrence steamship service, 2175

Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4405

Quebec Savings Bank Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 4183; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Queen Charlotte Islands, 150

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Agriculture dept. officials attending fairs (Mr. Leader) 285
Arctic expedition (Mr. Parent) 4012
Bacon imports and exports (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 938
Canada Temperence Act, correspondence (Mr. Stevens) 1032
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchases (Mr. Hanson) 4303
Doctors, employment (Mr. d'Anjou) 814
Dorchester employees (Mr. Cannon) 2088
Fixed charges (Mr. Euler) 708
Hotels, (Mr. Coote) 938
Mileage (Mr. Tobin) 914
Statistics, (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Canadian Pacific Railway, (Mr. Kellner) 626; (Mr. Lucas) 625, 3704
Civil Service
Inside and outside (Mr. McQuarrie) 3264

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns— *Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Quebec city and district, (Mr. Cannon), 387
Returned soldiers (Mr. McKillop) 386
Statistics (Mr. Crerar) 207
Temporary employees, (Mr. Archambault) 1385
Made permanent (Mr. Archambault) 814
Customs and excise duties (Mr. Black, Huron) 814
Customs officials, Halton county (Mr. Anderson) 914
Dominion lands, pre-emption area (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Dorchester penitentiary, (Mr. Michaud) 494
Exports and products, agricultural (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 814
Fuel
Joint Peat Com. (Mr. Irvine) 387
Lignite Utilization board (Mr. Irvine) 387
Grain and grain trade
Elevator overages (Mr. Millar) 494
Terminal elevators (Mr. Stevens) 3821
Highways
Dundas street (Mr. Anderson) 708
Projected, Ontario (Mr. Wilson) 624
Quebec, (Mr. Prevost) 814
Immigration, staff transfer, (Mr. Lavigueur) 2517
Income tax collections (Mr. Black, Huron) 733
Indian reserves, grain production (Mr. Evans) 1139
Levis
Dry dock, (Mr. Archambault) 1261
Postmasters (Mr. Bourassa) 519
Montreal, grain shipments, (Mr. Coote) 1974
National Defence, payments (Mr. Boys) 386
Oleomargarine, butter and (Mr. Sutherland) 386
Purchasing Commission, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1385
Railway grades, etc. (Mr. McBride) 625
Railway statistics (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Sales tax exemptions (Sir Henry Drayton) 708
School lands (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Soldiers' Settlement Board, Edmonton, (Mr. Boys) 3506
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome (Mr. Kay) 4012
Valcartier camp grounds (Mr. Delisle) 2298

Race Equality. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Naturalization

Race Track Betting, 3059. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
M. (Mr. Good) 494, 709-764, neg. on div. 766

Radial Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Radiotelegraphy, 3337. *See also* Telegraphs and Telephones; Wireless
Licenses, 3338
Revenue, 3337
Manitoba, arrangement with, 3338
Military signal service, 3338
Post office and, 1780
Radio-direction finding, qu. 3820
Radiotelegraph regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Wireless service, etc., 3374

Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. Bill (License fees)
Res. 2086, 2284; 1r., 2287; 2r., 2467; com., 2468; 3r., 2468
Sections and substitutes discussed:
Apportionment of fees, 2468
Broadcasting stations, 2468
Licenses, 2467

Railway Act 1919 Amdt. Bills
1. Freight rates, discrimination (Mr. Stevens) 1r., 54
2. Return tickets (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
3. Rates, equalization of; grain movement. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton), 1r., 730

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Appeal from to Privy Council, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Branch lines, approval of, 4327
Canadian National Railways, and, 666
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Appeal to Privy Council, 1912
Calgary speech, 3191
Letter to boards of trade, British Columbia, 1915, 1945
Letter from Vancouver Board of Trade, 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 3188
Removal of, 3188
Commissioners
Addresses and occupations previous to appointment, qu. 1973
Names, salaries, etc., qu. 1260
Establishment of board in 1903, 1929
Estimates, 3188
Judgment, June 30th, 1922, 1914
Lake grain rates, 4218. *See also that title*

Railway Commissioners—*Con.*
Langley, Hon. Mr., statement, 3190
Maclean, Mr. S. J., pamphlet, 3194
Manitoba—Canadian Northern agreement, 1932
Parliamentary interference with, 1762
Rates, fixing, 1761
Report, eighteenth annual, 1659
Rutherford, the late Dr., 3192
Shipping rates, control of, qu. 2611
Subsidized steamboats, rates, 2174, 4003
Western Canada, representation, 3192

Railway Mail Service. *See* Post Office

Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway
Accidents, 3957
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 1558
Appropriations, statement, 2926
Baltimore and Ohio, promotion, 2828
Branch lines, 1568, 1735, 3006. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4339, 4344
Gaspe, 1243
Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Caraquet and Gulf Shore, purchase, qu. 1258, 2938, 2939
Construction, 1440
Co-operation of, 1965
Deficits, 2747
Department. *See* Railways and Canals
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Earnings, flour transportation, Buffalo-New York, 2960
Electrification, 3422
Excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Express charges, 2876
Freight rates. *See that title*
Gaspe-Edmundston, 1243
Gaspe peninsula, 4186
Grades, rates, qu. 625, 1917
Grain shipments, diversion, 2898. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, 1618
Highways and motors, 1619
Immigration and land settlement, 1180, 1193, 2801, 1337
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
James Bay railway, 1036-49, 1073, 1402
Labour, organized, 126, 1426. *See also* Labour
Land grants to, 1353
Lands, purchases, sales, 1739
Late Minister of. *See* Kennedy, Hon. W. C.

Railways—*Con.*
Maritime provinces, 4186
Michigan Central bridge, Niagara Falls, qu. 1864
Minister of, appointment, Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
New York Central, promotions, 2828
Pacific-Great Eastern, 4700
Peace River district, 1433, 3006. *See also that title*
Pennsylvania, promotions, 2828
Pools and running rights, 3058
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Problems of, 1880. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Public ownership, 2956. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Radial, 3056
Railway labour, wages, 2876, 3190
Railway mail service, 4529. *See also* Post Office
Payments for, qu. 3143
Railway rates, equalization. *See* Freight Rates
Railway subsidies, 2902, 4303
St. John valley railway, 4311
Settlement, western provinces, 2833
Settlements far removed from, 3431
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John; Vancouver
Statistics, 207
Strikes. *See* Labour
Surveys and inspections, 4691, 4698
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, 1071, 3056
Ties
Freight rates, 3036
Prices, 3036
Transfer charges, 2876
United States, 1618. *See also that title*
Company-owned, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix across Maine, 2902

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals; Railways
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canals. *See that title*
Department
Bell, Major Graham A., deputy minister, salary, 3195, 4557
Canada Highways Commission, 2489. *See also* Highways
Contingencies, further amount, 3377
Estimates, 1619, 2489, 3173, 3188, 3195, 3376, 3650, 3610, 3676, 3760

Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed minister, 2295
Intercolonial-Prince Edward Island pensions, 3195
Minister, appointment of, 519, 2295
Inquiry, 1081
Printing and stationary, outside service, 3197
Railway surveys and inspections, 3648
Salaries, 3195
Water powers, 3421
Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697
Expenditure by provinces, qu. 3887

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee
Change in personnel, 2252
Report, 2252

Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Raisins and Dried Currants. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff; Fruit

Ralph Connor, writings, immigration, 1181

Ralston Commission. *See* Pensions, Royal Commission

Ralston, Col. J. L. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Raney, Hon. W. E. *See* Ontario

Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Raw Materials, free trade in, 2858

Rawding, Mr., Clementsport, N.S., postmaster, 1795

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 160. Conditions in West as portrayed by western members, 160; congratulations to Mr. Forke; tariff for revenue, 161; the amendments; redistribution; Near East crisis, 162; attitude of Prime Minister, 163-164; status of Canada and foreign policy of Great Britain, 165; Canada's participation in wars of 1763 and 1812, 165-166
Budget, 2741. Cheerful sentiments of member for Skeena; tribute to Minister of Finance; budget acceptable to country; "standing pat"; "tariff stability" 2741; British preference; sales tax; beet sugar tax; wines; criticism of Sir Henry Drayton; French treaty; comparison of Canadian and United States catalogue prices, 2742; emigration to

Raymond, Mr. W. G.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
United States; cost of living; Canadians coming back; election of 1921; tariff issue; tariff concessions to Progressive party; an unresponsive attitude; wealth, levy upon; national debt; banks; widows and orphans; stockholders; capital and labour, 2743; purchasing power; natural resources, valuable only when developed; capital and capitalists, antagonism to; communists, socialists, anarchists, Bolshevists; property, protection of; Russia, example of; sugar, reduction of duty; postal war tax; postal rates, comparison Canada with United States, 2744; tariff, more important questions than, 2745; grain and grain trade; transportation; immigration and tariff go hand in hand; revenue proposals of Progressive party; income tax, proposal to increase; luxuries, taxation of; land tax; free trade, 2745; United States, trade with; tariff not a theoretical question; no surrender of Canadian market, 2746
French treaty bill, 2245
Agricultural implements, 2246
Agricultural products, 2247
Luxuries, 2742
Postage, war tax, 2744
References to speech on budget, 2747, 2756, 2787
Secession, 2244

Raymond and Talbot, Messrs., Rimouski harbour claim, 4588

Readjustment of Representation. *See* Redistribution Bill

Rebellion of 1837, 1365

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Reciprocity with United States, 85, 1196, 1223, 1246, 2243, 2810, 2948, 2966, 3049. *See also* speeches on Budget; Markets; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty; United States
Agricultural implements, 3017
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3016
Authority to negotiate, 3016
Blaine, late Hon. James G., statement, 2922
Boots and shoes, 3016, 3499
Building brick, 3017
Cattle industry and, 3082. *See also Live* Stock; Markets

Reciprocity with United States—*Con.*
"Clear-cut" issue, 3081
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493
Commercial union, 3906,3907, 3911
Commission of 1897, 3014
Fetish of, 2952
Fishing interests and, 2906, 3082, 3906
Goods on free list, 3017
Great Britain-France, 3050. *See also Treaties,* French Treaty
Herschell, Lord, 3014
History of, 2842
Leather, 3017
Markets for manufactured products, 2856
Natural and manufactured products, 2910
Natural resources, interchange, 2910
"Noble Eighteen," 2908
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2838, 2843, 2847, 2854, 2909, 2910, 2917, 2922, 2934, 2937, 2958, 2972, 2977, 2992, 3011, 3013, 3016, 3060, 3078, 3454, 3473, 3901, 3905
Fruits and vegetables, 2977
New York Times, 2968
Permanency, 3017, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2842, 2910, 2918, 3013
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718, 2778, 2832, 2931
Campaign, 2734, 3014
Defeat of, 1233, 2851, 2922, 2924, 2931
Conservative alliance with Nationalists, 2924
Evidence of attitude, Liberal party, 3010
Herring drawn across trail, 3013
Letter, Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, 3081
Liberals who opposed, 2851
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3015, 3075, 3080
Omissions from proposed agreement, 3902
Western provinces, opposition to, 2854
Screen for failure to implement tariff pledges, 2951
Sentiment towards, 3082
Standing offer by Canada and United States, 3016
Termination of recent arrangement, 2993
Treaty of 1818 weapon in dealing with United States, 2906
Use of Canadian ports by fishing vessels, 2906

Reclamation. *See* Dominion Lands; Interior; Lands

Reconstruction in Europe, 3003. *See also* Germany, Reparations

Recreation Grounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; National Parks and Reservations

Red Cross Society
Grant to, 2169
Vetcraft shops, 694

Red Deer
Hebridean immigrants, 3584. *See also* Immigration
Valley, Coal Operators' Association, 1275

Red River, Manitoba, wharf, 1000

Redistribution, 27, 40, 162. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution Bill
Delay, 2400
Electoral reforms. *See* Proportional Representation
Intention of government, inquiry, 4250
Ivel, Mr. W. M., reported employment, 733
Marshall, Mr. Duncan and, 3313
Nova Scotia, and, 73
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand counties, 667

Redistribution Bill (Readjustment of representation in the House of Commons)
1r., 250-254; 2r., 436; ref. to Special Com., 487, 572-574
Special Committee, 2979
Leave to report, 857, 937
Number of members, 488-9
Privilege, Mr. Sutherland, 1660
Reference to, 487, 572-4
Reports, qu. 2612
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4593, concurred in, 4736-42

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Budget, 2830. Tribute to Ministers of Finance and Railways; rural mail system; immigration; public works; Canadian National Railways; public debt; national problems; natural resources; oriental immigration, 2830; western provinces, conditions Ontario and Quebec, industrial development and agricultural depression; Maritime provinces, commercial disadvantage due to remoteness of market; equitable treatment of all provinces; educational opportunities, 2831

Re-Establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reforestation. *See* Forests and Forestry

Reform of Senate. *See* Senate

Regimental Funds. *See* National Defence

Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518

Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.; Bankruptcy Act

Reid, Capt. John, Hudson Bay railway, 1046

Reindeer in "Barren Lands", Mr. Stefansson's statement, 1073

Rejected Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456

Relief Work. *See* Unemployment

Renfrew postmastership, qu. 205

Renovated Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Rents. *See* Cost of Living; Public Buildings

Reparations, 2498, 4653. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Pugsley; War Claims

Repatriation. *See* Immigration; Naturalization Act

Repentigny, Que. wharf, 977

Reports Tabled, 3, 8-9, 33, 54, 74, 99, 122, 202, 250, 331, 574, 812, 767, 911, 936, 986, 1080, 1156, 1307, 1361, 1384, 1539, 1631, 1659, 1686, 1910, 2204, 2252 2611, 2837, 2885, 2926, 4075, 4510

Representation. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Readjustment of. *See* Redistribution

Research. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Central research institute, 788
Helium, discoveries in, 703, 4439
Medical discoveries, 1287. *See also* Banting, Reward for. *See titles,* M. (Mr. Ladner)
Scientific and industrial research
Discoveries, 4439
Honorary advisory council
Expenditure, qu. 731
Oil shale deposits, 2514
Patents of invention, 2082

Reservations. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Reserves. *See* Indians

Resignation of Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Resolutions, The Ninety-Two. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis)

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Responsible Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Restaurants, profiteering, 2586

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, 3551

Retired Officers. *See also* Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill
Indian Army officers, settlement in British Columbia, 1096

Retirement Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service

Returned Soldiers. *See* Civil Service; Labour, Unemployment; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill,
(Application in force though applicant died before delivery of policy; decision to be reviewed)
Res. 3582, 3743; 1r., 3745; 2r., com., 3r., 3892; Senate amdts. 4734, 4750

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuters' News Service, 4712

Revenue. *See also* speeches on Budget; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; Revenue Bills; Taxation; Trade
Amdt. (Mr. Forke), 3016
Collected during war, 2985
Direct taxation, 2836
Estimate of, 3074
1923-24, 2642
Expenditure and, 3064
French treaty and, 1983. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Income tax, 2858
Unearned income, 3026
Luxuries, tax on, 2858
Methods of raising, 2784, 3016. *See also* Taxation
New sources, 2828, 2909
Progressive policy and, 2817
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913
Tariff, 2745, 3025
Reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 3301
Unearned income, 2954, 3026

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
2. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4505
3. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; com., 4392; 3r., 4393
4. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2656, 3922, 4181, amended, 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Revenue Stamps. *See* Post Office

Revised Statutes, procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974

Rheaume, Mr. J. T. (Jacques Cartier)
Address, in reply, seconder, 16; late Mr. Lafortune, 16; Canada's financial condition; marked progress in industry; necessity for increased immigration, 17
Introduced, 3

Rhineland. *See* Germany

Rice, freight rates, 1915

Richmond and Wolfe Counties
Accredited herds, qu., 813
Soldier settlement, 913

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, expenditure, 4627

Right of Appeal. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.

Right, Petition of. *See* Petition of Right

Riley, Mr. E. T., 60

Riley's Army, transportation, 3042

Rimouski Harbour
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Wharf, 977

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4145
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4195
Canadian Press, Limited, 2587
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2587
Copyright Act, 2343
M. for amendment of, 495
Deputy Ministers, French language, 1805-08
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1805

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Emigration to the United States, 1173
Farm labour, 1174
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Empire settlement scheme, 1175
Policy, 1172
Restriction of, 1174
Newspaper postage, 4535
Population, net increase, 1173
Post offices, number in Montreal, qu. 3135
Public debt, increase, 1896-1922, 1173
Public ownership of railways, 4195
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 720
Royal Academy of Arts bill, 281
Rural depopulation, 1174
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4185
Wine and beer excise taxes, qu. 518

Riordon Pulp and Paper Company
Business profits tax, 4490
Arrears, qu. 1974

Riots, Aid of militia in. *See* National Defence; Troops

Rivière du Lièvre wharf, 978

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Agricultural conditions, 1837, 1846
Agricultural implements, standardization, 796
Australia
Trade treaty with, 1848, 3475, 3476
Visit to, 1848-49, 2815, 3017, 3474, 3475
Belgian exposition, 496
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3457
Woollen goods, 3459
Business conditions, review of, 1837, 1846
Canada-West Indies treaty, 3378
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, 3385
Canadian travelling exhibition in France, 4712
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 4290
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 487, 2139, 2287, 2343, 2436, 3154
Amdt. clause 2, 2291
Cost of living, 1812
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine), 651
Dairying industry, 1839
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 663
Farm mortgages, 1839
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4549
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
French treaty bill, 2239
Balance of trade, 2239
Boots and shoes, 2240
Bronze powder, 2017
Favoured nation, 2242
Fuel supply, 796
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 811
Government publications, 811
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of grain at United States ports, 3649, 3961
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 4709
Litigation, 2045
Validity, 782
Dockage, 783
Elevators
Edmonton, 4718
Government
Grain passing through, 2037
Value, 2037
Halifax, 4714
Lethbridge, 4718
Mixing, 2036
Montreal, short weights, complaint, 2037
Ontario, 2037, 2039
Quebec, grain shipment, 4233
Screenings, 2039, 2041, 2254
Vancouver improvements, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commissioners, board of, 2036
Salaries, 4709
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1764, 4710, 4711
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1210
Rates, 4290
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Screenings, 2254
Shipments, congestion, 3767
Transportation, insurance, 3764
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 4587
Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 3960, 4218-35, 4276, 4285, 4290
Lake grain rates, royal commission, 4710
Report, 2885, 3045
London Corn Exchange, complaint, 3649
Oil bounty, Alberta, 2510
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Oil, fuel and lubricating, standardizing, 809
Oriental immigration, 507
Patents of Invention bill, 331, 2064, 2083, 2087, 3154

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Patents of Invention—*Con.*
Appeal to Exchequer court, 2080
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2065, 2128
Domicile, election of, 2070
Foreign patents, 2068
Petroleum bounties, 780
Raisins and dried currants, 3476. *See also under this title,* Australia
Russian trade mission, 987
Shipping combines, prosecution, 4228
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4701
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3377
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3385
Contracts, 2172
Inspection, 2178
Mackenzie river, 2176
Magdalen islands, 2174
Mediterranean, proposed, 1637
Northern Alberta, 2176
Pictou-Magdalen islands, 2174
Railway Commission and, 4004
Rates, control of, 2174
Subventions, 2171
Victoria-West Coast-Vancouver island, 4003
Toronto seed branch building, 4625
Trade. *See also under this title,* Australia, French Treaty
Annual report, 1910
Commissioners, 1837
Exports, 1838
Oriental, 507
West Indies-Col. Amery, 3392
Trade and Commerce dept.
Canada Grain Act, 2035
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 2033, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701
Patents and Copyright branch, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade Marks and Designs bill, 331, 2063, 2293
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Wheat board legislation, 2696
Extension by order in council, 3045
Woollen industry, protection, 930

Roberge, Mr. Eusèbe (Megantic)
Introduced, 3

Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Roberts, Hon. W. F., secession, 3145

Roberval, Que. wharf, 978

Robichaud, Mr. J. G. (Gloucester)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4120
Budget, 2935. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Progressive party; policy futile and action ill-advised, 2935; economic conditions and remedies; "blue ruin" speeches; confidence in future; remedy proposed worse than disease; conditions prior to 1896; return of Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier; revival of business; depression following war; country again on road to prosperity; trade revival shown by import and export figures, 2936; Banking and Commerce committee, inquiry; British preference, increase of; direct importation; reciprocity with United States; Canadian seaports, 2937; Bay of Fundy; Shippegan; Hudson Bay railway; wheat shipment, facilities of eastern ports; Sir Sandford Fleming, report, 2938; Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway; comparative mileages, 2939; National railway policy; fishing industry; disabilities under United States tariff; legislation; modus vivendi; secession talk, 2940
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3394
Coastal regulations, suspension of, 2960
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3365
Fish, express rates on, 3365
Introduction, 3
Pensions, 3710
Vimy Ridge memorial, 184
Wharves, revenue, 976

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (King's, N.S.)
Address in reply, 72; redistribution, effect on Nova Scotia; immigration campaign; condition of European markets, 73
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 879
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 834

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Montreal post office, daylight saving, qu. 3143

Robson, Judge. *See* Combines

Roche, Hon. W. J., 354-5. *See also* Civil Service Commission

Rockefeller Foundation, hospital standardization, 2934

Rocky Mountain Park. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Rodin's Statue of France, 2832

Rods. *See* Copper Bars or Rods; Steel

Roentgen, discoverer of X-rays, 1287

Rogers, Hon. Robert, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Rondeau, Ont. pier, 983

Root Vegetables. *See* Vegetables

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection, Bill (Inspection certificate evidence of grade and condition). Mr. Caldwell. 1r., 937

Rosoman, Mr. Cyril E., postmaster, Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Ross, Mr. George. *See* Post Office

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Annual drill, 4636
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Breakwaters, appropriations for, 4563
British preference, woollen industry, 3462
Budget, 2932. Amendment; Finance Minister's statement unsatisfactory; Liberal platform of 1919; European unrest and dissatisfaction; British navy best guarantee of peace; exodus; reasons for the movement; preference of British immigrants for Australia and New Zealand, 2932; proposals to disband mounted police, discontinue military training and curtain naval service; pre-election promises and pledges; food prices not going down; tuberculin test; special delivery letters, cost of; military training expenditure and results; cabinet ministers—are they required?; income tax, widows' exemption; reciprocity; domination of United States; educational system; medical course; standardization of hospitals;political and social system; weighing and measuring babies; moral influence; Canada's favourable position; not advisable to open door to United States, 2934; chief reliance upon British stock; confidence in courage and bravery of French-Canadian race, 2935
Cadet services, 879
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Certified milk, 3300
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 540
Grant, Dr., civil service, 541

Ross, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3594
Hector celebration, 4636
Immigrants rejected, 706, qu. 1992
Medical advisory boards, 697
Military hospitals, qu. 282, 669, 673
Maintenace cost, qu. 812
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Milk pasteurization, 3300
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3724
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743
Portsmouth postmaster, 1832
Shipping rates, 3783
Soldiers' Civil Re-establshment
Hospitals. *See under this title,* Military hospitals
Salaries, 669
Soldier settlement, 2030
Board, qu. 2180
Ontario, qu. 492
Salaries, 2017
Tuberculin test, 2933, 3284, 3300
Welland canal construction, 3782

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Collingwood harbour dredging, 4578
Feeding Stuffs Act, conference, 606
Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, qu. 707
Millfeeds conference, 606
Postal appointments, 1801
Rural mail carriers
Compensation for loss, 1833
Remuneration, 1792

Roumanian Loan, qu. 623, 2010

Rowell, Hon. N. W., 318

Royal Academy of Arts, Bill respecting, (Mr. Rinfret) 1r., 281

Royal Assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 866. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Naturalization
Cape Sabine, post, 3944
Cost and estimates, 1148
Duties, seven day week, 4514
Enforcement of federal statutes, 699, 777
Espionage, 1142
Estimates, 774, 1163
Fitzpatrick, Mr. F. J. E., article in Maple Leaf, 1140
Force and officers, 1141

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—*Con.*
Investigations and convictions by, 1144-5
Legal adviser, Mr. Donald Downie, 777
Motions for disbandment of, 2933
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 816, 1139, neg. on div, 1152
Naturalization, 779. *See also that title*
Nelson district withdrawal from, 2943
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, enforcement, 697
Ottawa departmental buildings, policing, 778
Pay, 777
Pensions, 774, qu. 1362
Reorganization, 776
Scrip, qu. 1362
Seizure of books and property, 1142
Strength and work of force, 1144

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Royal Commissions. For individual commissions, *see their titles*
Appointments to, 2710. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1209-1212
Judges and, 3604
Lake grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. *See* Steamship Services

Royal Military College, 4628

Royal Naval College. *See* Esquimalt

Royal Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Rugs, for departmental offices, qu. 1486

Ruhr District, invasion. *See* Germany, Reparations

Rules of the House. *See* House of Commons

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Marcil; Speaker

Rural Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Rural Credits. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits

Rural Depopulation, 35, 1126, 1165, 1174, 1182, 1189, 1234, 1394, 1406, 1432, 1844, 1860, 1906. *See also* Emigration; Farmers; Labour; Population
Causes of, 1133
Economic conditions, 1856

Rural Depopulation—*Con.*
Great Britain in, 1854
United States, 2829
Wealth, production of, 1856

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Post Office, Postmasters

Rush-Bagot Treaty. *See* Treaties

Russell, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868

Russia
Bolshevism, 2744
Immigration, 1340, 2845
Relations with, 44-45, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986, 987

Rutherford Commission. *See* Race Track Betting

Ryckman, Mr. E. B. (East Toronto)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Budget, 2912. Budget disappointing; accounts not balanced, currency depreciated, exchange unfavourable; trying to satisfy too many factions; incidence of taxation; summer trade; stability not finality; sales tax; pyramiding; passing on to farmer, housewife and labourer, 2912; cigarette tax; income tax; production and revenue lessened; based on fallacy that taxation of rich relieves poor; Mr. Otto H. Kahn; income tax reduction in United Kingdom and United States, 2913; capital diverted from industry to tax free bonds; immigration and investment discouraged; graduated income tax; alternative between new taxation or economy, 2914; ministers' salaries and members' indemnities; aristocracy of spending; civil service; finances complicated; ordinary and war expenses should be specially provided for, 2915; substitution of turnover for sales tax; farmers and the tariff; price comparison between Canada and United States; William Henry Seward on United States tariff, 2916; not enough protection; reciprocity in tariff taxation; imports of agricultural products; farmers' national policy; reciprocity proposals, 2917; reciprocity agreement of 1911; United States out for themselves; war debts; United States would "crash through any agreement"; 2918; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2919

Ryckman, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Canadian National Railways
New positions and salaries, 2701
Paris offices, 3631, 3680
Cheque tax, 3933
Combines bill, 2630
Appointments, 2665
Technicalities, 2665
Government elevators, value, 2037
Labour dept., economies, 1624
Masters and mates, 2668
Patents of Invention bill, 2070
Domicile, election of, 2072
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3864, 3881
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2468
Toronto harbour improvements, 984, 2678, 4578

St. Alexis wharf, 980

St. Andrew's Dam fishway, 1000

St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

St. Andrew's lock, 2682

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental farm, 460, qu. 1028

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 979

Ste. Anne's lock, Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph line, qu. 3138, qu. 3262

St. Barnabe Nord postmaster, 1830

St. Bruno postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3140

St. Charles wharf, 980

Ste. Claire postmaster, qu. 1031

St. Croix
Harbour, 2899, 2938
River, bridges, 2342

St. David postmistress, 1489

St. Jean d'Evangeliste, postmaster, qu. 2698

St. Jean d'Orleans wharf, 980

St. John, N.B. (city)
Employment office, 3453
Immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Martello tower, 3444
Members of Parliament, visit to, 2503
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Water supply, 1022
Station, 2481, 3188, 3645, 4310, 4445
Terminals, train shed, 3188, 3645
Warehouse facilities, 308

St. John, N.B. (port), 2676
Canadian National Railways, 1767
Grain shipments, 261, qu. 1484
Harbour commissioners, qu. 911
Importation through. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Improvements, 109, 4610
Courtenay bay, 109, 2676
Pilots, 3358
Wharfage tolls, 975

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill
(Extension of time)
Res. 3145, 3403; 1r., 2r., com., 3405; 3r., 3406

St. John-Bay of Fundy steamship service, 2176

St. John-Bear River steamship service, 2176

St. John-Digby steamship service, 2176

St. John River
Bridges, 2342
Sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Wharves, taking over of, qu. 1488

St. Joseph d'Alma postmaster, qu. 3140

St. Laurent, late Mr. Arthur. *See* Public Works

St. Lawrence Ship Canal, surveys, 3647
Hydrographic, 3336

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 3339
Dredge No. 12, Capt. Bilodeau, qu. 1487
Maintenance and dredging, 3375, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374. *See also* Sorel

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 2979. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Hudson Bay railway; Lake Grain Rates; Vancouver Harbour bill; Water Powers; Welland canal
Aerial survey, 1776
Expenditure, 3076
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 665
International Joint Commission, 3427
Parliamentary discussion of project, 2807
Power
Development, qu. 490, 2682
Dominion Power Board, investigation, 3427
Exportation, 658
Power canal, qu. 204
Water powers, 3782
Shipping rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Grain, 3343
United States
Agreement with, 3705, 3762
Negotiations with, 665, 3208, 4513

Ste. Marie, Mr. L. T., appointment, qu. 1028

St. Mary's Cape, N.S., breakwater, 941

St. Michel de Bellechasse wharf, 980

St. Moïse, Que., agent, 1489

St. Omer, Que., wharf, 980

St. Père, Mr. E. C. (Hochelaga)
Civil Service Commission, 1188
Emigration to United States, 1188
Immigration
Agents, appointment, 1188
Farmers and farm labourers, 1188
Labour, attitude, 1186, 1187
Policy, 1186
Labour, unemployment, 1187
Repatriation, 1188

St. Peter's, N.S. postmaster, qu. 1488, 1795

Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588

St. Stephen, N.B. industrial centre, 2901

Saar Valley. *See also* League of Nations
Administration, 3995, 4000
Commission, 4653

Sackville public building, 4613

Safety League. *See* Canadian National

Sailors. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine
Institutions for assisting, 2167

Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers Bill
Res. 193; 1r., 195; 2r., 277; ref. to Agriculture Com. 277; com. 2105; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts. 3150

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Agricultural conditions, 1841
Binder twine, price, 4386
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549, 4550
Government telegraphs, qu. 383
Grain
Dockage and screenings, 786
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225-34
Marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 304
Hudson Bay railway, 3647
Labour, hours, 1841
Penitentiaries, 773
Railway department, printing, 3197
Saskatchewan Co-operative creamery, 185

Sales, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 269
Vancouver terminal elevator, qu. 517
Addition to, cost, qu. 621
Yorkton income tax office, qu. 384

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Bill; Taxation

Saline Lake Deposits, Western Canada, 3198

Salmon Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Salvage Cases. *See* Soldier Settlement

Salvation Army
Immigration, 1430, 1476, 1480-1
Canada Colonization Association, 1093
Child, 1470

Sample Market. *See* Grain, Marketing of

Sanctuaries, Birds and Wild Animals. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Sardine Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Saskatchewan. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2766
Automobiles in, 82, 148. *See also* Automobiles
Canadian Air Force, 1748-51
Co-operative creameries, 2779
Co-operative Elevator Company, 2779
Dairying industry, production, 1921, 2744
Debentures, sale of, 2770
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061, 3942
Dredging, 1012
Dunning, Premier, statement regarding budget, 2770-1
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Hail Insurance Commission, 2770
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Highways, 3185. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, domestic servants, 1099, 1476
Indians, 2145
Lands
Reclamation, 1065
Southwestern, 1353
Mennonites, 1229
Mixed farming, 2773
Public buildings, 1023, 4629
Resources, report of Mr. Crean, 1060
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Calcutta trade commissioner, 1840
Settlers' relief, 3447
Sunset lake postmaster, claim, 1832

Saskatchewan—*Con.*
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Wheat board, res. of legislature, 3045

Saskatoon post office, 1785

Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa, Hindu franchise, 508, 4641-65. *See also* Hindus

Saturday Night, statement, labour shortage, 1125

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sayabec postmistress, dismissal. *See* Post Office; Boulay

Scandals. *See* War

Scandinavia, immigration from, 1085

Scarfe Varnish Works, qu. 1485

Schofield, Rev. Dr., res. Pension Board, 3399

Scholarships. *See* Students

Schools. *See also* Education
Attendance age, 1179
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Closed for lack of money, 1202, 1342, 1388, 2836
Lack of in the West, 1390
Lands, 3398. *See also* Dominion Lands
Reversion of, 3445
Sections reserved for. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 1385, 3982, 4202
New, opening of, 1889
Oriental children, 2326, 2485
Segregation, 1896
School homes for immigrants, 1227
Taxes, unpaid, 3256

Scientific and Industrial Research. *See* Research

Scientific Men, neglect of, 1294. *See also* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scotland, immigration from, 1876. *See also* Immigration, Hebrideans

Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, Grain Inquiry Commission, 4711

Scott, Mr. Frank. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Scottish Aid Society, immigration, 1876

Scottish Pioneer Association, Hector celebration, 4705

Screenings. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Seamen
Desertion of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference; Treaties; Ports

Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, price comparison, 2737, 2742

Secession, 2940. *See also* Maritime Provinces; Nova Scotia; Western Provinces
British Empire from, 2244
Nova Scotia; 2057, 2177, 2243-4, 2977
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement of, 3145
Talk of, 2977, 3067
Western provinces, 2808, 2814

Second Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill

Secondary Amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secret Agreement, Japanese immigration, 1448

Secret Treaties. *See* Near East Crisis

Secretary of State
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, alien enemy property, custodian, 3823, 4671
Salaries and contingencies, 2392, 2494
Naturalization. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Correspondence, Vancouver judges, 2199
Certificates, issue, 2182. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Naturalization Acts, expenses under, 2495
Public archives, 3985
War claims adjustment, 2495. *See also* Aliens; War

Securities, Issue of. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

Sedition. *See also* Criminal Code Act Amdt. Bill; Immigration Act Amdt. Bill; Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, 1142

Seed. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Fairs, 599, 600
French treaty, 1984
Purchasing Commission, qu. 279, 599, 601
Seed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444

Seed Testing and Inspection, Bill
(Grading and qualities of seed)
Res. 195; 1r., 198; 2r., and ref. to Agriculture Com. 277-8; com.. 2304; 3r., 2308
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants, 2307
Clark, Mr. George H., 2304
New varieties, registration of, 2307
Noxious weeds, 2305
Primary, 2305
Plant, definition of, 2304
Registration through Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Sale of seeds for export, 2307
Samples to be taken in presence of witness, 2308
Seed commission, 2304
Time limit for complaint, 2308

Seeds, Noxious, 2305, 4378. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill

Seizures. *See* Customs and Excise; Fish and Fisheries

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk, Man. wharf, 1000

Senate
Abolition of, 1376
Amendments concurred in:
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 4201
Board of Audit Act, 4733
Canadian National Railways (Securities) bill, 4754
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 4536
Combines bill, 3504
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4736
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 4733
Fruit Containers bill, 3150
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 3149

Senate—*Con.*
Amendments concurred in—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 2050
Patents of Invention bill, 3154
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744-50
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4734, 4750
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4734
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 4750
Amendments, non-concurrence
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4357, 4592
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., Joint committee, 730
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4688, 4689, 4694
Rejection of, 4753
Divorce proceedings, publicity. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Elective, 2908
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1364
Estimates, salaries and contingencies, 2694, 3949
Fowler, Hon. Senator, remarks on immigration bill, 3032
Grain-carrying trade, committee report, 2899
Hudson Bay railway report. *See* Hudson Bay Railway, M. (Mr. Knox)
Joint committee. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Lougheed, Senator, remarks on Immigration bill, 3032
Members of House of Commons appointed to, 2710
Progressive party and, 1378
Reform, 2908
Senators
Age limit, 1376
Attendance, 4007, 4008
Indemnity, 4008
M. (Mr. Leader) for reduction of, 1153
Pensions, 1376
Vested right of, 1376

Senate and House of Commons
Joint Committee on matters of common interest, 4007
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Indemnity; attendance)
Res. 4184; 1r., 2r., com., 4185, 4236; amdt. (Mr. Gardiner) six months' hoist, neg. 4246; amdt. (Miss Macphail) to refer back, neg. 4247; 3r., 4247; Senate amdts. 4734

Senate and House of Commons—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Attendance of senators and members, 4007
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Personal explanation—Mr. Gervais, 4249
Sessional allowance, 4185, 4236
Amdt. (Miss Macphail) to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Accredited herd system, qu. 492
Agricultural Instruction Act, renewal of, qu. 490
Budget, 2957. Protection, adequate; tariff proposals and Liberal pre-election pledges; need of profitable markets; British preferential tariff, 2957; mistake to penalize Canadian industry; woollen industry affected by increased preference; competition from other countries; artificial silk duty; knitting factories threatened with ruin; petition against increase of British preference and alteration of sales tax; copper and hemp bounties; reciprocity; Canadian and United States duties on agricultural products, 2958; imports; home market for manufactured and agricultural products; unbalanced budget; economy; high standard of living, 2959
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Seed inspection, 198
Six Nation Indians, 1307

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Sessional Indemnity. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act

Settlement. *See* Immigration; Soldier Settlement

Settlers. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Land for. *See* Immigration
Relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Transportation facilities, 2172

Sevres Treaty. *See* Near East Crisis

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Budget, 2784. National debt, revenue; methods of raising; deficits; taxation; increase in national business; expenditure; retrenchment; immigration 2784; natural resources; retrenchment, public works, civil service, superannuation; taxation and extravagance, 2785; taxes—income, business, consumers, sales; national policy based on special privilege; tariff, downward revision; labour unions; strikes; high cost of living; prices, control of; agriculture, condition of; farmers in Parliament; partisan politics, cost of; prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 2787; combines; spread between producer and consumer; disappointing budget; protective feature of tariff; the amendment
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*

Seymour Narrows, obstruction, 3333

Shale Deposits. *See* Oil

Shareholders. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (Calgary West)
Address in reply, 66. Gift from France of Vimy Ridge, 66; Parliament and economy; administration of national parks; four cardinal principles of taxation, 66-67; agriculture essential industry of Canada, 67; financial and economic depression in farming industry, 67-68; cost of grain production, 68; high transportation and insurance rates, 68-69; western grain route, 69; cattle industry and embargo; co-ordination of branches of Agriculture department; revision of Bank Act, 70; government immigration policy, 70-71; Near East crisis, government's action, 71; General Smuts at Imperial Conference of 1921; personal standing and obligation to constituents, amdt. to amdt., 72
Annual training, 864
Banff national park
Electric plant, 3436
Power rights, 496, 3750
Calgary Power Company, 3938
Springs and cave, 496
Water powers, 3420
Banff-Windermere highway, 3437
Bank Act, revision, res. Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4089-4105; 4134-4160; 4509
Bank mergers, 4134, 4150
Interest at 7 per cent, 4103
Maximum rate, amdt. 4148, neg. 4148
Shareholders' audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4089
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1505

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
Business of the House
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1302
Supply, amdt. to amdt., 1302
Business profits tax, 4491
Cadet services, 877
Calgary
Power Company, privileges, 3750
Unemployment relief, 1681-3
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 4709
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3377, 3389, 3397
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3410-13
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, combine, 1395
Canadian national parks, automobile admission fee, 3943
Canadian National Railways
Coal, purchase of, qu. 4437
Alberta, qu. 1363. 4752
Employees' pensions, 288
Paris offices, 3650-74
Transportation combine, 1395
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Canadian Press, Limited, 4712
Subsidy, 4728
Canadian representation in United States, 4664
Cheque tax, 3934
Chilled beef, 464
Civil Service Act
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253
Homestead inspectors, 3252
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 363, 382, 519
Special committee, 937
Civil Service bonus, 1664
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Civil Service Commission, 346
Combines
Bill, appointments, 2665
Transportation, 1395
Cost of living. *See also* Civil Service bonus
Freight rates and, 1958
Reduction, 1394
Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Betting information, 2282
Guessing competitions, 2282, 2283
Customs and excise, salaries, 3276
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4253
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4668
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2360
Dominion lands and parks.
Automobile admission fee, National parks, 3943
Salaries, 3250

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Egypt, British policy, 4662
Emigration to United States, 1393
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Grant, 3413
Experimental farms, 464
Freight rates, 1394
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1958
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1956
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Halibut treaty, 4132
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1690
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4645, 4664
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3130, 4442
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4690
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1396
Advances to, qu. 517
Results, 1105
Child, 1472
Estimates, 1387
Policy, 1392
Imperial Conference, 4645-63
Constitutional changes, 4664
Policy, 4662
Publicity, 4665
Indemnity of members, 4009, 4247
International Labour Conference, 1645-6
Interest rate. *See under this title,* Bank Act
Labour
Coal miners' strike, district 18, 1629
Industrial disputes investigation, 1629
Labour Gazette, 1622
Lack of Confidence vote, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 213
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225
Land speculation, 1395
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Merchants' Bank failure, 4150
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrison claim, Little Anse, 4724
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2123
Northwest Territories Act, procedure, qu. 1974
Oil-well drilling machinery, duty, 3917
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions
Appeal boards, 683
European war and active militia, 2167, 3723
Legislation, 2519
Officials, conduct of, 4703

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1649
Royal commission reports
Interim, 2167
Printing, 3401
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401
Permanent force, 892
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3130
Physical training, 877
Political patronage, 3347
Postal rates, public libraries, 1809
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4679
Privilege—Grain Growers Guide, 987
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 4629
Public expenditure, East and West, 3436
Purchasing Commission, 3950
Authority for, qu. 2699
Railway rates
Attorney General, B.C. vs. C.P.R., 1917
Railway commission judgment, 1917
Redistribution, 4741
Renovated butter, 4253
Rideau canal, 4691
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, taxes, qu. 1974
Rocky Mountain park
Hudson Bay Company claim, qu. 2418
Stipendary magistrate, 1739
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778
Rural depopulation, 1394
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, public libraries, 1870
Scholarships, international, provision for, 878
Screenings, purchase of, 785
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4185, 4238-4247
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747, 3894
Soldier Settlement Board, extension, 1128
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3346
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4077
Tariff, high protection cost, 1394
Taxation, burden of, 1394
Tourist traffic, 3437
War, Canada's participation, 4663
Water powers, 3420. *See also under this title* Banff
Western provinces, conditions, 1396
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, Standard Shipping Company, 1704
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Grain dockage, qu. 3505
Port Arthur elevator, qu. 2612
Renfrew postmastership, qu. 204
Toronto harbour dredging, 1011

Sheep-Raising Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock; Wool

Shells. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Sherwood, Mr. H. Crossley, letter, 519

Shippigan, port, 2938

Ships. *See* Vessels

Shipping and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Freight Rates, Shipping; Harbours and Rivers; Marine; Naval Service; Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Vessels
All-Canadian routes between East and West, 3273
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. *See also that title.*
Shipping combine, 4278
War claims, qu. 3142
Canadian shipyards, closing, 1338
Cattle boats. *See also* Live Stock
Alleged unsanitary condition, 2613
Space, 2133
Certificates
Certificated masters on coasting vessels, 3971
Steamship. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Dollar Shipping Company, 3273
Great Britain, 3072
Great Lake Transportation Company, lease of freighters, 3848
Harling, Thomas & Son, shipments via Panama canal, 3273
Hirtle, Schooner Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Kirkwood line, 2175, 3846
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
London Guarantee & Accident Company, qu. 1138
Ocean ports, 2898. *See also* Ports
Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Immigration
Tramp steamers, 2127
Registrar. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343

Shipping and Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Shipping associations. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Shipping combines, 3845. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Ships purchased from foreigners, 3972
Standard Shipping Company, 4278
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Steamship services. *See that title*
Strikes. *See* Labour

Shire Horses, gift to Canada, 2207, 2253

Shortages. *See* Grain

Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Sick Mariners' Dues. *See* Health

Sifton, Sir Clifford
Coal supply, 1265
Clyde, the, mechanics from, 1204
Fuel supply, 788
Hudson Bay railway, 1047
Immigration, 1181-3
Importation of British workmen, 1186
"Man with sheepskin coat" 1204
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Lake grain rates, 4285
Standard of living, 1168

Silesia, partition of, 3995

Silks. *See* Custom Tariff; Treaties, French Treaty; Textiles

Siloam, schooner. *See* Vessels

Silver. *See* Mines and Minerals

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3356
Navigation, safeguards, qu. 812

Sinclair, Mr. John A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
References to, 2996, 3012

Sinclair, Upton, press, capitalistic control, 2726

Singapore Naval Base, 2469, qu. 3506, qu. 3820, 3822, 4654

Single Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Single Tax. *See* Land; Taxation

Single Transferable Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Six Nations. *See* Indians

Skeena River. *See* British Columbia, Fishing Licenses

Sloan, Hon. William, Asiatic immigration, 1901

Smart, Mr. Bogue. *See* Immigration

Smith, Mr. A. H. *See* Drayton-Acworth Commission

Smith, Goldwin, protection, 3071

Smuggling. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Taxation

Smuts, General, 31, 72. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Imperial Conference

Snider, Judge, report, 1714

Snowden, Mr. Philip, British labour party, 2722

Social Agencies. *See* Labour, Unemployment

Social Service Council. *See* Race-Track Betting

Social Standards, work, popular attitude, 1189

Socialism, 123, 631, 2727. *See also* Labour
Macolm island Finnish settlement 1247

Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Soft Drinks, tax on. *See* Confectionery and Beverages; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Soldier Advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Bill

Soldier Settlement. *See also* Soldier Settlement Board
Carleton county, farms sold, qu. 1013
Fire insurance, 496
Lands
Reversion of, 3257
Taxation, 3256, 3260
Loans
Black, Mr. W. J., 2019
Expenditures and, qu. 2207
Missisquoi and Brome counties, 4012
Ontario, qu. 492
Questionaire sent out by Miss Macphail, 1845
Richmond county, farms sold, qu. 913
Wolfe county, farms sold, qu. 913

Soldier Settlement Board, 51. *See also* Immigration
Advances under act and cost, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Amounts due Dominion government, qu. 814

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Advice and assistance to immigrants, 1126
Edmonton, insurance, 3506
Estimates, 1910, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2986
Field supervisors, location of immigrants, 1089
Hebridean immigrants, 3252, 3596
Immigration, 170, 1179, 1255, 1406
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Land sales, alleged attempt to bribe supervisors, 1091
Legal expenses, 2018
Loans, 2018
Members, salaries and expenses, qu. 2180
Moss, Mr. H. H., illegal arrest, 2030
Peace river district, 1185
Salaries, 1910, 2017
Salvage cases, qu. 206, 2018
Staff, 2018

Soldiers. *See also* National Defence; Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
British soldier, deportation, 2254
Burial of destitute, 693, 695
Hospitals, 669. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Imperial and foreign, treatment of, 691
In distressed circumstances abroad, 1456
National monument, Ottawa, 2685
Official advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Returned soldiers
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Branch banks and, 4122
Canadian legion, Victoria, B.C., res. 2942
Civil service. *See also that title*
Appointments, 1795
Dismissals, 1772
Employment, 1772
Clearing land, 1185
Deaths from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Naturalization, 1379
Pensions, 2942. *See also* Pensions
Postmasterships and, 1799
Sheltered employment, 694
Vetcraft shops, 694
Treatment of, 2942
Unemployment, 2168
Relief, 689, 1679, 1681, 2168
Vocational training, 686

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment
Department of, 113, qu. 282, 3893, 4075. *See also* National Defence; Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Amalgamation with National Defence, 3893
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Estimates, 668
Expenditure, 2967, 3893
Reduction of, 23, 2032, 2987
Hospitals, 668, qu. 812. *See also that title*
Brant, closing, 1995, 4075, 4303
Euclid Hall, Toronto, closing, 4075, 4303
Imperial and foreign soldiers, treatment, 691
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Joint industrial council, 1654
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 677, 696
Medical treatment and examination, 670, 687
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 670, 708, 2013
North Essex election, 2013
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pay and allowances, 687
Pensions, 3707. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 2166. *See also* Pensions; Returned Soldiers
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Toronto Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Mrs. Van Koughnet, 4726
Training, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 1681, 2168
Vancouver office, appointments and dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Vocational loans, 687

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department Act Amdt. Bill
(Review and appeal tribunals; official soldier advisers; evidence on oath)
Res. 3648, 3745; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3892; 3r., 3895; Senate amendments, 4750
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, review and appeal tribunals, 3892
Official soldier advisers, 3894
Power to take evidence on oath, 3895
Regulations, medical and appeal boards, 3892

Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, qu. 3506, 3507, 4725

Solicitor General. *See* Justice

Sorel
Postmaster, appointment of, qu. 1487

Sorel—*Con.*
Shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344, 3374
Maintenance and operation, 3374

Souris, Man., public building, 4614

South Africa
Immigration policy, 1474, 1882
Senate, constitution, 1370

South America
Senates, constitution, 1373
Steamship service, 3377

Southampton, Ont. breakwater, 984

Soviet. *See* Russia

Spain
Senate, constitution, 1373
Trade with, 2397
Treaty with France, 2219

Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial forest patrol, 1776

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of:
Acoustics of chamber, 4594
Adjournment
To await action of Senate, 4754
To discuss, etc., 1540, 2886
Against rule, unless urgent, 3589-90, 4441
Debate to be confined to matter at issue, 3599, 3601
Must not revive former discussion, 4296
No right of reply, 3595, 3603
Except by consent, 2896
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Baker memorial, Joint commttee, 730
Bills
Drafting by law officers of House 494
First reading, explanation brief, 487
Not alterable except by authority of House, 3326
Reference to Private Bills Com. 4308
Second reading
More elaborate explanation, 487
Notice in writing, 3399
Principle only to be discussed, 3091
Third reading by consent, 4141
Time fixed for consideration, 4236
To be preceded by res. 4248
Trade, 331
Urgent and pressing, 4392

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Business of the House, to-morrow, 3750
Chair to be addressed, 2921
Committees
Discussion of questions not referred, 3267, 3270
M. for not debatable, 4013
M. to print proceedings, 3399
Notice of motion to go into, 3582-3
Reference in anticipation of report, 3574-6
Reports, concurrence by unanimous consent, 1739, 1991
Special
Appointment, two days notice necessary, 572
Membership limited to fifteen, 937
Redistribution bill, reference, 488
Consent, unanimous, 3326
Conversation, 1872
Debate
Anticipated or repeated, 1271, 3326-30
Closed if mover answers question, 2523
Decorum, 406
Irregular, 1668
Matters under consideration by committees, 2930
Member
May not speak without consent after mover has closed, 1080
Must address Chair, 2921
Mover closes, 393, 421, 568, 1210, 2523, 4474
Notice of M. to go into com. 3582, 3583
Peace and tranquillity, 3557
Previous, references to, 1687
Reference should be in third person, 2921
Relevancy, 3327
Debates, official report of, bulky returns, 940
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338
Industrial group of Great Britain, message, 4436
Interruptions, 323, 406, 3557
Only by consent, member speaking, 3518, 3587
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Staff, 2691
Organization, 4592
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., letter from Mrs. Kennedy acknowledging sympathy, 281
King, His Majesty the, introduction of name in debate, 728

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281
Language
"False" 3269
"Unmannerly" 3269
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation, anticipating, 667
Letters, reading, 2181
Library of Parliament, 2693
Members
May ask further question on orders of day by leave, 287
May not anticipate report of com, 3574-6
May speak only once, 2r. of bill, 273, 277
Moving res. exhausts right to speak, 1210
Must address Chair, 2921
Must not impute motives, 2573
New, introduced, 2837
Recognition of by Speaker, 1159
Referring to another, must use third person, 2921
Right of reply, 2896
Right to speak, 3589
Sitting may not interrupt without consent, 1546-9, 1996
To be fair to member speaking, 1155
Minister of National Defence, correct title, 495
Moose Jaw controverted election, 515, 615
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Motions
Adjournment to discuss. *See under this title,* Adjournment
Amendments
Expanded negative, 3521
To be consistent with principle involved, 643
Anticipatory, 3267, 3326, 3870
Changing membership, special com., 2417
Debate closed, member may not speak without consent, 1080
Dropped, 3264
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 341-42
Mover
Closes debate, 277, 393. *See also under this title,* Debate
Has no right to amend, 1528
Leave to withdraw, 1911
Right to speak exhausted, 1210
Non-debatable
For Com. of Whole, 4013, 4185
That Speaker leave chair, 3185, 4013, 4076

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Non-debatable—*Con.*
That com., rise, 4185
When made by consent, 3326
Notice, 4295
In writing, 3399
Not given, M. must stand, 3084
Not in writing, put by consent, 1538
Not substantive, no right of reply, 3595
Objection, too late, 3981
Questions sub judice, not debatable, 1284, 1307, 1912
Redrafting, 816
Seconder, 1308
Special order, 3271
Sub-amendments, 3573
Substantive, right to reply, 2896, 3595, 3603
Unanimous consent, 345, 435, 572, 1739, 2047, 2639
When vote is taken, Speaker bound to read, 3580
Newspaper articles
Irrelevant, 4143
Reflecting on House, 4142
Orders of the day
Debate not permissable, 859, 3650, 4441
Members speaking twice, 3401
Press statements not to be quoted but synopsized, 667
Questions permissible but not debate, 734, 1309, 1925, 2898, 3400-01
Order paper
Errors, 487, 519, 4437, 4457
Not available on account of long sitting, 4744
Petitions
Irregular, 2885
Presentation by unanimous consent, 4525
Point of order, member speaking to, 322
Privilege, questions of
Committees, discussion of questions not referred, 3267
Contradiction of members' statements from outside, 3649
Matter properly before House, 3268
Remarks out of order, 709
Statement by consent only, 708
Questions
Allowed only by consent of member having floor, 212
Already answered, 2419, 2795
Answered by member speaking, 2523
Answered verbally to be preceded by asterisk, 3506

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Asking, does not exhaust members' right to speak, 3589
Cost of living (Mr. Church) out of order, 3704
Excessive length, 622
Oral, without notice, 734
Orders of the day on, 734
Passed as orders for returns, 344, 939, 1139, 1386
Sub-judice, 1912
To be asked in third person, 3589
Railway Commission, appeal from, 1284, 1912
Relevancy, 309, 427, 1553, 3557
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Every member entitled to copy of, 940
Royal assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755
Rules of the House, 3330
Rule 17A, debatable motions, 3583, 4014
Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Rule 115, urgent and pressing, 4308, 4392
Special com. on, 1299
Rulings
Appeals from, 4076
Senate amendments, 4592
Senate and House of Commons Joint Com. 2611
Sitting
Hour of, opening day of session, 1
Wednesday, unanimous consent, 99
Statements, indirect presentation of, 3649
Stewart, late Hon. J. A., letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435
Supply, M. for, Rule 17C, 2640
Vacancies, 1763. *See also under this title,* Moose Jaw
Nicolet, 2178
Vimy Ridge Memorial
Letter from President of French Republic, 1538
Message from Governor General, 1631
Vote
May be taken if wish of House that Speaker do now leave chair, 4014
Method of taking, 434
Ways and Means Com., rule 17C, 2640

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Agricultural Conditions Com., report, printing, 2181
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4017
Charters, extension for one year, amdt. 4014

Speakman, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Business of the House
M. to adjourn, 3584
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com. 1302
Calgary customs warehouse, 1023
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 639
Credits
Rural, 639
System, 1252
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Economic conditions, 1250
Emigration to United States, 1253
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Hebridean immigrants, 3252
Treatment of, M. 3584
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Immigration
Hebridean, 3252, 3584
Policy, 1250
Selected, 1254
Soldier Settlement Board, 1255
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Institutionalism, excessive, 1251
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Party system of government, 1254
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703
Protection, suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Public buildings and local improvement taxes, 1022-3
Railway mail service, 1804
Railway rates, equalization, 1252
M. (Mr. Clark) 1966
Redistributon, 4741
Roads and bridges, 1014
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
St. John quarantine building, 4614
Sales tax, consumer and, 4423
School lands, purchase price, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed, purity of, 601
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, 2022-25
Steamship services, 2173
Tariff, more equitable to producers, 1252
Western provinces, conditions in, 1250
Winter trips, California, 1252

Special Delivery Letters. *See* Post Office

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Res. 2656, 3181, 3922, amended 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Books, failure or refusal to keep, 4434
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 2656, 3938
Cheque tax, 2656, 4363, 4409
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 3933; neg. 3934
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3934, ruled out of order, 3935
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 3935, ruled out of order, 3936
Limitation of maximum, 3922
Confectionery and beverages, 2656, 3046, 3938
Duty paid value, definition, 4425
Excise stamp taxes, payment with postage stamps, 3938, 4435
Receipt tax, 2656, 4409
Exemption, 4423
Sales tax, 4181, 4409, 4425
Collection at source, 2656, 3938, 4411
Exports, 4364, 4418
Government or provincial sales, 4435
Imports, 4409, 4417
Licensed manufacturer, 4410
Producer or, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4414-21
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 245, 915
Refund
Goods sold to provinces, 4435
To licensed manufacturers, 4418
Tinplate, 4418
Wholesale or jobber, 4410
Wines, excise tax on, 2656, 3937, 4425

Spectacle and Eyeglass Frames, 2653

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address; Governor General

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Audibility of debate,4572
Budget, 2976. Erratic and wasteful discussions; a business man's standpoint; amendment, 2976; tariff reduction and free trade; reciprocity; protection for tiller of the soil; oleomargarine duty; western conditions; "calamity howling"; secession talk, 2977; comparison of present and past conditions; improvement in agricultural position; cold storage, federal and provincial encouragement and assistance, 2978; St. Lawrence river waterway; water transportation; Welland canal; government by committee; avoidance of responsibility; committees of the

Spence, Mr. David—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
House, cost of; redistribution; soft drinks, tax on; cigarette duty; income tax penalties; Post Office department; postage stamps, use for special war revenue purposes; cheque tax; sales tax; newsprint; duty-free goods; banana trust; fruit, competition of foreign fruits; importation of, 2979; tariff commission; potato duty, 2980
Canadian National Railways, hotels, manager, qu. 1257
Cold storage, 187, 2978
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 275-6
Experimental farms, 472, 473
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2200
Mediterranean steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636
Military expenditure, 876
Nova Scotia wharves, expenditure, 4572
Toronto
Customs house, 3282
Harbour improvements, 986
Viaduct and union station, 4449

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Alberta
Destitution, 1440
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
United Farmers of, 1440
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4057, 4083-4102
Bankruptcy Act administration, 780
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Canada Grain Act, administration, 782
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Central experimental farm, building, 4631
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 634, 635
Amdt. to extend bank charters for twelve months, 638
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4199, 4323
Toronto office building, qu. 814
Davidson commission, war contracts, qu. 812
Emigration to United States, 1439
Freight rates and, 1440
Flax, cultivation of, 4378
Hebridean immigrants, 4706
Hector celebration, 4706
Immigration
Advertising, 1084
Canada Colonization Association, 1439
Grant, 1092
Estimates, amdt. to reduce, 1441

Spencer, Mr. Henry E.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Organizations asking for increased, 1111
Policy, 1438
Population, loss of, 1439
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Income tax collections, western provinces, qu. 2206
Industrial disputes, settlement of, 1705
Interest rates in West, 1440
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Justice, administration of, 4674
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003
Live stock condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Mixed farming, 2773
Naturalization, mounted police and, 779
Old age pensions, 1649
Oliver-St. Paul branch railway, 4323
Opium and narcotic drugs, 700
Peace river district, railways, 1440
Public works, surveys, 1020
Railway construction, 1440
Rural mail, western provinces, 1802
Scales, inspection of, 810
Taxation, indirect, 1440, 3027
Toronto seed branch building, 4627
Vermilion town lots
Purchase, qu. 489, 1307
Rental, qu. 2417
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 656
Western provinces, conditions, 1439
Wrecks, investigation, 3160

Spirituous Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Sponagle, Col. J. A., port physician, Margaretville, N. S. qu. 2697

Sporting Mountain mail service. *See* Post Office

Spray Lakes lease. *See* Calgary Power Company

Spruce Bud Worm. *See* Forests and Forestry

Stability. *See* Tariff

Stamps. *See* Post Office; Taxation

Standard Shipping Company. *See* Freight Rates

Standard of Living, 1168. *See also* Cost of Living; Immigration

Standard Oil Company
Dividends, 2601

Standard Oil Company—*Con.*
Prosecution and fines, 2585

Standardization. *See* Agricultural Implements

Standards
Bureau of, 788
Canadian Engineering Association, 788

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Agricultural conditions, 1846, 3064
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Budget, 3062. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3062; sales tax, exemption drain tiles; cheque tax; stamp tax, notes and cheques; tariff policy of Conservative party; "out-Heroding Herod"; stability; definition of protection tariff and tariff for revenue, 3063; new Liberal doctrines; source in Montreal; failure of budget to balance; expenditure, increase of; expenditure and debt reduction; agriculture; condition of; speech of Minister of Agriculture; accredited herd system, 3064; tuberculin test; agriculture, needs of; sympathetic consideration of other interests; extreme attitude of Progressives; spirit of compromise; sacrifice, 3065; farmers and the tariff; provision for long-term loans; market facilities; Liberal party and tariff; failure to implement pledges; tariff reduction offset by increase in sales tax, 3066; disappointment of Progressive party; National Policy; problems of East and West, 3067
Cadet services, 878
Dairying industry, 1846
Emigration to United States, 1414
Farm mortgages, 1846
Immigration
Policy, 1412
Progressive party and, 1413
Ministers' and officials' travels, qu. 283, qu. 343
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3558
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1787
Sales tax, drain tiles, 3046, 3063
Tariff, immigration and, 1413
Western provinces, conditions in, 1415

Stationery. *See* Printing Bureau

Statistics. *See also* Immigration; Population; Trade

Statistics—*Con.*
Census figures, 43
Dominion bureau of, 788, 2032, 2034
Annual report tabled, 1539
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Staff
Temporary employees, qu, 938
Transfer from Labour dept, 1671, 2032
International labour office, 1631
Production, statement of, 2720
Wealth of Canada, estimated, 2719

Statutes, Quebec provincial, 1660

Steamship Combines. *See* Agricultural Conditions Com. report; Combines; Freight Rates, Shipping

Steamship Companies. *See also* Steamship Services
Immigration, 1201, 1462

Steamship Services, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Trade and Commerce
Advertisement for tenders, 3382-3
Canada-Great Britain, qu. 937
Canada-Newfoundland, 2171, 3377
Canada-West Indies, qu. 937, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Charlottetown-Pictou, 2171
Extension to Great Lakes suggested, 2175
Freight rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Control of, 2174
Railway commission and, 4003
Grand Manan and mainland, 2172
Halifax-Louisburg-St. Lawrence, 4701
Halifax-Newfoundland, 2173
Halifax-West Coast-Cape Breton, 2173
Inspection of, 2178
Mail carriage, 2172
Mainland and islands of Miscou-Shippegan, 2173
Mediterranean to, qu. 1488, 1636
Mulgrave-Canso, 2173
Mulgrave-Guysboro, 2173
Pelee island and mainland, 2174
Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish, 2174
Pictou-Souris-Magdalen islands, 2174
Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or ports, 2174
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Quebec or Montreal and Gaspe, 2176
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 2176, 4004
St. John-Bear River, 2176
St. John-Digby, 2176
St. John-Westport-Yarmouth, 2176

Steamship Services—*Con.*
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2178
Tariff and, 2923
Vancouver ports on Howe island, 4003
Vancouver-Northern ports British Columbia, 4003
Victoria-West coast Vancouver island, 4003

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2835. Congratulations to Finance Minister; protective tariff, little relief; protected interests, nothing to fear; disappointment and discontent in West; agricultural conditions; cost of living and production; prices of farm products; lack of purchasing power; cost of transportation and distribution, 2835; Crowsnest pass agreement; Wheat Board; Manitoba legislature, attitude of; royal commission on freight rates and grain trade; rural credits and farm loans; natural resources; municipal taxation, prices in Canada and United States; tariff and prices; agricultural implements; protection unsound; revenue; direct taxation, 2836; inheritance tax; graduated income tax; amendment
Experimental farms, 469
Lake Killarney improvement, 999
Live stock industry, 468
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1146
Seed inspection, 198
Taxation, direct, 2836
Turtle Mountain reserve, reforestation, 3413

Steel, the L. R. Company, Limited, qu. 1994

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjammer
Coal resources of Hudson bay, 1073
Reindeer and muskox in Barren Lands, 1073

Stenographers, members' qu. 518

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Australia, trade treaty with, 1848
Bank Act, reference to speech on, 4031-4
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4032, 4081, 4089, 4099, 4125
Bank of Vancouver, qu. 4011
Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, 816
British Columbia
Claims against federal government, 708
Liquor. *See under this title* Canada Temperance; Liquor
Oil companies, 2505

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3454
Goods imported via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454
Bureau of Standards, 788
Business of the House, private bills, posting, 4248
Canada Highways bill, 2338
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, coasting regulations, 4235
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2407-13, 2424. *See also under this title,* Liquor Act of 1922, 2407
Correspondence with Attorney General, British Columbia, 1032-38
Exceptions, 2409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Expenditure and earnings, 1868
Vessels, earnings, 3324, 3399
Canadian National Railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3610
M. to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4341
Appropriations, 4342
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Management, responsibility and powers, 3628
Paris offices, 3618, 3627, 3681
Amdt. that item stand, 3664; ruled out of order, 3667
Ruling, reference to, 3670
Securities, 4525
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2308-37, 4537
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 204
Combines bill, 2524
Combines Investigation Act, 1910, prosecutions, 2575
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4208-4217
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Corruption-liquor purchases, 2410
Customs duty, goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 3272
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4265, 4344
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Homesteads, 4201
Pulpwood, permission to cut, 4206
Estimates, civil government, form of, 612, 780

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Exchequer court judgeship, 2500
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4541
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
Freight rates
Railway Act Amdt bill, 54
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1940
French treaty
Canned salmon, Japanese packed, 453
Favoured nation, 448
Fuel supply, 793
Geological survey, 2504
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 322
Grain and grain trade, 3821
Elevators
Dockages, qu. 1484, qu. 1661
Earnings, 2042
Overages, 2043
Screenings, 2041, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Revenue from, 2042
Grain Act, licenses, 2299
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 293, 304, 305
Shipment and handling, 2044
Granville island, taxation, qu. 1485
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Nova Scotia, 941
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Quebec, 950
Highway construction grants, 623
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 513
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1315
Endorsation of Imperial government and railways, 1328
Chinese, 2311-12. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
Lands
Orientals to, 511
Thirty-two year agreements for sale, 1317
Policy, 1315
Taxation and emigration, 1319
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 511, 857
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495-98
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians, 2124-5
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Interest rate, 4110
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2138

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron ore deposits, British Columbia, 2505
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4281
Lake of the Woods
Control board, expenses, 4001
Regulation bill, 4173-75
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia
Administration, 2410, 2424
Bootlegging
Attorney General and, 2407
Execution of murderers of policeman Lawson, 2407
Export, 2407
Warehouses, 3144
National railways, transportation on, 3324
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3256
Marine hospitals, 701
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, trip to Great Britain, 3290
Masters and mates, 2610
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2114-23
National Defence, pay of staff, 891
New York, appointment Canadian customs officer, 3272
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4484
Officers, military, retired, 891
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Ordnance lands, 3444
Ore-testing plants, 2506
Ostrea lake wharf, 943
Patents of Invention bill, 2066-77-87, 2131
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
Domicile, election of, 2070
Pensions
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 4248
Point Grey sandhead leases, 3671
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., report, 248
Prince Rupert civic employees, 2086
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 416
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 951
Public Works, estimates, explanation, 961
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2500-02
Purchasing Commission, 4002
Renovated butter, 4265 ,4344
Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Pensions, inadequacy, 774, qu. 1362
Scrip, qu. 1362
Sales tax, 4181, 4429, 4431
Drain tiles, 3183
Exemptions, 4431
M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Nursery stock, 4432
Tomato plants, 4432
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4241
Settlers' relief, 3448
Special War Revenue Act, M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Sponagle, Col. J. A., qu. 2697
Steamship services, 2171
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Terminal elevators and grain trade, 3821
Timber permits, qu. 203
Trade commissioners, 1847
Unemployment, order in council No. 220, 436
Vancouver harbour bill, 255-9
Vancouver harbour board, 387
Venereal diseases, 705
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
War claims, amdt. to reduce, 2502
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085

Stevenson, Mr. John A., article on immigration, 628

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Agriculture, depressed condition, 1083
Alberta Liberal convention, 2995, 2797
Alpine Club grant, 3414
Arctic explorations, 3944
New ship for, 4702
Banff National park, water powers, 3420, 3939
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 3412
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509-12, 3206. *See also under this title,* Fuel
British Empire exhibition, 1910
Appropriation, 3950
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 4704
Budget, 2795. Tribute to Finance Minister, 2795; science of government; responsibilities and difficulties; promise and performance; tariff reduction; war debt, expenditure and taxation, 2796; inflation; agricultural conditions; depression of 1890-96; extravagance, ex-

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
penditure and debt; per capita debt; natural resources, 2797; protection of industries; artificial silk; business depression, 2798; changes of government in Alberta and Manitoba; tariff reduction not warranted; difficulties due to other causes; world competition; moving in direction of tariff reduction; tariff stability does not mean finality, 2799; immigration; freight rates; railway labour, wages; deflation; emigration; co-ordination of immigration work; land settlement; unemployment, 2800; labour; unemployment; co-operation of government with railway companies; agricultural conditions in United States; immigration from United States; taxation, apportionment of; taxation of capital, 2801; necessary to attract capital as well as labour; natural resources, development of; mineral wealth, conservation of; coal and oil production; inheritance tax; balanced budget; railway debt and deficits; revenue from coal and oil in Alberta, 2802; amendment; income tax; land tax; inheritance tax; agriculture, condition and prospects, 2803
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3435-39, 4702
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Calgary Power Company, application, 3939-40
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2413
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands
Automobile admission fee, 3942
Water powers, leases, 3420, 3442, 3939
Cattle embargo, effect of removal, 1101
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 768, 2308-2337, 2481, 4536. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Children, 2484
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Merchants, 2482
Students, 2317
Wives, 2484
Civil Service Commission, appointments, 1086
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Alberta
Freight rates on, 1269

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Alberta—*Con.*
Production and revenue, 2802
Shipments to Ontario, 1163
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Hudson's Hope, 3203
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Commodity and agricultural products, prices, 1083
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Deflation, inequality of, 1407
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks bill, 1256, 2060-86
Dominion lands
Contingencies, 3408
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, 1354
Reclamation by drainage, 3430
Dominion Lands Act, Amdt. bills
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Homesteads, 3982, 4201, 4364
Second, 3398
Dominion lands and parks, 3249. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Estimates, 3406
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion Power board, 3427
Emigration to United States, 1082-93, 1322-30
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Exhibitions, 1454
British Empire, 1910, 3950, 4704
Exhibits for, 1468-9
Expenditure, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Staff and salaries, 1455-65
United States in, 1465
Farmers' credits, 1088
Forest protection, 3409-20
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
Freight rates, 2799
Reduction of, 1101
Fuel Supply. *See also under this title,* Coal
Coal prices, control of, 3198
Coke ovens, 789
Fuel testing, 789
M. (Mr. Church) 1269-81
Peat experiments, 790, 3199, 3206
United States, 3203
Geodetic survey, estimates, 3245
Geological survey, estimates, 2504, 3197
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Grain, marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 309
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Grazing leases, 3426
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3591
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 503
Historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939
Fort Edward, 3432-5
Homesteads. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Improvements, 3251
Inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3227
Howat, Mr. Alex., detention at border, 2297, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3159
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4687
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3203
Immigration, 2800. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Advertising, 1103, 1218
Alleged campaign against, 332
British Columbia, 1327, 1096
Canada Colonization Association, 1089, 1386, 1479, 1877
Agreement, signing, 1976
Terms, 1102, 1320
Endorsation of Imperial Govt. and railways, 1328
History, 1102
Minister's statement, 1089
Further statement, 1320
Officers, 1172
Directors and, 1327
Proposals of, memo, 1877
Railway contributions, 3400
Reorganization, 3400
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1164, 1323, 1328, 1429
Child, 1099, 1469
Agencies, 1470
Domestic servants, conductresses, 1477-8
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 688, 1096, 1464, 1469, 1473, 1480
Grant, division of, 1475
European, 1170, 1316
Farm labourers, 1100
Winnipeg, 1976
Foster homes for children, 1099
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Great Britain, from, 1084, 1346
Officers in, 1879
Hebridean, 3591
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Interest rates on land purchases, 1088
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Leased land for American settlers, 1101
Literature, 1428
Maritime provinces, 1086

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Minister's statement, 1082
Movement of population to United States, 1082
New Brunswick, 1200
Nominative system, 1360, 1478
Norway and Sweden, from, 1192
Ontario, 1085
London office, 1428
Oriental
Chinese, 1443. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission of, 1446
Children, 1445
Estimates, 1443
Legislation, forecast of, 502
Japanese
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1454
Passages
Assisted, from Great Britain, 1100
Immigrant's family or friends, 1100
Loans, 1475
Prepaid, agreement with Imperial government, 2611
Policy, 1317, 1386
Propaganda embracing all Canada, 1098
Provincial government and, 1327
Publicity work, 1874
Quebec, 1085, 1104
Restriction of, 1170
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Agreement with Canadian Pacific, 1458
Scotland from, 1095
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Statistics, 1881-1922, 1094
Swedish representative, visit of, 1095, 1192
Ukrainians, 1397
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1093
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 502, 514
Immigration and Colonization dept.
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 1476, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1110, 1317, 1386
Details of, 1482
Ingram, Mr., appointment of, 2664
May, Mr., appointment of, 2663
Outside service, salaries, 1082
Salaries and contingencies, 1873, 1909
Indians, 2124
Agents, 2146
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, appointment of, 2151
New Brunswick, 2154

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia, 2163
Cattle, beef production, 2159, 2162
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2126
Education, 2126
Appropriations for, 2164
Increased, 2145
Church organizations, work of, 2146
Edmonton school, 2149-2165
Morley reserve, 2150
Farming, 2156
Greater production, 2155
Indian Affairs, dept
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2153, 2165, 4702
Reorganization, 2162
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Medical service, 2160
Minister, statement of, 2145
Northern Ontario and Manitoba, hunting grounds, 2146
Nova Scotia, 4702
Potlatching, 2163
Reserves
Blackfeet, 2148-9
Caughnawaga, expulsion of halfbreeds, 2163
Grain production, 2156
Highways, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Hay, 2153
St. Lawrence river islands, 2164
Sioux, 2160
Treatment of, 2158
Tuberculosis, 2153
Interior, dept. of
Estimates, 1904, 3406, 3939, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, surveys, etc. 3246
Iron ore
Alberta, 2512
British Columbia, 2505, 2514
Reported discovery, lake Athabasca, 2513
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 1992, 2138, 2204, 2428-36, 2668-71, 3981
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Cheap, 1118
Delegates from United States, detention *See under this title,* Howat
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Labrador gold discovery, reported, 2611
Gold rush, 1995
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 238

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4172
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands; Immigration
American immigrants, for, 1093
Free, available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Speculation, 1395
Taxation of, 1105
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1213, 1309
Liberal platform of 1919, 2994
Lignite Utilization Board, 2515. *See also under this title,* Bienfait
Live stock prices in West, 1101
Mackenzie river district, halfbreed claims, 3409, 3444
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Maps, preparation of, 3443
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention, 2469. *See also under this title,* Howat
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Military hospitals, mental cases, 671
Mines department
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Salaries, 3207
Moose Mountain pleasure resort, 3408
National Parks and Reservations bill, 3131
Northwest territories
Administration, 3944, 4702
New ship, purchase and maintenance, 4702
Wireless telegraph system, 3944, 3948
Oil, 2802
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, 2508
Fuel, shale deposits, 2513
Oil companies, British Columbia, 2505
Southern Alberta, 2508
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Ore-testing
British Columbia, plants, 2506
Machinery, 2509
Shipment to Ottawa, 2505
Peat. *See under this title,* Fuel
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Promissory notes, tax, 3924
Publicity agent in London, 4707
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3406
Reforestation, Turtle mountain reserve, 3413
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3427
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
School lands. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4203
Seed grain advances, 3444, 4367

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board
Advances and salaries, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Estimates, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2018
Land sales, supervisors, alleged attempt to bribe, 1092
Legal expenses, 2018, 2020
Loans, 2028
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3245
Towers, 2512
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Water powers
Administration of, 3420
Banff National park, 3420, 3939
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Highwood river, 3427
Leases, 3422
Provincial jurisdiction, 3421
Publicity, 3421
Wheat, price of, 1101
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Mining fees, 1636

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Branch lines, construction bill, 4311-22
Cheque tax, 3934
Destructive insect pests, 597
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1060
Income tax, fines, remissions, 3507
Labour, department
Annuities branch, 1677
Staff, 1677
Merchants' Bank inquiry, 3990
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2459, 3984
Noxious weeds, 2305
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1834
Penitentiaries, 771
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833
Seed testing bill, 2305
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4311, 4315, 4322
Weights and measures, Peterborough, 810

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Address in reply, 169. Near East crisis, 169; increase in commerce; trade conventions; removal of cattle embargo; immigration; Bank Act revision, 170; shipping rates combine inquiry; re-

Stewart, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
distribution; proportional representation, 171; Mr. Hoey's reference to Mr. Meighen, 171-172; Conservative party not dead or sleeping, 172
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1527
Brockville rifle range, 889
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, lease of freighters, 3848
Canadian National railways, ties, qu. 516
Cornwall canal employees, qu. 3135
Hudson Bay railway, 4684
Immigration, medical inspection, 703
Income tax convictions, qu. 3582
Labour, jurisdiction, 1650
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrisburg-Waddington ferry, qu. 1029
Murray Stewart, steamer, qu. 386
National monument, Connaught place, 2685-88
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2439-40
Old age annuities, 1639
Peat experiments, 3206
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Rideau canal, water power leases, qu. 622
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Troops for Sydney strike, qu. 624

Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5, 7, 8, 166
Letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435

Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. Dan W., qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton)
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976

Stipendiary Magistrates. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Rocky Mountain park, 1739

Stock. *See* Live Stock

Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stornoway. *See also* Hebridens
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speech, 2181

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 149. Skeena pioneer constituency, 149-50; Yukon telegraph lines; Queen Charlotte islands, 150; natural resources of Skeena; halibut fisheries;

Stork, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Prince Rupert port, 151; railway traffic; visit of Montreal Board of Trade, 152; Grand Trunk Pacific, 153
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Budget, 2733. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity, reception of announcement in Canada and United States; Chicago Tribune, comment; sugar, 2733; sales tax; copper bounty; machinery for manufacture of fish offal; British preference; direct importation; Canadian ports; Prince Rupert; reciprocity campaign in 1911; Fordney tariff, 2734; fishing industry and United States markets; use of Canadian ports by United States fishermen; collection of duty on purchases in Canada; United States wharf on Canadian soil; Canadian representative at Washington, 2375
Labour, right to organize, 2888
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2460
Orientals, 2461
Powell River Paper Company, 2888

Strikes. *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour

Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Students. *See also* Schools; Universities
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Medical, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Federation of Canadian students, res. 2486

Stumping Machines. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Sub-Judice Questions. *See* Speaker

Subsidies. *See* Bounties; Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dry Dock Subsidies Act; Steamship Services

Suez Canal, Goods imported via Hong Kong 3454

Sugar. *See also* Budget; Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Beet, excise duty, abolition of, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393
British preference, 2651
British tax on, 2754
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Combine, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Women and, 2576
Customs drawbacks, 2655, 3502

Sugar—*Con.*
Customs duty, 2820, 2825, 2981, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3060, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping clause, 2646, 3046
Reduction of, 2645, 2646, 2744, 2968, 3049
Refiners' protection, 2987
Gambling in, 3058
Jam manufacturers, 3477
Price, increase of, 2646, 2734, 2889, 2933

Sullivan, Mr. Arthur W., 381

Superannuation. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities, Civil Service; Judges; Pensions

Supplementary Estimates. *See* Estimates

Supreme Court, general rules and orders, 1659

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 456, 575, 668, 859, 941, 993, 1082, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1538, 1619, 1637, 1668, 1694, 1740, 1764, 1811, 1837, 1873, 2017, 2124, 2145, 2392, 2489, 2494, 2610, 2671, 3160, 3272, 3330, 3406, 3610, 3706, 3760, 3798, 3824, 3830, 3938, 3985, 4554, 4594, 4638

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 4732, 4735
Estimates. *See that title*
Subjects and items discussed:
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Cattle
Shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Embargo, expenses, 3989
Dairying, 609, 3283
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 595, 3988
Experimental farms, 456
Fruit, 598
Health of animals, 575, 587, 3989, 4675
International Institute of, 599
Publications, 598
Salaries and contingencies, 610, 3303, 4674
Stockgrowers' Protective Association grant, 587
Suppression of foul brood in bees, 4675
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Auditor General, 3897, 4003

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Air Force. *See under this title,* National Defence
Annuities. *See under this title,* Labour
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4676. *See also under this title,* Insulin
British and Foreign news service, 4712
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 4708
Business Profits War Tax Act, 3949
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 2035, 4709
Canada Highways Commission, 2489, 3173
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Athletic Team, Olympic games, 4706
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788
Canadian Forestry Association, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3798, 3824-30
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3938, 3948,
Canadian National Railways, 1764
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3676, 3789
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 3376
$ 1,700,000, 3376
$ 1,550,000, 4692
Branch lines, purchase of, 3646
Peace river railway survey, 4698
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Transcontinental, Fortin & Moffat claim 3646
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Canadian representative in United States, 4001
Canadian Press, Limited, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727
Canals. *See also under this title,* Railways and Canals
Isle Perrot bridge, St. Anne's lock, 3646
Rideau, 4691
Trent, improvement, 3647, 4691
Welland, construction, 3760, 4690
Chief electoral officer, 4001
Civil Service
Bonus, 1664, 1811
Commission, salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Commissioner of Taxation, 3949
Customs and Excise, 3272
Debates, Official Report of, 2691

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4667
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion lands and parks, 3406, 3938, 4702
Dominion lands, contingencies, 3408
Outside service, salaries, 3249
Dominion Power Board, expenses, 3427
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Empire Forestry Convention, 3410
Exhibitions, 1910, 1454
British Empire, 3949, 4704
Canadian traveling exhibition in France, 811, 4711
External Affairs, salaries, 3987
Finance, charges of management, 3987
Fuel supply
Advisory fuel committee, 4691
Fuel and power resources, investigation, 3427
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey, 2504
Government publications, 1712
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Gratuities to Grand Trunk officials, 1664
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Harbours and rivers, 941, 993
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 1002, 2671
Manitoba, 993, 4589
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
St. John, 2676, 4610
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4722
Ontario, 981, 2690, 4588, 4594
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675, 4610
Toronto harbour improvements, 2678, 4610
Prince Edward island, 945, 4586
Quebec, 950, 4588
Champlain dock, 2675
Health, department of, 697, 2167
Marine hospitals, 701
Medical examination of immigrants, 702
Medical research laboratories, 703
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Hector celebration, 4705
Highways. *See under this title,* Canada Highways
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 4680

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Company, refund, 3647, 4686, 4689
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration and Colonization, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Imperial Conference, 4638
Imperial Economic Conference, 4638
Expenses of delegation, 4666
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3949
Indians, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Insulin, discovery and supply, 703
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interior, department, 4702
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, 4667
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dominion observatory, 3242
Engraving maps, etc., 3443
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3428
Ordnance lands, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, 3430
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 1909, 3949
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Justice, department, 4667
Administration, 705, 4674
Bankruptcy Act, administration, 780
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Salaries, 780
Labour, 1621
Annuities Act, administration, 1639
Canada Gazette, 1707
Employment offices, 1630
Industrial Disputes Act, 1627, 1702, 1716
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Salaries, etc., 1668, 1694
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 4001
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, monument, 1017
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, Canadian delegates, 3989
Legislation
House of Commons, 4674
Committees, expenses, 2691, 4674
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Senate, salaries, etc. 2694, 3949
Library of Parliament, 2691
Lord Selkirk Association, grant, 4704

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Mackenzie river district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marine and Fisheries
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3364
Detroit river traffic regulation, 3357
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
False Creek bridge, 3375
Fish culture, 3367
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Fisheries protection service, 3361
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, salaries, 3351
Live Stock inspection, 3334
Maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, 3353
Marine biological board, 3371
Marine signal service, 3358
Meteorological service, 3360
Navigation
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Obstructions, navigable waters, 3332
Schools, 3331
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Maintenance of steamers, 3160
Wrecks, investigation, 3160, 3330
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
River St. Lawrence ship channel, 3375
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Sorel shipyard, 3343, 3374
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334
Merchants Bank inquiry, expenses, 3990
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Mines and Minerals
Assay office, Vancouver, 3207
Explosives division, 2514
Mines and Geological Survey, 2504, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
National Defence, 1740
Ammunition, 884
Annual drill, 4635
Arsenals
Lindsay, 803
Quebec, 884
Bonus, 1751, 1772
Cadet service, 877
Canadian air service, 1748, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Engineer services and works, 4638
Grants to associations, 889
May, Miss H. M., grant, 900
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia services, annual drill, 859
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
Northover, Major, H. R., 4635
Ordnance lands, arms, etc., 890
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Schools of instruction, 900
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1745
Warlike stores, 900
National Gallery of Canada, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020, 2685
Naturalization Act, administration, 2495
Northwest territories
Administration, wireless, etc., 3449, 3948
Wireless station, Mayo, 4702
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Paris agency, expenses, 4001
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Pensions
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3706
Fenian raid, 3742
Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 2168, 3742
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Post office
Mail service, 1778
Miscellaneous, 1832
Salaries and contingencies, 1814
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Printing, publications, 811
Printing bureau, 1710, 1730
Miscellaneous printing, 1716

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Public printing and stationery, retiring allowances, 3949
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, 1022
Archives, 1730
Law, late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Manitoba, 4628
Maritime provinces, 4614
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario, 1022, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, 1729
Architects, compensation, 4633
Parliament buildings, 1716
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Printing bureau, new building, 1730
Quebec, 4614
St. John immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021
Water supply, 1022
Saskatchewan, 4629
Terrebonne, Quebec, 2690
Public Works, 4594
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Graving docks, locks, etc. 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See under this title,* Harbours and Rivers
Roads and bridges, 1014, 4589
Salaries, 2684
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682, 4590
Pulpwood Commission, 4709
Purchases, government, supervision of, 3950, 4001
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, wireless stations, 3374
Railway Commissioners, Board of, 3188
Railways and Canals, 3650. *See also under this title,* Canals
Arbitration, litigation, etc. 3195
Contingencies, 3377
Intercolonial pension allowances, 3195
Printing and stationery, 3197
Prince Edward Island railway, pensions, 3195
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648, 4691
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, 1163
Royal Canadian Navy, 900-2

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374,
Surveys and investigations, 3647
Secretary of State
Public archives, 3985
Salaries, 2392, 2494
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board, 1910
Advances and salaries, 2017
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668, 4703
Department, salaries, 687
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 696
Medical examination of pensioners, 670
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pensions, European war and active militia, 2166
Sheltered employment, burial expenses, etc., 693
Treatment, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 2168
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701.
Topographical surveys, 3244
Trade and Commerce, 3377, 4701
Bounties, petroleum, 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171
Patent and Copyright branch, 2035
O'Halloran, Mr. G. F., salary increase, 4673
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Steamship services. *See under this title,* Steamship Services
Terminal elevators, maintenance, 810
Treaties, negotiation of, expenses, 3989
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Water powers, surveys, etc. 3420
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Yukon territory, government of, 3943

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic Survey; Water Powers
Base lines, townships, lakes, rivers, qu. 1866
Prairie provinces in, qu. 1866
Public works, 1020
Railway, 4691. *See also* Railways
Peace River district, 4698

Surveys—*Con.*
Topographical, 2509, 3244
Boundary posts and towers, 2512
Expenditure, qu. 1865

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture department
Deputy minister's salary, 611
Estimates, 3284
Salaries and contingencies, 611
Agricultural conditions com. 3271
Agricultural instruction grant, 607-8
Administration, 3284
Agricultural products, imports, qu, 617, 1426
Alderson claim, 584
Ammunition, 887
Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426
Bacon, grades of, 593
Bayfield harbour, 981
Business of the House
Chair, ruling of, 4720
Questions passed as orders for returns, 940
Canada Grain Act, administration, 785
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3693
Cattle. *See also under this title,* Live Stock
Embargo, removal, correspondence, 4133
Shipment, 3317
Civil Service
Hours, 1427
Reduction of expenditure in Great Britain, 1803
Political partisanship, 286
Cold storage, 188
Warehouses, 191
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Dairying industry, 609
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Restrictions, 3153
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3153
M. to discharge order, 3325
Daylight saving, farmers and, 1427
Debates, official report of
Missing pages, 887-8, 1081
Supply, undiscussed items, 3292
Emigration to the United States, 1431
Exhibitions, 1468
Experimental farms, 464-486
Ontario, 465
Farm labour, 1427
Feeding stuffs
Adulteration, 604
Conference, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Halifax grain elevator, 4716
Hamilton-Brantford highway, 2494

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Health of animals, 584
Compensation for slaughter, 486
Hog grading, 593
Government publications, agriculture, 1428
Grain, dockage, 785
Group government, 1427
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1102, 1104, 1428, 1478
Financial support, 1429
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Child, 1472-5
Domestic servants, and, 1100
Empire settlement scheme, 1474
Literature, 1428
Ontario, 1098, 1428, 1475
Policy, 1425
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1630, 1716
Labour
Department, statistics, 1682, 1684
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Live stock. *See also* Cattle
Breeding at experimental farms, 465
Export trade, 193
Visit of Canadian commissioners to South America, 1213
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, qu. 384
Activities of, 3292, 3308
Address to South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Appointment, 3308
Order in council, 3294
Political patronage, 3316
Salary, 3286
Trips
Florida, 3309
Great Britain, 3308
Matane harbour improvements, 972
Mill feeds, adulteration, legislation, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs
National Defence, ammunition, 1744
Naval service, 909, 1744
Nova Scotia miners' strike, 84, 1716
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Butter and, 386
Manufacture of, 3153
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3575
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good), 3572
Ontario grain elevators, 4716-20

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Order in council, P.C. 223, 815
Peat experiments, 790
Penitentiaries, 772
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Dredging, 1012
Post office
Political patronage, 3316
Rural mail delivery, 1803
Remuneration, competitive system, 1803
Privilege, Redistribution Com. 1660
Pulpwood, export, royal commission, 4709
Quebec arsenal, 887
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2975
Redistribution, special committee, 1660
Privilege, 1660
Report, 4740
Welland, Lincoln and Haldimand, 667
Sales tax, 1427
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 927
Tariff changes, 1427
Tuberculin test, 3302
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Warner, Mr., reference to, 1425

Swan, Mr. E. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Sweden
Immigration from, 1095, 1191, 1216
Senate, constitution of, 1373

Switzerland
French treaty, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Immigration, 3591
National Council, constitution of, 1373
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Trade with, 2397
Watches and clocks, imports from, 2214

Sydenham Hospital. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sydney Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2178

Taché, Mr. J. de L., General Librarian, Debates, missing pages, 1081

Taché, Sir E. P., Senate, elective, 1367

Tadoussac, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157

Tagore, Mr. Rabindranath, civilization, 2729

Talbot, Mr. Onésiphore. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Tampa Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Tank Cars, transportation of, qu. 1361

Tariff. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty; United States. *For items discussed see* Customs Tariff Items
Aggregate tax paid in 50 years, 2793
Agricultural implements, 2743, 2756, 2975. *See also that title*
Industry, cost per employee, 2975
Agricultural conditions and, 1355, 1907
All countries increasing, 2819
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Amdts. of Liberal opposition 1920 and 1921, 3020
Average rate, 22, 89, 2838
Bituminous coal, duty on, 1275-8
British preference. *See also that title*
Increase, 2718
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Budget of 1922, net increase of duty, 3034
Canada not self-contained country, 3061
Canadian and United States, duties, comparison, 2958. *See also* United States
Changes in, 2702, 2853, 3488, 3895
Date on which effective, 3504
Under pressure of organized effort, 1427
Class privilege, 2728, 3069, 3074
Combines and, 2533, 2586, 2714
Anti-combine clause, 2534
Reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561, 2583
Commission of 1920, 3028
Report voluminous, 3024, 3028
Conservative policy appropriated by Liberals, 2974
Consistency, 3072
Copper and creosoting industry, discrimination, 3231
Downward revision, 2786, 2831, 2945, 2907, 2968
Drawbacks, raw material, qu. 1864
Dumping clause, 2535, 3072
Duties, combines and, 2608
East and West, 2753
Economic warfare, 3053
Emigration and, 1093, 1440, 2737, 2823. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Equal to that of United States, 1246
Farmers, difficulties and, 2916, 3065
Favoured nation treatment. *See* Treaties, French, Italian
Finality, 2648, 2772, 2799, 2841, 2912, 3052. *See also under this title,* Stability
Fordney-McCumber. *See* United States
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519

Tariff—*Con.*
High, 2924, 2980
Revolt against, 1859
Home markets, 2849
Immigration, effect on, 1113-4, 1119, 1133, 1222, 1413, 1416, 1424. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Implements of production, reduction, 2718, 2858, 2951, 2955. *See also under this title,* Agricultural Implements
Industries and, 3024
Intermediate and preferential. *See* Treaties, French
Investigation of industries, 2955
"Invisible tariff" 3000
Issue from 1878 to 1896, 2974
Items. *See* Customs Tariff Items
"Jacking-up," 3074, 3907
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Laurier-Fielding, 3030
Liberal party and, 2221, 3008. *See also that title*
Budget, protective, 2818
Platform, 1919, 2872
Pledges, 2951, 2952, 2994
Policy, 3007
Liberal and Conservative parties 2854
Joint product of, 2852
Not much difference between, 3018
Limitation to tariff income and turnover, 2859
Lower, competition, 2861
Luxuries, 2015
Macdonald, Sir John, of, 2756
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufacturers and, 2812
Minimum, 440
Minister of Finance, attitude on, 2838
Moderate, 2856, 2857
More equitable to producers, 1252
National policy, 2786. *See also that title*
Necessaries of life, 2955
Reduction of duties, 2718
No relief from, 2835
No surrender of Canadian markets, 2746
Not political but economic question, 2818
Oleomargarine, 3529
Ontario and, 1240
Other matters of greater importance, 2959
Parliamentary committee, 3028
Patents, Trade Marks and Copyright Act, 2293, 2294
Per capita tax, 3026
Permanent tariff commission, 2754, 2980, 2955, 3028, 3069
Portage la Prairie, district board, res., 3039

Tariff—*Con.*
Preferential. *See* British Preference; Imperial Conference; Treaties, French, Italian
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Production costs, 1394
Progressive party and, 2745
Prohibitive, 2850
Prosperity and, 2398
Protection, 2787, 2854. *See also that title*
Revenue and, 2778, 2835, 2957, 3048, 3063
Public ownership, 2905
"Purely and simply protective", 2908
Railway deficit and, 2905
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
Reciprocity, 3080. *See also that title*
Reductions, 38, 100, 1420, 2813, 2944, 2972, 2976, 3048, 3066, 3077, 3082
Liberal party and, 2847
Recent, 3010
Resolutions, 2650, 3454, 3895, 3963
Changes in, 3046, 3082
McMaster, Mr., free food and implements of production, 2996
Revenue, 2839, 2850, 2854, 2905, 3063, 3069
"Same old", 2981
"Say-so" of beneficiaries, 2956
"Scientific" 3069
Seward, late William Henry, speech, 2916
Special committee, 2955
Special privileges, 2786
Specific duties, 2215
Stability, 2648, 2657, 2703, 2717, 2718, 2741, 2755, 2772, 2775, 2787, 2799, 2806, 2809, 2819, 2835, 2841, 2853, 2912, 2966, 3011, 3028, 3052, 3053, 3064, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3303, 4031
Genoa Conference, res. 3053
League of Nations, res. 3054
Steamship subsidies and, 2923
Substantial reduction in, amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Tariff act of 1897, 3014
Tariff Commission, evidence, 2296
Tinplate industry, 2400
Trade commissioners and, 1840, 2923
United States and, 3010. *See also* United States
Unjust tax, 3062
Valuation of goods for customs, 90
War taxation, 2985
Weapon, 3477, 3907. *See also* Treaties, French
Western Canada and, 1887, 2747, 3062
Undue burden, 2781
Who pays? 2839

Tariff—*Con.*
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion, 2853. *See also* Budget
Wool, 2866
Woollen goods, reduction, 2990
Woollen industry, 3458
Protection, M. (Drummond) 928

Taxation. *See also* Agriculture; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill; Inland Revenue; Protection; Special War Revenue; Tariff
Agricultural implements, 1850. *See also that title*
Apportionment of, burdensome to poor, 2789
Automobile, qu. 1993, 2841. *See also that title*
Banff hotel, 3435
Bank drafts, 3925, 3928
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and Beverages
Bill of exchange, 3923
Budget, failure to balance, 2831
Building prices and, 2165
Burden of, 1348, 1355, 1394, 1403, 1880, 2831. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Business profits, 2786, 2789, 2998. *See also* Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill
Notes given in payment, 4489
Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, arrears, qu. 1974, 4490
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Unpaid, 4440, 4489
Business Profits War Tax Act 1916, administration, 3949
Cheque tax, 23, 121, 332, 2706, 2859, 2948, 3034, 3929, 4409, 4423
Embossed cheques regulations, qu. 492
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequality of, 3063
Maximum
Limitation of, 2847, 2877, 2979, 3922
Reduced to $1, 2656
Passed back to farmers, 3039
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927
Responsibility for payment, 2877
Who pays? 3039
Cigarettes. *See* Customs and Excise
Collection, 89. *See also under this title* Income; Sales Tax
Methods, 2213, 2786
Commission, 4039
Commissioner of, salary, 3949, 4669
Confectionery and beverages, 2644, 2656, 2707, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Confectionery and beverages—*Con.*
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 3938, 4182
Soft drinks, tax on, qu. 624
Tax, revenue, qu. 624
Consumer, 2789. *See also that title*
Consumption tax. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Cost of living and, 2839. *See also that title*
Crude, 2788
Debt and, 2964
Depreciation and renewal allowance, 1711
Difficult and irritating, 2804, 2859
Direct, 2836, 2956, 3000, 3010, 3035
Results, qu. 281
Dominion lands, taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion, provincial and municipal, 2641
"Enormous" 2963
"Excessive" 1345, 1391, 1394, 2712
Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Exemptions. *See under this title,* Income, Children; Sales Tax; Receipt Tax
Experiments in, 2788
Express money orders, 3923
Extravagance and, 2785
Farmers paying taxes, 4224. *See also that title*
Four cardinal principles of, 66-67
Granville island, qu. 1485
Great Britain in, 1854
Reduction of, 2712
High, 2583, 2747, 2857, 3010
Exodus to United States, 2823
Implements of production, 2718. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Income, qu. 281, 1195, 2859. *See also* Income War Tax Act. Amdt. bill
Agricultural forms, 4498
Based on fallacious doctrine, 2913
Bonds exempt from, qu. 342
Bonds, interest rate and, 4494
Burdensome to urban tax-payer, 2745
Capital, 3027
Diverted from industry by, 2914
Children, exemption for, 2128, 2880, 3038, 4502
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1382
Collections, 2658, 2998
Cost of, qu. 733
Total, 2825
Community of property, 2880, 3038
Convictions, qu. 3582
Deductions, for educational and charitable donations, 3954
Dividends, 2881
Duplication, 2859

Taxation—*Con.*
Income—*Con.*
Exemption. *See also under this title,* Children
Small incomes, 2728, 4493
Up to $5,000 for head of family, 3038
Widows, 2934
Farmers, payments by, qu. 1259, 1486, 2845
Federal, provincial and municipal, 2825, 2859
Fines, qu. 2180, 3507
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Graduated, 2706, 2788, 2837, 2914, 3073
Great Britain, 2788
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Income and investment discouraged, 2914
Incomes earned and unearned, 2745, 2788
Unearned, 2718, 2858, 2880, 2954, 2967, 3026
Dividends, 3038
Increase, 2658, 3010
"Intolerable nuisance," 2914
Moose Jaw office, qu. 2699
Penalties, 2979
Protest from people who do not pay, 2786
Revenue and production, lessening of, 2913
Revenue, cost of collection, farmers, qu. 1259, 4224
Rich not bearing fair share, 2788
Scale of, 2985
Steeply graded, 2728
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Total assesment, qu. 2393
United States, reduction, 2913
Vancouver offices, qu. 912
Western farmers, 1889
Western provinces, collections, qu. 2206
Yorkton office, qu. 384
Income War Tax Act, administration, 3949
Increase of, 1121, 1822, 1854, 2712, 2784, 2987, 2997
Indirect, 1440, 2789, 3027, 4423
Inequitable, 2728, 2788
Inheritance, 1383, 2728, 2788, 2792, 2802, 2803, 2810, 2825, 2837, 2909, 3026, 3073
Inland revenue, use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Land values, 1105, 1118, 1178, 1344, 2728, 2745, 2778, 2803
Unearned increment, 3016
Liberal platform, 2003
London Spectator, statement of, 1122
Luxuries, 915, 2003, 2706, 2710, 2718, 2742, 2745, 2789, 2853, 2858, 2989, 2997, 2999, 3073, 3910
Excise tax on, 2779
Tax collections, qu. 2393

Taxation—*Con.*
Manitoba
Agricultural production and, 1404
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Municipal, 426, 2641, 3445
Burdensome, 2836
Unpaid, 2768, 2769, 2953, 2961
Natural resources, 2729
Necessaries of life, on, 2710, 2728, 2736, 2754, 2789, 2999
New, 2857, 2997, 3078
Not wanted, 2914
Per capita, 1121, 3026
Post office money orders, 3923
Postal rates, 1780
War rate, 2745
Postage stamps, use for excise taxes, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3938, 4435
Prices, increase of, 2716. *See also* Prices
Promissory notes, 3063, 3923
Provincial amusement tax, 2826
Railway deficits and, 2905, 3006
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2643, 2656, 2705, 3034, 3923, 3934, 3935, 3938, 4423
Evasion of, 2706, 2826
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequity of, 2826
Payment in postage stamps, 1815
Revison of, 4409
Reduction of, 2749
Relief from, 3038
Responsibility for, 2920
Revenue, 2745
Revenue and postage stamps, 1815, 1818
Revenue stamps, selling cost, 1819
Sales tax, qu. 281, 1427, 2656, 2742, 2789, 4181 4183, 4425. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alberta collections, qu. 2417
Amendment, 3031
Automobiles, qu. 1993
Books and book bindings 1870
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1157
Carbonic acid gas, 3938, 4182
Collection, qu. 285, qu. 938, 2840
At source, 2643, 2656, 2840, 2998, 3031, 3038, 3938, 4181
Change in method, 2734
Domestic goods, 2840
Foreign goods, 2840
Complexity of, 2642
Confectionery and beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery
Contracts affected, 2750
Cost of living, 2839
Increase, 1813
Date of taking effect, 2657, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Sales tax—*Con.*
Domestic and foreign goods, 2804
Drain tiles, 2742, 3046, 3063, 4183
Duty-free goods, 2979
Exemptions, qu. 491, 2643, 2998, 3031, 3063, 4431
Drain tiles, 3046. *See also under this sub-title,* Drain Tiles
Newsprint, 2999, 3046
Raw wool, 2998
Rulings as to, qu. 708
Tomato plants, 4432
Exports, 4364
French treaty, 2279, 2280, 2299
Furs, 2742
Imports, 4409
Increase in, 2213, 2804, 3033, 3066, 3078
Jobbers, 4410, 4433
Licensed manufacturer or producer, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Manufacturers, licensed, 4410, 4433
Michigan Central bridge, remission, qu. 1257
Middleman, encouragement, 2805
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 915
Necessaries of life, 2999
Newsprint, 2979, 2999, 3046
Nursery stock, 4432
Origin of finished articles, 2840
Passing on, 2750, 2912, 4411, 4416
Prime Minister's speech in 1921, 2997
Profiteering, 2997
Proposed change, petition against, 2958
Public libraries, 1870
Pyramiding, 915, 2823, 2859, 2912, 2998, 3036, 3031, 3033, 4423
Regina Photo Supply Company, qu. 518
Simplification, 3082
Suggested abolition of, 1230
Summer trade, 2912
Tomato plants, 4432
Union Jack, 4514
Wool, 2742
Workability, 2786
School land taxes, 3445
Schools closed from inability to pay, 1388
Unpaid, 4205
Single tax on vacant land, 1105, 1344. *See also under this title,* Land
Sixty-seven per cent paid by consumer, 2789
Suggested conference on, 67
Tariff and, 2859, 2839, 3068
"Taxed to death," 2826, 4493
Taxes, banks' refusal to pay, 4099

Taxation—*Con.*
Tax reductions, 2642
Tax sales,
Alberta, 4062
Manitoba, 2961
Travellers' cheques, 3923
Turnover tax, 2841, 2859, 2916
Unpaid, 637, 1388, 3257, 3445, 4205
Unimproved land. *See under this title,* Land
War, 2788, 2985, 3028
War profits, 2788, 2985
War taxes, collection by Post Office dept. 1815
Western farmers unable to meet, 1202, 2781

Tax-Exempt Bonds. *See* Bonds

Technical Education Act. *See* Labour

Technical Positions. *See* Civil Service

Telegraphs and Telephones. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Wireless
Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 1017
British cable service, Canadian Press, 4727
British Columbia-mainland, 1017
Canadian National Telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Fort Qu'Appelle-Humboldt, qu. 383
Great North Western Telegraph Company, qu. 707, 2471
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Manitoba, 2285
Northwest territories, 3944
Nova Scotia, 4590
Prince Edward Island, 2682
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph lines, qu. 3138, qu. 3262
St. Charles-Peribonka telegraph line, qu. 3262
Vancouver island district, 1017
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal, qu. 3140
Wireless stations, 3337
Yukon telegraph system, 150, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206, qu. 2417

Temiscouata forest fires, 4010

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Temporary Employees. *See* Civil Service

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* Canadian National Railways; St. John

Terrebonne public building, 2690, 4614

Territories Act Amdt. *See* Northwest Territories

Testing of Seed. *See* Seed Inspection

Textiles. *See also* British Preference; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty
Clothing, British preference, 3032
Collars and cuffs, duties 3048
Cottons
British preference, 3463
Cotton manufacturers, combine, 2534
Duty, 3035, 3048. *See also* Treaties, French
For manufacture of pneumatic tires, duty, 2654, 3487
French treaty, 1987
Dominion Textile Company
Combine, 2563
McSweeney, late Senator, statement, 3464
Securities and dividends, 3463
Stock, 1853
Embroideries. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates, 1964
Knitting industry, artificial silk and, 2958
Laces, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Linen, 3897
Profits, 3464
Silks. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Artificial silk
Duty, 2820, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3489
Industry, 2658, 2703, 2798, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 3069, 3075, 3492
Knitting industry and, 2958
Tops or waste or artificial fibre silk, drawbacks, 3896
Yarns and fabrics, 2654
Duty, 2704, 3046, 3488, 3489
Imports of, 445, 2397
Silk cloth woven in the gum, duty, 3489
Silk industry, 2397, 2853
Canadian, 2397
French treaty and, 1977
Textile industry, 3466
Velvets and velveteens, duty, 3035, 3488
Woollen industry, 3458. *See also* Wool
Blankets, duty, 3048
British preference, 2958, 2989, 3034, 3458, 3459
Clothing, 3048
Competition from Great Britain and France, 2958
Duties, 3048
Drawbacks and, qu. 1994
Legislation to assist, qu. 4184
Marking of, 2973
Penmans, stock quotations and dividends, 3463
Preferential tariff and, 3458
Prices, 2990, 3459

Textiles—*Con.*
Woollen industry—*Con.*
Protection of, M. (Mr. Drummond) 928
Woollen goods, manufacture of 2866
Yarn, 3489, 3896

Thetford Mines, strike, 2207

Thomas, Mr. A. J. *See* Canadian National Railways

Thomas, Mr. J. H., 46

Thomson Line, ocean freight rates, 2127

Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856

Thompson, the late Right Hon. Sir John, copyrights, 2140

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Cold storage companies, 191
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2055
Field crop competitions, 600, 602
Montreal cold storage, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204
Welland canal construction contracts, qu. 1489

Thornton, Sir Henry Worth, 103, 126, 284. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Cattle shipments, space, 3040
West Indian service, 3379
Capital expenditure, 3811
Criticism of, 3640
Fuel supply, evidence, Senate com., 1919
Hudson Bay railway, 4683
Immigration, 1167
Reported statement, 2795, 2844
Western provinces, conditions, 2962

Thoroughbred horses. *See* Race Track Betting

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Bill (Improvement and management of harbour)
Res. 3399, 3963; 1r., 2r., com., 3965; com., 3r., 4207

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1752
Lindsay market scales, 208

Tidal and Current Survey. *See* Marine

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C.
Grand Trunk arbitration, qu. 730, qu. 1029
Payments to, 1154, qu, 1661

Timber. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lumber
Areas, limits of, 4206
Available supplies, 818
Creosoted, qu. 813, qu. 1137
Permits to cut on Dominion Lands, qu. 203, 3398, 4206. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Shortage, 2711

Timber Wolves, destruction of live stock, 597

Times, The, London, Hudson Bay railway, 1059

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, 1071, 3056

Tinplate Industry, 2751
Establishment in Toronto, 2819
Sales tax, 4418
Tariff uncertainty, 2819

Titles, Honours and Decorations
Abolition of, 210
Banting, Dr., 4645
M. (Mr. Ladner) 1285, neg. on div. 1299
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1292
Nickle resolution, 1286-98

Tobacco. *See also* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Bootlegging in, 2989
Cigarettes
Bootlegging, 3230
Consumption, qu. 516
Customs duty, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 4392
Excise duty, 2655, 2825, 3229
Tax on, 2657
Cigars, consumption, qu. 517
Duty, 2913, 2988
Experimental stations, 459, 465
Harrow, 466
Home-grown, 4209. *See also* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Imports, qu. 1258
Revenue, loss of, 2913

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Accredited herd system, qu. 206
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Canadian National railways, mileage and cost 914
Haney, Mr. M. J., 3355
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Public debt, 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914
Public expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913

Tobin, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement
Farms in Richmond county, qu. 913
Wolfe county, qu. 913
War expenditure, 1914-1922, qu. 914

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. Walter, decision, question not referred to com. 3267

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd, system, 578, 3302
Animal diseases, inspection, 2202
British Columbia liquor laws, 2411
Prices, 2411
British Empire exhibition, 1873
Budget 2861. Congratulations to Finance Minister; government coming round to protection; unfair to Canada to cut down tariff; United States and oriental competition; copper bounty; Trail smelter; amendment; inclusion of planks from Liberal platform of 1919; agricultural conditions; disorganized markets, 2861; profitable and unprofitable lines of agriculture; single-crop farming; mixed farming with live stock as basis; prices low and crops high; plugging up the leaks; marketing of live stock; policy and prices; no advantage in breeding scrub stock, 2862; dairying industry; unprofitable herds; yield and cost; Nappan experimental station; experiment with scrub cows; value of industry to country; export markets; Canadian butter in Great Britain, 2863; competition of Denmark, Holland and New Zealand, 2863; butter grading; hog and export bacon industry; types and weights; Wiltshire sides; Danish bacon, competition of, 2864; prices at Chicago and Toronto; bacon from corn-fed hogs; breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865; sheep and wool industry; woollen manufacturing industry; marketing of lambs, 2866; wheat screenings as feed for lambs; inferior stock, loss from; animal contagious diseases; tuberculosis; hog cholera; research work; internal parasites; tuberculin test, 2867; immunization from tuberculosis; human tuberculosis; work of Dr. Watson; glanders; agricultural products, distribution; cheaper transportation and equalization of freight rates; Pacific coast trade; Panama canal, 2868; export markets; oriental trade; co-operative selling; farm credits; agricultural education; better farming methods; Central experimental farm; immigration, exclusion of Asiatics; better understanding between farmer and city-man, 2869; no time for pessimism; pioneering; Bruce county in early days; summary of proposed policy
Buffalo
Slaughter of, 3440
Tuberculosis 3440
Business of the House, supply, relevancy, 4719
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2411
Chinese immigration bill, 2316
Merchants, 2316
Cold storage, 186
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 485
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Butter substitutes, 3151
"Manna" 3152
Renovated butter, 4251, 4255
Dairying industry, 2864, 3296
Butter, pasteurization 3298
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4672
Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 595
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms, 476-485
Fishery cruiser, Victoria, 4708
Freight rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1922
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, registration, 2397
Health of animals, 578
Tuberculin test, 578, 2867
Tuberculosis eradication, 3989
Indians cattle, 2159
Iron deposits, Vancouver island, 2514
Liquor
British Columbia plebiscite, 2441
Prices, 2441
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 193, 2202, 2292
Live stock industry, 476, 589. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Masters and mates, examination, 2610
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Nicomen island, protection, 626
Oleomargarine
Dairying industry and, 3296
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3510
Manufacture 3152
Paternal legislation, 727

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3707
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 723
Renovated butter, 3151, 4255
Seed testing bill, 278, 2305
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, Agriculture dept., 579, 2868

Tomato Plants. *See* Customs; Taxation

Topographical Surveys. *See* Surveys

Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Canadian National Railways
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4198
Electric lines, 2393
King and Yonge streets property, qu. 814, qu. 1663, qu. 1994, 2819, 2481, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Casualty clearing building, 4621
Customs house building, 3277, 4621, 4624
Fuel supply, 3200
Harbour improvements, 984, 985, 1011, 2678, 3076, 3774, 4444, 4445, 4562, 4578, 4610
Level crossings, 2477
Penny bank of. *See* Penny Bank
Post office building, 1780, 3277
Postal receipts, increase, 2819
Postal revenue, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Restaurants, profiteering, 2586
Seed branch offices, 4621
Soldiers' Comfort branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Soldier Settlement board, 2029
Street railway system, 2475, 3056
Tin-plate industry, 2819
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Toronto Transportation Commission, 1703
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4335, 4442
University of, scholarships, 878
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 517, 2477, qu. 4011, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442, 4447

Toronto Eastern Railway, 2475

Toronto Suburban Railway, qu. 280, 2181, 2475, qu. 2612, 3324

Tourist Traffic. *See* Canadian National Parks

Tower. *See* Parliament buildings

Tracadie Lazaretto, 702

Trade. *See also* Address; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; speeches on Budget; Tariff; Trade and Commerce; Treaties, French, Italian
Anglo-Canadian, fostering of, qu. 284
Annual report, 1910
Australia, with, 1848, 2964, 3476
Balance of, 2922
Bankruptcy, 648. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill
Canadian representative at Washington, 2735
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
China and India with, 1840
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717
Competition, Great Britain and Germany, 2752
Conditions, analysis, 2984
Cuba with, 308, 1840
Enlarged, advantages of, 2910
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Fiji islands, 1848
France with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, with, 437. *See also* British Preference
Increase in, 2784
International 2923
Interprovincial, 2177, 2748
Italy with, 2395. *See also* Treaties, Italian
Japan with, 1449
Pacific coast, 2868
Percentage of imports and exports, 2843
Oriental, 507. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Potatoes in, 308. *See also* Vegetables
Reciprocity with United States, 2650. *See also that title*
Russian trade mission, 986
Spain with, 2397
Steamship services. *See that title*
Switzerland, with 2397
Trade commissioners, 1837
Tariff and, 2923
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269, 2301
United States with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
West Indies, 3382
World competition, 2799

Trade and Commerce Department
Bounties, administration 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Trade commissioners, 1840
Commissioner of patents, duties, 2065
Consular and commercial agents qu. 284
Elevators, terminal, maintenance, 810

Trade and Commerce Department—*Con.*
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 3377, 4003, 4701
Exhibitions, 1467
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171. *See also* Steamship Services
O'Halloran, Mr. George F., Commissioner of Patents, 4673
Patent and Copyright branch, salaries, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 1837, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade, annual report, 1910
Trade commissioners and agents, 856, 1837
Weights and measures, inspection, 810

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
(Registration of industrial designs)
1r., 331; 2r., 2063; com., 2293; 3r., 2294

Trades and Labour Council. *See* Labour

Trades Union Congress. *See* Labour

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Resignation of, 2178

Trail, B.C., smelter, 2861, 2944

Transportation. *See also* Canadian National Railway; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Coal, 1247. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Equalization of rates, 1253. *See also* Freight Rates
Gaspe, 1243
Improvement of, 2745
Inadequate. *See* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Peace river district, 1433, 1440
Problems, 126. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Reduction, cost of, 1400
Shipping combine, 1134
Steamship companies, immigration and, 1193, 1201. *See also* Immigration
Water, 2979
Western Canada, 1440
Wheat, cost of, qu. 385. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Travellers' Cheques, tax. *See* Taxation, Cheque

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449, 2399
Australia, with, 245, 1848. *See also* Australia
Belgium, 246
Canada-West Indies, 3378
French Treaty, 9, 97, 436, 2657, 2815, 2832, 2964, 4457
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2001
Agricultural products, 1978, 2210, 2235
Aluminum, 1989
Analysis of, Mr. Chaplin, 1978
Anchovies and sardines, 2008
Automobiles, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Bacon, ham and pork products 1978
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Boots and shoes, 1990
Bottles, 2218
Braids and cords, 2213
Brandies, 2643, 2742, 2999, 3478
Brass and copper ware, 1981
British preference, 2005
Bronze powder, 1979, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2016, 2270
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998, 2017
Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217
Brushes, 2214
Building materials, 1982
Butter, 2273
Buttons, 2214, 2234
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Canadian ports. *See under this title.* Direct Importation
Cement, 1984
Cereals, 1984, 2006
Chemicals, 1980-5
Coal tar derivatives, 1986
Cobalt products, 2263, 2300
Competition, unfair, 2300
Condensed milk, 1984
Consumer, relief to, 3049
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Convention approved, 2255
Cotton manufactures, 1987, 2218, 2263
Cutlery, 1988
Dairy products, 1984
Direct importation, through Canadian ports, 1772, 2303, 2949
Duty, reductions in, 438, 2710
Eggs, 1978
Electrical apparatus, telephones, 2214
Electric lamps, incandescent, 1980
Embroideries, 2008, 2211, 2214, 2999
Engines and machinery, 1981-8
Favoured nation, 439, 443, 2005, 2007, 2014, 2210, 2213, 2219, 2232, 2234, 2241, 2271, 2395, 3035
Feathers and ornaments for hats, 3035
Fish, fresh and preserved, 1978, 2006, 2235

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Flour, 1978
France
Exports to, 2213
Friendly relations with, 2216
Trade with, 2209, 2255
French Consul General and, 2229
Furniture, 1982-9
Furs, 1981
Handkerchiefs, 2214, 3035
Hen feathers, 1978
Horses, 1978
Household necessaries, 441
Imports and exports, 1977, 2230
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Iron and steel, 1985-8, 2001
Japan, 2214
Trade concessions to, 450
Laces, 3035
Lard, 1978
Liberal platform, 2211
Linen yarns and thread, 1981
Live stock, 1983, 2211
Luxuries, 444, 450, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2213, 2221, 2259, 2742, 2989, 2999, 3035, 3910
Machinery and parts, 441
Manufacturers and, 2236. *See also under this title,* Canadian Manufacturers
Meats
Cured, 1978
Fresh, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978
Millinery, 3035
Minimum tariff, 440
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2218
Musical instruments 1982
Pianos and organs, 1990, 2237
Neighbouring countries, concessions to, 450, 2131, 2215, 2219, 2273
Oleomargarine, 1984
Paper and paper products, 1987
Paper board, 1981
Perfumery, 3035
Potatoes, 1984
Poultry, 1983
Revenue, loss of, 2014, 2209, 2235
Ribbons, 3035
Rubber, manufactures of, 1990, 2237
Sales tax, 2279, 2299
Sewing machines, 2237
Silks, 448, 2209, 2215, 2221, 2255, 2264, 2266, 2300, 2397, 2398, 2742, 3035
Specific duties, 2215
Spelter, 1979
Summary of, 2232
Switzerland, imports from, 2213, 2255

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Tabled, 54
Tariff and, 438, 2710, 4074
Tariff weapon, 3907-10
Treaty of 1907, 2004-29
United States, 2011
Concessions to, 449
Trade with France, 1991, 1997, 2213, 2218, 2229, 2276, 2396
Treatment, Unnited States and Canada, 441
Velvets and velveteens, 3488
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wheat, 1978
Wines, 438, 442, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225, 2302, 2643, 2710, 2999, 3035, 3937
Wood, manufactures of, 1982-9
Zinc, 1979
French Treaty Bill, res. 331, 436-456; 1r., 456; M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., 1910; withdrawn 1911; renewed 1977; discussion, 1977, 1995; 2r., on div. 2250-51; com. 2251-55-90-99; 3r., 2347
Halibut Fisheries Treaty with United States. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill
Approval of, res. 4440, 4455; agreed to, 4480
Correspondence, 1032, 1212
Tabled, 1256
Joint res. of parliament, transmission, 4736
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857-8
Procedure, 4437
Inquiry as to, 4132
Rider inserted by United States senate, 1308
Signing of, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664
Italian Treaty, 9, 2394, 2701, 2815, 2832
Consideration postponed, 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401, 2949
Favoured nation treatment, 2394
Border states, 2395
France, 2395
Italy, trade with, 2395
Relief to consumers, 3049
Signing of, 2403
Tabled, 89
Italian Treaty Bill, res. 331, 2394; 1r., 2395; 2r., com., 2395; 3r., 2437, 2701
Negotiatiton of, expenses, 3989
Peace treaty
Enemy property custodian, qu. 1486
International Labour Conference, 1441
Light thrown on causes of war, 2725
Orders in council, 767
Postal Treaty with the United States, 2, 4529

Treaties—*Con.*
Rush-Bagot, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Germain, 653
Switzerland, 2398
Trade, 437. *See also under this titlte,* Australia, French, Italian
United States. *See also* Reciprocity, United States
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Reciprocity treaty of 1854, 2910
Versailles, qu. 279, 1631-2, 3994. *See also* Germany, Reparations; War Claims
Labour, right to organize, 2889, 2895
Modification of, 4653

Tree Planting. *See* Forests and Forestry

Tremblay, General. *See* Quebec Harbour Commission

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton
Emigration from, 2823
Wool-combing industry, 2823, 2827, 3461

Trial by Jury. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Yukon Act Amdt.

Trials. *See* Justice
Eskimos, Hershell Island. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Troops. *See* National Defence
Use of in labour troubles. *See* Labour

Trout-Fishing. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868

Truro park, 3440

Trustees. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Trusts. *See* Combines

Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1447. *See also* Immigration, Chinese

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals; Live Stock; Pensions
Animals, 462-486. *See also* Live Stock; Animal Contagious Diseases
Tuberculin test, 2867, 3284, 3300
Attributable to military service, 3850
Bovine and human, 2868
Buffalo, 3439
Cattle, 2131-38. *See also* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Eradication, 3989
Dairy products, 3299

Tuberculosis—*Con.*
Immunization from, 2868
Indians, 2152
Live stock, 2867
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Military hospitals, 670
Pension obligation and, 3850
Returned soldiers, deaths from, qu. 3134
Serum, 2868
Tuberculous Veterans Association, petition, 4536

Tugboats. *See* Vessels

Tupper, Sir Charles
French treaty, 1991
Title, 1295

Turkey, threatened war with, 2815. *See also* Near East Crisis

Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Turnover Tax. *See* Taxation

Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Tutankhamen, King, 755, 1761
Inheritance tax, 2788

Two Months' Supply. *See* Interim Supply

Typewriters. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Tyrrell, Mr. J. W., Hudson Bay region, 1072

Ukrainians. *See also* West Ukrainian Republic
Immigration, 1396, 1883
Settlement of, 1341

Uncleaned Screenings. *See* Grain, Elevators

Undesirable Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Unearned Income. *See* Taxation

Unemployment. *See* Labour; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Unification. *See* Canadian National Railways

Unimproved Land. *See* Land; Taxation

Union Act, 1364, 1365

Union Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Union Label. *See* Labour

Union Nationale Française, immigration, 1877

Union of South Africa. *See* South Africa

Unions. *See* Labour

Unit of Representation. *See* Redistribution

United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 81, 1440

United Farmers of Manitoba, 1462

United Farmers of Ontario
Combines and trusts, 2584
Immigration, 1191
Proportional representation, 425

United Mines Workers of America. *See* Labour; Howat

United States. *See also* Reciprocity; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration, cost of, 1155
Agriculture
Economic organization, 1857
Encouragement of, 1390
Agricultural conditions, 642, 2829
Agricultural implements, duty free, 3017, 3062
Agricultural products, 2751
Markets for, 2810, 2869
Alien enemy property, custodian, 2496, 3823
American Expeditionary Force, mental tests, 1219
American legion, 2444
Annexation, 93
Asiatic immigration, exclusion, 1194
Banking system, 4083
Bankruptcy law, 3092
Bean-growing industry, 2981
Boots and shoes, duty, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499
Borrowings from, 93-94
British debt, 2879, 2918
Budget, 3341
Building boom, 1129, 3004, 3017
Cabinet officers, number of, 3043
Canadian exhibitions in, 1454
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3649
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361, 4480
Canadian railways, ocean ports in, 1754-5
Canadian representation, 4001, 4664. *See also that title*
Canadian tariff policy and, 3010
Canadians in, 43. *See also* Emigration
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cattle, export to, 1410, 2871
Chinese immigration, 2313, 4349
Coal, 3203. *See also that title*
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Embargo on, 1265, 1279
Exports from. *See* Coal
Purchased for railways, 1277
Strikes and labour unions, 2786
Supplies from, 1262

United States—*Con.*
Coloured population, 2316
Combines, grand jury system, 2585
Competition from, 2861. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Conditions following Civil War, 1122, 1232
Congressional library, 2693
Copyright, 2140. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Cost of living, 1812
Customs duties, per capita, 2738
Debt, per capita, 2956
Duties against, reduction by order in council, 2649
Emergency tariff, 2847. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Effect upon Canadian export, 2847
Emigration of Canadians to, 21, 1082, 1085, 1975. *See also* Emigration
European reconstruction, 4654
Exports, 1838
Pulpwood to, 4347. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Fair Tariff League, 3070
Farmers' bloc, 2791
Federal Reserve Bank, 3059, 4124, 4407
Federal reserve system, 4069
Fishing industry, 2940
Fish, market for, 2906, 2946, 3002
Fishing schooner, Siloam, capture, 2207
Fishing vesels, purchase of bait, 3705
Halibut fishery treaty with. *See* Treaties, Halibut
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Use of Canadian ports by, 3361, 4480
Flour, ocean rates, 2127
Ford, Henry, presidential candidate, 2908
Fordney-McCumber tariff, 172, 2649, 2708, 2748, 2818, 2823, 2857, 2869, 2909, 2919, 2940, 2946, 2958, 2977, 2993, 2997, 3011, 3013, 3035, 3052, 3061, 3098
Cattle, 3293
Coal, 1275
Farmers' gains and losses, 3070
Pacific coast fisheries, 2734
Power of president to vary, 3902
France, trade with, 1991, 1997, 2011, 2209, 2213, 2222, 2276, 2396. *See also* Treaties, French
Free list, agricultural products, 2910
Free trade, 1403, 2738, 2746, 3013
Freight cars, interchange, 4697
French Canadians in, repatriation, 1462
French treaty. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Grand Trunk lines, 3197
Grain prices, 297-8. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

United States—*Con.*
Grain shipments through United States ports, 3763
Great Lakes disarmament, correspondence, 1307
Harding, late President, world peace, 2911
Highways, 3437
Hirtle, Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Hogs, corn-fed, 2865
Immigration and, 1248
After Civil War, 1885
Agencies in, 1875
Obstacles to,, 1416
Policy, 1885
Imports and exports, 2821, 2928, 3061
Income tax, 2986, 4503
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reductions, 2913
Industrial development, 2751
Industrial organization and competition, 2992
Inflation, 2800, 3004
Influence in Canada, 2934. *See also* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
Fuel investigation, 1279
Internationl boundaries, survey and demarcation, 3248
Japanese organizations, 2444
Labour delegates, detention at border, 2296, 2419, 2469, 2347, 2393
Labour demand, 1129. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Lake of the Woods water powers. *See that title*
Levels, qu. 2700
Liquor laws, 4295
Illicit traffic, alleged, 2208
McKinley tariff, 2910
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufactured products, 2751
Market for, 2856
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Movement of population to. *See* Emigration
National Reserve bank, 4145
Naturalization, 2443
Oriental problem, 2443
Oriental propaganda in, 1896
Pecuniary Clains Convention, 779
People from, stopped at border, 1167. *See also under this title* Labour delegates
Ports
Adulteration of Canadian grain, 3649, 3961
Competition. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Ocean, 2898
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Postal treaty, 4529
Potatoes, export to, qu. 621

United States—*Con.*
Prices, comparison of, 2742, 2916
Prosperity, 2657
Protection and, 2751
Pulpwood, export to, 3413, 3416. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Railway system, 3057
Unification, 1618
Railways
Earnings, flour transportation, 2960
Grain shipments, diversion to, 2898
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2707, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2843, 3847, 2905, 2917, 3454, 3473
Chicago Tribune, comment, 2733
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718
Standing offer, 3016
Relations with, 2905
Rural credit system, 642, 2829, 2930, 4043, 4046, 4130, 4298
Rural depopulation, 2829
Rural mail delivery, 1781
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3208, 3705, 3762, 4513. *See also that title*
Self-interest, 2918
Senate, constitution of, 1373, 1378
Silk industry, 2397, 2400
Strikes, 1629
Sugar boycott, 2734
Surplus, 2823
Tariff 1113, 1119. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Change of sentiment, 3013
Emigration and, 1093
Tinplate industry, 2400, 2751
Trade relations with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
Agents in Canada, qu. 284
Negotiations with, 3074
Revival, 2650
Unemployment, decrease of, 2650
Wages in, 1165. *See also under this title,* Emigration; Labour
War and, 2918
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2735. *See also* Canadian Representation
Welland canal construction, 3762
Wharves, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wheat, duty, 2993

Universities. *See also* Education
Bank directors and, 4025, 4073
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Graduates emigrating to the United States, 2732
Independent thought stifled, 3074

Universities—*Con.*
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Toronto, 878

Unopposed Motions for Paper
Accredited herds (Mr. Caldwell) 626
Agriculture dept. employees (Mr. Bouchard) 815
Alberta Drainage Company (Mr. Kellner) 3144
Arctic islands and northern Quebec (Mr. Parent) 814
Banff park, power rights (Mr. Shaw) 496
Banff springs and cave (Mr. Shaw) 496
Bank returns (Mr. Coote) 3264
British Columbia claims (Mr. Stevens) 708
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, (Sir Henry Drayton) 3705, 3822
Canadian National Railways
Equipment orders, (Mr. Meighen) 2701
Grand Trunk, United States terminals (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Lifting of steel, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1664
Orders in council (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Regulations (Mr. MacLaren) 496
Canadian Pacific Railway, Quebec terminals (Mr. Parent) 815
Cattle trade with Great Britain (Mr. Meighen) 208
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions (Mr. Manion) 330; (Mr. Meighen) 208
Dismissals (Mr. Hanson) 856
Positions exempted (Mr. Irvine) 914
Customs and Excise, legal work (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Disallowance of Nova Scotia legislation (Mr. Hanson) 208; (Sir Henry Drayton) 249, 208
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs. (Mr. Maybee) 3705
Eastern Lands Development Company, (Mr. Lapierre) 626, (Mr. Carruthers) 1635
Euclid Hall and Brant House, closing (Mr. Church) 4303
Export liquor warehouse licenses (Mr. Stevens) 3144
Freight rates, shipping, coastal regulations (Mr. Coote) 2613
Government printing, Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) 3144
Grand Trunk arbitration (Mr. d'Anjou) 1307
Halibut fishery treaty (Mr. Meighen) 1032

Unopposed Motions for Paper—*Con.*
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal (Mr. Irvine) 1868
Hudson Bay railway (Mr. Meighen) 208
Immigrant supplies, Quebec (Mr. Charters) 496
Lewis, John L., correspondence (Mr. Meighen) 250
Liquor, export, revenue, etc. (Mr. Good) 3704
Lindsay market scales (Mr. Thurston) 208
Margaree river salmon fisheries, (Mr. Hanson) 2700
New Brunswick export houses (Mr. Caldwell) 815
Newspapers and printing companies, contracts, (Mr. Black, Yukon) 1974
Nicomen island, protection (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Nipissing Indian reserve (Mr. Lapierre) 1307
North Oakville post office (Mr. Anderson) 914
Nova Scotia miners' strike (Sir Henry Drayton) 914
Orders in council
Canadian National Railways (Sir Henry Drayton)815
P. C. 223 (Mr. Sutherland) 815
P. C. 1566 (Mr. Black, Yukon) 249
Oriental immigration (Mr. McQuarrie) 1307
Ottawa river water storage (Mr. Parent) 815
Printing contracts, newspapers, etc. (Mr. d'Anjou) 2298
Purchase of bait for fishing vessels (Mr. Forke) 3705
Railway lands, purchase or sales (Mr. Boys) 1739
St. Lawrence river waterway (Mr. Church) 3705
Sardine herring fishery (Mr. Duff) 2518
Six Nations Indian reserve (Mr. Senn) 1307
Soldier settlers, fire insurance (Mr. McMurray) 496
Sporting Mountain mail contract (Mr. Hanson) 856
Sydenham hospital (Mr. Ross, Kingston) 626
Technical and professional officials (Mr. Martell) 815
Testing of dairy cattle (Mr. Caldwell) 1307
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Toronto Suburban railway (Mr. Church) 2181
Trade commissioners (Mr. Putnam) 856
Vermilion town lots (Mr. Spencer) 1307
Wheat board, correspondence (Mr. McConica) 626
Winnipeg coal purchases (Mr. McMurray) 496

Unrest, Industrial. *See* Labour

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Emigration; Population

Vacancies. *See* Auditor General; House of Commons

Valcartier Camp Ground. *See* National Defence

Valleyfield, Canadian Bronze Powder Works, 1998, 2017

Valuation for Duty. *See* Customs

Vancouver (city)
Assay office, 3207
Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Board of Trade,
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 1869, 1910, 3189
Freight rates, equalization, 1953
Bridge, 1008
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 3272
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Granville island taxation, qu. 1485
Immigration
Chinese, 1444. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Immigration sheds, 1447, 1896
Income tax offices, qu. 912
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1451
Labour department, 1678
Orientals, business competition, 504, 1902, 2311
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Producers' Dairy Company, 2526
Proportional representation, 401
Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association 4266

Vancouver (port). *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Ballantyne pier, 257, 258
Dry dock, 1002, 2671
Elevator, 1057, qu. 1487, 3769
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Improvements, 2033
Grain shipments, 69, 1034, 3769
Harbour, 83, 110, 1002
Harbour commission, 387, qu. 912
Kitsilano reserve and, 383
Vacancies, 1372
Port development, 1051

Vancouver Harbour Advances Bill
Res. 198, 255; 1r., 269-270; 2r., com., 3r., 332

Vancouver Island, iron deposits, 2514

Van Koughnet, Mrs., Soldiers' Comfort Branch, Toronto, 4727

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables; Treaties, French Treaty
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canned, imports, 445
Competition from United States, 2977
Dehydration of, 4674
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Potatoes
Acreage and production, 2934
Diseases, 595
Duty, 2651, 2707, 2959, 2980, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Free trade in, 2820
Freight rates, 137-138
French treaty, 1984
Grading, 598. *See also* Root Vegetables
Growers, 137
Imports, qu. 617, 2820, 2959
Inspection, 598
New Brunswick, 2763
Potato-growing industry, 308
Prices, 2820
Prince Edward Island, 131, 2763
Reciprocity in, 2993
Seed, inspection of, 2306
United States
Competition, 2977
Exports, qu. 621
Wharfage tolls, 975
Root vegetables, sale and inspection, 937
Tomato plants, customs duty, 4432

Velvets. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty

Veniot, Premier, St. John river wharves, qu. 1488

Vermilion, Alberta, town lots, 1307
Purchases, 489
Rental by government, qu. 2417

Verret, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826

Versailles, Treaty of, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Treaties
International Labour Conference, 1631

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine; Shipping
Acadia, 1044, 3336
Alaskan wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160
Algerine, qu. 1763

Vessels—*Con.*
Arctic, 3944, 4012
Bayfield, 3336
Bonaventure, 1044
Boethic, 1044
Canadian, Chinese sailors on, 2334
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cartier, 3336
Challenger, 1742
Crews, 2670. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
Eureka, 1364
Fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Foreign. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Gleeful, tug, qu. 1763
John D. Hazen, 3160
Lady Grey, 3160
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Lillooet, 3336
Llandovery Castle, loss of, 1745
Malaspina, 2207
Marvale, wreck, 3333
Mikula, icebreaker, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Minto, 1044
Montcalm, 2614, 3160
Monte Grappa, foundering, qu. 912
Murray Stewart, tug, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354
Reliance, qu. 812
Restless, 3336
Siloam, seizure, 2207
Space for cattle. *See* Live Stock, Shipments
Stanley, 2614
Taibu Maru, 859
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Tuscan Prince, wreck of, qu. 1763
Wireless equipment, 3355

Vetcraft Shops. *See* Soldiers

Veterans' Associations. *See* Pensions

Veterinary Surgeons, drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Veto. *See* Disallowance

Vickers Company
Cancellation of contract, 1746
Hydro-planes, 1748
War claim, 1745
Canadian Vickers, qu. 2205
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3780
Hopper barge construction, contract, 3350

Victoria, B.C.
Dominion astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dry dock, 1002

Victoria, B.C.—*Con.*
Harbour, dredging, 110, 1014
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, qu. 3137

Victoria, vacancy. *See* Cape Breton North and Victoria

Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Ammunition, 886
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079-4124
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087, 3089
Business of the House, Speaker's rulings, 4076
Canadian National Railways, deficits, 4190
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Copper bounty bill, 4375
Editorial Committee, French publications, 1670
French translation and printing, 1489, 1670
Halibut fishery treaty, 4467
Imperial Conference, 4639
Indemnity of members, 4237
Labour, right to organize, 2894
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4237
Petition of right, fiats, 3222
Powell River Paper Company, 2894
Public ownership of railways, 4191
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 713, 716, 737
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4237-46

Ville Marie wharf, 981

Vimy Ridge Memorial Site, 2, 3, 12
Gift of by France, 65, 2832
Accepted, 180
Agreement, 181
Joint res. of parliament, 811, 3819
Message from his Ecellency the Governor General, 1631
President, French Republic
Letter from, 1538
Joint res. to, 811

Vincent, Mr. J. U., 1806

Vocational Training. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Vote, Lack of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence

Voting in Divisions. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Wages. *See* Cost of Living; Labour

Wainwright Buffalo Herd, 2773, 3407, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 4702

Waldron, Mr. Gordon, United Farmers of Ontario, 425

Walker, Sir Edmund, immigration, 1343

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2133
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2056-9
Health of animals, 581
Historic sites, 3432
Port Dover, Ont., Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Income tax, revenue, cost, etc. qu. 1259
Life-saving station, Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Oleomargarine, drawback on materials, 3503
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Radiotelegraph stations, lake Erie, 3338

Want of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Wanipigow River dam, 1000

War. *See also* Germany, Reparations; National Defence
British expeditionary force 3885
Burdens, 2967, 2981. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canada's participation in, 4655. *See also that title;* Imperial Conference
Canadian expeditionary force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Causes of, 2725
Claims. *See* War Claims
Conditions following, 1231. *See also* Immigration
Debt, 2797. *See also* Pubic Debt
Capital levy 2722-28
Expenditure 2915, 2920
Naval 110
Responsibility for 3078
1914-1922, qu. 914
French-Canadians, bravery 2935
Glorification of, 2686
League of Nations and, 3993
Loans. *See that title*
Material, sale of, 2986
Medals 1743
Medical supplies, purchase of, 2921
Middlemen, 2921
Monuments and Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge
Pensions. *See that title*

War—*Con.*
Profiteering, 2585, 2981
Profits, taxation of, 2788, 2985
Reparations. *See* Germany
Responsibility for. *See* Germany
Retired officers, serving in. *See* Militia Pension Act Amdt.
Revenues collected during, 2985
Rhineland occupation, cost of, qu. 2696
Scandals, 2815
Davidson commission, qu. 812
Taxation, 2788, 3028. *See also that title*
War profits tax, 2788, 2985
United States and, 2918

War Claims. *See also* Alien Enemy Property; Germany, Reparations
Adjustment of, qu. 1486, 1745
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, qu. 3142
Canadian claims against Germany, 2496
Canadian Pacific Railway shares, 2496
German claims against Canadians, 2496
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500
Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745
Massey-Harris Company, settlement of, 2497
Militia services, 900
Statement of expenditure, 1747
Naval service, 900
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment as commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Secretary of State, 2495
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce vote, 2502, neg. 2504
Statement of, 2496
Vickers, contract, cancellation, 1746

War Measures Act, Oleomargarine, 3528. *See also* Oleomargarine; M. (Mr. Carroll)

War Revenue Act. *See* Special War Revenue

War Service, Repatriation. *See* Naturalization Act

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Budget, 2959. "Annual family squabble"; zigzag course of debate; arguments for and against protection; more important matters than the tariff; freight rates; suspension of coasting regulations, 2959; increase of lake grain rates; the "shipping barons"; discrimination by Canadian boats in favour of United States lake ports; milling in bond; United States railway earnings from transportation of flour, 2960; Crowsnest pass agreement; saving in railway rates absorbed by shipping

Ward, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
companies; western agricultural conditions and demands; talk of secession; tax sales in Manitoba, 2961; conditions in Saskatchewan; what is the matter with western Canada? mortgaged farms; remoteness from tidewater; high interest rates; increased dependence upon agricultural prosperity; gratuities to Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern directors and officials, 2962; cattle shipments to Great Britain, space and rates; public debt; taxation; interest payments; New York loan, April 1922; the spectre of debt; doing business with borrowed money, 2963
Canadian National Railways, retiring gratuities, 1483, qu. 1632, 1687, 2962
Unorganized districts, road-building, 3258
Welland canal construction, 3789

Warehouses. *See* Canada Temperance; Customs; Grain; Liquor

Warlike Stores. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Agricultural conditions, 1423
Alberta coal
Freight rates, 3009
Resources, 1282
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 549, 555
Climatic conditions of West, 1423
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Edmonton Indian school, 2165
Emigration to the United States, 1422
Experimental farms, 467
Farm labour, 1424
Forest protection, 3418
M. (Mr. Michaud) 825
Fuel supply, 795
M. (Mr. Church) 1282
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1055
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1425
Policy, 1421
Speeches, adverse effect of, 1423
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3513, 3516, 3519, 3539
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 758
Reference to, 1425
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1151

Warner, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Rural mail delivery, western provinces, 1791
Tariff, immigration and, 1424
Tree-planting, 3418
Vancouver harbour bill, 266
Wheat-growing, 1423

Washington. *See also* United States
British Ambassador at, 858, 4457. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
Canadian representative at, 2735, 3017, 3085, 4001, 4664
Congressional library, 2693
Disarmament conference, 2911, 4000
Visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823

Waste Paper, disposal by government departments, qu. 1028, 1713

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers. *See also* Fuel Supply; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration of, 3420
Alienation of, 3422
Canadian national parks, 3442, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Forest Reserves
Banff, 3750, 3939
Carillon rapids, 659
Cedar rapids, 659
Development of, 3422
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Dominion Power Board, 3427
Eastern townships, 1248
Electric power, exportation, 658
Export duty, 2828
Suggested prohibition, 1272
United States to, 1266
Fuel supply, 3203. *See also that title*
Hudson Bay railway, 1040, 1065
Hudson Bay region, 1072
Grass river, 1065
Jurisdiction, 665
Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods, 3421, 3425, 4163. *See also that title*
Control Board, expenses, 4001
Leases, 3421
United States citizens to, 3426
National policy, development of, 1270
Nelson river, 3421
Niagara district, 3782
Niagara falls, 3940
Ottawa river, qu. 1974
Peace river district, 1433

Water Powers—*Con.*
Provincial ownership and jurisdiction, 3421
Railway electrification, 3422
Resources, 2750
Revenue, 2969
Rideau canal, qu. 622
St. Lawrence 2682
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3782
Surveys and investigations, 3203, 3420
Expenditure, 2969
Water Powers board, 3420
Water powers of the world estimated, 1270
Winnipeg river, 1214, 3421. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Waterhen Lakes, drainage, 3431, qu. 4303

Waterton Lakes
Highway, qu. 2085
Park, 3435

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways and, 3057
St. Lawrence river. *See that title*

Watson, Dr. glanders, treatment of, 579, 2868

Ways and Means, Committee of, 2640, 3084, 3229, 3231, 3454, 3705, 3895, 3963, 4162, 4181
Bounties on manila fibre and copper bars or rods, 3231
British preference, 3454
Budget speech, 2640
Customs tariff resolutions, 3454-74
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3229
Interim supply, 1539, 3705
Motion for, discussion, 3222
Notice of, 179
Supply bill, 4735
United States, reciprocity, 3454

Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145, 3995

Wealth of Canada
Estimated, 2719
History of, 2728

Webb, Sydney, report, 2545
Sydney and Beatrice, Decay of Capital and Civilization, 2726

Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Weed Seeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill; Seed

Weekly Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Weights and Measures
Cartage charge 810
Inspection 810
Peterborough district, qu. 492, 810

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln Counties. *See* Redistribution

Wells, Mr. H. G., Civilization and the War, 2722

Well-Drilling Machinery. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Welsh Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

West Indies
Fish markets, 3002
Steamship service with, 3377
Trade, 3382. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
West Indies delegates, 3392

West Ukrainian Republic. *See also* Ukrainians
M. (Mr. Campbell) 651, withdrawn, 658

Western Canada. *See* Western Provinces

Western Canada Colonization Association. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Western Grain Standards Board. *See* Grain, Marketing

Western Provinces. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Grain and Grain Trade; **Immigration;** Natural Resources. For individual provinces. *See their respective titles*
Agricultural conditions, 1196, 1201, 1439, 1880, 1889, 2766. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Banks and Banking; Budget; Immigration; Railways; *and under this title,* Conditions
Examples of successes and failures, 2767
Questionnaire and answer, 2772
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, administration, 2132
Bad farming, 1889, 2781, 2812
Branch lines construction, 4185
Conditions in, 1213, 1221, 1246, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1388, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1415, 1854, 1883, 1890, 2747, 2811, 2845, 2961, 2977, 3002, 4038, 4062, 4222

Western Provinces—*Con.*
Conditions in—*Con.*
"Calamity howlers", 2811, 2977
Christison, Mr. J. N., 1891
Goosen, Mr. Peter, 1892
Spence, Mr. George, 1891
Winter trips to British Columbia and California, 1252
Extravagance, 1889
Farm mortgages, 2962
Farmers' earnings, 2813
Field crops, 2846
Financial distress, 1890
Freight rates, 3190
Grain shipments. *See* Freight Rates; Grain; Vancouver Harbour Bill
Grievances, 3056-62
Immigration. *See that title*
Industries, 1889
Lack of, 4047
Interest rates, 1088. *See also* Banks and Banking
Mixed farming, 2772
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Municipal and provincial extravagance in building, 1890
Natural resources, 1121, 2782, 2836, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Petroleum bounties, 2648
Redistribution, 4738
Remoteness from tidewater, 2962
Representation on Railway Commission, 3192
Ridicule and intimidation, 2813
Rural income tax-payers, 2845
Rural mail delivery, 1790
Rural shareholders of banks, 2846
Saline lake deposits, 3198
Secession talk, 2808, 2814, 2961, 2977, 3067
Settlement of due to railways, 2833
Solidarity, 3062
Surveys in, qu. 1866
Tariff and, 1424, 2747
Taxation, undue burden on, 2781. *See also* Taxation
Thornton, Sir Henry, statement, 2962
Transportation, 4222. *See also* Freight Rates; Grain
Treatment, 4191
Understanding with manufacturers, 3023
Unrest, alleged condition of, 4514
Wealth "stream drying up" 2757

Weyburn Security Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Interest on investment, 976

Wharves—*Con.*
New Brunswick, transfer to federal government, 946
Revenue, 976
United States, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wharfage tolls, 975

Wheat. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Stem Saw-Fly. *See* Agriculture; Insect Pests

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, 278

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Agricultural implements, standardization, 809
British preference, woollen goods, 3470
Budget, 2964. Debt and taxation; expenditure; retrenchment in civil government; raisins and dried currants; duty; Australia, trade with; French treaty; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty; binder twine, discrimination against manufacturer, 2964; history of binder twine industry; price advance following abolition of duty; production, imports and exports, 2965; home and export prices; tariff stability; knowledge as to conditions of investment; reciprocity proposals; amendment, 2966; income tax; unearned income; indemnity of members; socialistic doctrine; Abraham Lincoln on rights of capital, 2967
Firebrick duty, 3482
Fuel supply, 809
Old age annuities, 1639
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Penitentiaries, 771
Pensions, disability entitling to, 679
Post offices, grade 3, qu. 4300
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3781
Tobacco imports, duties, qu. 1258
Unemployment relief, 690
Welland canal construction, 3781

White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

White, Sir Thomas, Reciprocity, "Noble Eighteen", 2908

White Mud River, fishway, 3362

White Star Dominion Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Whitney, Sir James, hydro-electric development, 1267

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Combines Bill

Widows, Pensions. *See* Pensions

Wild Life Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations Bill

Wiley Estate. *See* Yukon

Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Willison, Sir John. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Canada Colonization Association, 1323, 1328, 1429
Retirement from, 1164
Reminiscences, quotation from, 1182

Wilson, Mr. C. C. (Wentworth)
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 624, 2492
Ontario projected highways, qu. 624

Windermere Highway. *See* Banff-Windermere

Windsor, N.S.
Dredging, 1010
Historic sites, 3406

Windsor, Ont., emigration, 1404

Wines. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Winnipeg
Coal purchases for public buildings, 496
Elmwood postal station, 4628
Emigration from, to United States, 1975
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Government printing, 3144
Winnipeg Saturday Post, qu. 3323
Grain sample market, qu. 345
Institutions and services of, 1214
Liberal Association, immigration, 1429
Lord Shaw, statement on immigration, 2833
Minto street armoury, qu. 2084
Proportional representation, 392, 411, 412, 433. *See also that title*
Stockyards, 2762
Ukrainians, resolution. *See* West Ukrainian Republic
Unemployment, 41-42, 435, 1124, 1215, 1644, 1883
Mayor, representations from, 1658

Winnipeg—*Con.*
Water powers, 3421, 3425. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Winnipeg Free Press, emigration, 2790

Winnipeg-St. Croix projected railway, 2898

Winnipeg River, 1214. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Wireless Telegraphy, 3337. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Telegraphs and Telephones
Hudson Bay route, 1046
Industrial Group, Great Britain, message from, 4436
Navigation and, 3333
Northwest territories, 3944-5
Vessels, equipment, 3355-6
Wireless stations, 3374
Mayo, 4702

Wolves. *See* Animals, Wild

Wolvin, Mr. Lee H., 4281. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Women
Civil Service, in, 1772
Dominion Council of Health, representation, 3649
Farm, 1844
Pensions, 1651. *See also that title*
Representation in parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Women's Labour League, 2718

Wood, Mr. E. R., 60

Wood, Mr. H. W., statement on budget, 2771, 2853, 2946

Wood, Mr. W. F., income tax conviction, qu. 3582

Wood. *See also* Lumber
Staves, duty, 3487

Woodbridge, Ont., postmaster, 1821, 1828

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Bacon, grading, 593
Budget, 2846. A dual policy, 2846; tariff; slow movement of Liberal party toward reduction; reciprocity; market for agricultural products; effect of United States emergency tariff on Canadian exports; cheque tax; limitation, inequitable, 2847; agricultural

Woods, Mr. R. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
implements, tariff; speech of Mr. Meighen session of 1910-1911, "ramparts of gold"; protection increased by rise in price, 2848; boots and shoes, duty on; Canadian manufacturers, monopoly of home market and free access to United States; agricultural conditions, home markets practically worthless to farmers; world competition in agricultural products, 2849; tariff for revenue; duties too high to produce revenue; cigarettes; industrial centralization; disappearance of small manufacturing establishments, 2850; manufacturers, beneficiaries of cheaper production; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberals who opposed reciprocity, the "Noble Eighteen"; Sir Thomas White; manufacturers support government that will protect them; class legislation; Progressive group out for equal rights; tariff joint product of Liberal and Conservative parties, 2851
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 740
Rural mail carriers, 1789
Seed inspection, 197
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Wines native, prohibition of manufacture, 2411
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Woods, Lake of. *See* Lake of the Woods

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 41. Omissions in speech from Throne; no lessening of burden of taxation; unemployment situation, 41; statements from organizations and municipalities, 41-42; immigration scheme; land settlement plan; past immigration policy, 43; financial condition; commercial treaties, 44; Near East crisis; Canada's national status; Mr. J. A. Hobson on imperialism, 45; British policy in foreign affairs; Lloyd George; ex-Premier Nitti of Italy, 46; Trades Union Congress at the Hague, 46-47; necessity for permanent peace, 47
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Annual drill, 866, 4636
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 994,999
Autonomy, Canadian, 45, 4651

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4018, 4084-87, 4144-61
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Lawful association, amdt. 4084, neg. 4085
Officials, right of organization, amdt.. 4161, neg. 4161
Shareholders' audit, amdt. 4087, neg. 4090
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Belle River harbour, 4608
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British and foreign news service, 4712
Budget, 2718; amendment, Mr. Forke; free trade; greater economy in public administration; social readjustment; perpetuation of National Policy; tariff on implements of production, 2718; Liberal party promises forgotten; taxation of necessaries of life; raisins; Women's Labour League, telegram, 2718; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, statement; legislative and administrative machinery; over-organization; economic resources; estimated wealth of Canada, 2719; natural resources; gold, one per cent of national wealth; annual production; manufacturing industries, production costs and profit; capital invested; provincial and municipal debts, 2720; per capita debt; unemployment, anxiety and general dissatisfaction; labour, viewpoint of; doctrine of free trade; industrial and economic changes; free trade England; unemployment and social difficulties; labour and socialism; British National Labour party, policy, 2721; suppression of capitalistic system; resolution introduced in British House of Commons; Lloyd George and British socialism; H. G. Wells, sinking of ship of civilization; Dr. J. J. Tompkins of St. Francis Xavier University, Catholic social principles, 2722; face to face with serious crisis; industrial revolution; individualistic production; the farmer; transportation systems; internationalism, 2723; thinking in terms of the parish rather than of the world; status of the worker; freedom and the introduction of the taxing system; agricultural and industrial workers; concentration of capital; John Maynard Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace"; markets, 2724; buying power; war, causes of; combinations and trusts;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
financial control; monopoly of credits; economic and social consequences of capitalism; control of educational agencies, 2725; Upton Sinclair, Capitalistic Control of the Press; control of government; federation of British industries; Canadian Manufacturers' Association; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Decay of Capital and Civilization; wealth and poverty; privileges and monopolies, 2726; wage slavery; serious economic conditions; industrial democracy; socialism and state socialism; railways; spheres of federal and provincial control; coal mines; production for the use and not for profit, 2727; financial systems; labour platform; natural resources; public ownership and operation of public utilities and large scale industries; nationalization of banking system; abolition of class privilege; capital levy for war debt; taxation inequalities; History of Canadian Wealth; private property; natural resources; ownership and taxation of, 2728; conscription of men and wealth; new epoch in history; Rabindranath Tagore on civilization; radical changes necessary, 2729
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Supply, relevancy, 4602
Canada Gazette, 1709
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada-West Indies
Steamship service, 3378
Treaty, 3379
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3844
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3384
Vessels, sale of, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Board, labour representation, 3636
Coal, Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027
Management, responsibility and powers, 3635, 3699
Paris offices, 3699
Shopmen, resolution, 1338
Capital levy, 2728, 2909
Capital for settlers, 1089
China, civilization of, 2486

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration bill, 2338, 2485
Children, 2484
Merchants, 2484
Wives, 2484
Civil Service
Bonus, employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Salary revision, 1793-4
Underpaid, 4672
Combines
Coal situation, 254
Legislation inquiry, 254
Combines bill, 2551
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 2282
Sedition, 616
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2389
Doukhobors, 1340
Eight-hour day, 1643
English and French-speaking people harmony, 1341
External Affairs department, 3588
False Creek bridge, 4708
Farm labourers Winnipeg, 1976
Farm lands, prices, 1087
Freight rates on coal, 1345
Fuel supply, exploitation, 1344
German reparations, M. 280, 311
Governor General
Cars, repairs, 4691
Expenditure, 4627
Hansard, distribution of, 1715
Hector celebration, 4636, 4706
Hemp bounty bill, 4377, 4380
Hindu franchise, 4650-1
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Restaurant, 2692
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2347, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3155
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1336, 3637
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Child, 1342
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Exclusion, 2485
Students, 2485
Naturalization, 2196
Policy, 1336
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2433
Deportation without trial, 2433
Imperial Conference, 4650
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 3453

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Economic Conference, agenda, 3453
Imperial federation, 4651
International Labour Conference, 1643
Joint control of industry, 1655
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1704-6
Control, etc, 1655
Delegates from United States detention. *See under this title,* Howat
Estimates, reasons for decrease, 1638
Immigration and, 1339
Industrial councils, 1654
Industrial disputes, public utilities, 1703
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Organizations, federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2892
Right to organize, 2891
Bank officers and employees, 4084, 4161
Penitentiaries and, 772
Representation in parliament, 397, 3555
Strikes and unemployment, 1631
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4176
Land policy, 1344
Land tax, 1344
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1212, 1309
Lausanne Conference, 54
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
League of Nations, 3993
Library of Parliament, 2693
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 844
Mennonites, 1341
Meyerscough, Thomas, detention at border. *See under this title,* Howat
Military expenditure, 866
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2686
National Policy, permanency, 4652
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2195, 2455-57
Naturalization, Mounted Police and, 779
Nova Scotia steel workers, strike, 1643
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3871
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3716
Old age, inquiry, 733, 1646
Royal commission, interim report, 2167
Post office employees, salaries, 1794
Powell River Paper Company, 2891
Printing bureau employees, 1623
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 396, 419
Railway electrification, 3425
Rideau hall expenditure, 4627
Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duties, seven-day week, 4514
M. for disbandment, 816, 1139, 1151
Naturalization, and, 779
Reorganization, 776
Rural credits, 4146
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Russia, relations with, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986
Saar Valley Commission, 4652
Settlers' relief, 3448
Singapore naval base, 2469
Sydney steel strike, 287, 1643
Taxation, excessive, 1345
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Trial by jury, 2433
Ukrainians, 1341
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Labour
Insurance, 1638
Provision for, qu. 732
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Relief, foreigners, 1883
Value of time lost, 1685
Winnipeg, 1124-5, 1644
Conference on, 1659
Union label on Labour Gazette, 1623
United States industries and Canada, 4380
Vickers, qu. 2205
War, glorification of, 2686
Water powers
Lake the Woods, 3425
Policy, 3424
Publicity, 3421
Public and private ownership, 3425
Winnipeg, 3421
Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145
Winnipeg, Minto street armoury, qu. 2084

Wool, 2866. *See also* Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Live Stock; Textiles
Bounty on, 2866
Duty on, 447, 2866
Imports, qu. 617
Raw wool, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Sales tax, 2742
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973, 2823, 2827, 2866
Trenton mill, 3461

Woollen Industry. *See* Textiles

Workmen. *See* Labour

World's Moral Ideas, International conference, 1205

Wrangel Island, ownership, 3360, 3948

Wrecking Plants, Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763

Wrecks. *See* Marine; Vessels

Writers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Yarmouth, N.S., dredging, 944, 1011

York, Duke and Duchess, Congratulations on wedding, 2251, 2338

Yorkton Income tax office, qu. 384

Yorkton Enterprise, emigration to United States, 1404

Young, Arthur and Company. *See* Civil Service

Yukon Territory
Administration
Congdon, Mr. F. T., qu. 3131
Correspondence, 2299
Justice, 705
Road construction, 3943
British Empire exhibition, mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Council, 3943
Indemnity, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516

Yukon Territory—*Con.*
Extent of, 87
Gold output, 88
Governor General, visit of, 85
History, 85-89
Klondike, 86
Mineral resources, 85-86
Mining fees, 1636
Quartz-mining, 249
Naturalization, 2459
Population, 3943
Telegraph system, qu. 1662, qu. 2417, 2683, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Trial of Eskimos. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Wiley estate, administration, qu. 3131

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill
(Right to appeal from interlocutory judgement; jury trial; mining claims, property or location)
1r., 767-8; 2r., 4247; com., 4247; 3r., 4248

Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Zavitz, Dr., introduction of Mandeschuri barley, 483

Zinc. *See* Treaties, French Treaty